

Today I introduced a bill to curb what I consider one of the most unacceptable situations that faces our military families, and that is that our military families need food stamps. The bill I filed today, the Military Family Food Stamp Tax Credit Bill of 1999, will extend a tax credit to military families to ensure that they no longer have to depend on the government to put food on their table. The tax credit also helps our enlisted troops overseas who currently cannot participate in the food stamp program. With the anticipated increase in basic pay and this tax credit, we can look forward to raising the income level of our Nation's military so they will no longer be forced to rely on food stamps.

I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle will join me in honoring the important role of our United States military and support this bill.

QUESTIONS THAT MUST BE ASKED REGARDING OUR NATION'S COMMITMENT OF GROUND FORCES TO KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this House will debate whether the United States ground forces should be deployed to Kosovo as part of a NATO force to oversee the implementation of an agreement negotiated by a group of countries led by the United States. This body does not often debate foreign policy. Under our Constitution, foreign policy is generally the responsibility of the executive branch. But there are some limitations to that power. It is up to us to ask the tough questions, to oversee, to be the check in a system of checks and balances that generally works in the people's best interests.

We are the People's House. And while professionals might sometimes decry our provincialism, collectively we bring a perspective, an important and different perspective, to these decisions. The troops that will go to Kosovo to us are not unit designations or blocks on an organization chart. They are kids, the sons and daughters of members of our Kiwanis Clubs. They played football at our high schools and sang in the church choir. They are the kids who delivered our newspapers and struggled with math homework. They decided to go into the service because their dads did, or because they really have not decided what they want to do with their lives, or because they wanted to earn money for college, or see the world a little bit before they settled down, or because of duty to country.

There will be 4,000 names and faces with families from our hometowns who will be asked to go to a province most of them probably could not have found

on a map a few months ago, and before we send them overseas, we need to ask ourselves some tough questions. I know that, because I used to be one of them. I am the first woman veteran in the history of the United States to serve in the House of Representatives. I have friends and classmates who serve tonight in the Gulf, in Korea, in Europe, and all over the United States. I also know a little bit about NATO and European security policy, having served as a member of the United States Mission to NATO and as a director on the National Security Council staff at the White House during the period of the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Warsaw Pact. I am a strong supporter of NATO and of American engagement in the world. But my support is not unconditional or blind, nor should it be for any of us.

Let us not underestimate how profoundly serious our vote tomorrow will be. We will endorse or reject the indefinite assignment of 4,000 American men and women as part of a 30,000-person NATO deployment into the territory of a sovereign country, with which we are not at war and over the objections of that country, on the grounds that the administration of the province of Kosovo is not in accordance with international humanitarian standards. While we may have come to this point by small steps, the policy we will debate tomorrow is an extraordinary departure from what was envisioned in the NATO charter, and I would argue a departure from much of American diplomatic history.

I rise tonight not to argue with you for or against the Kosovo resolution, that will be for tomorrow, but to suggest to my colleagues some of the questions we must answer and ask on behalf of our constituents.

□ 1915

First, what is the threat to U.S. security or a vital U.S. national interest? We need to be able to answer this not in vague and rhetorical ways, but very specifically.

Second, what is the political objective we are trying to achieve, and is the deployment likely to achieve that political objective? In Kosovo, the purpose seems to be to stop oppression of the Kosovars and begin a process that will lead to a referendum on autonomy, but not independence.

Third, is the size and structure of the proposed force, their rules of engagement, their lines of command, clearly defined and adequate to the task so that risks are mitigated? Who do our forces report to, and who decides what they can and cannot do? Whom do they shoot at and for what causes? Do they have the armored vehicles and the air support they will need if everything does not go exactly as planned? And it will not. How are forces to react when KLA members refuse to disarm, as

many will? How should they react to outside intervention, unlike Bosnia where there are enclaves that different ethnic groups claim? In Kosovo, the Serbs and the Kosovars are claiming the same territory, and we are led to understand that Serbs and Kosovars and NATO forces will be all in the same area. How do we protect our troops in that situation? And what are they allowed to do?

Mr. Speaker, tonight we have a lot to think about as we prepare for the debate tomorrow.

RATIFY CEDAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues, my colleagues in the House of Representatives, to take a stand for women. In honor of Women's History Month, I am reintroducing a resolution urging the Senate to ratify the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women known as CEDAW, C-E-D-A-W. The convention holds governments responsible for first condemning and then working to eliminate all forms of discrimination against all women. This agreement establishes rights for women not previously subjected to international standards including political laws, including employment law, including education and health care.

CEDAW was approved by the United Nations General Assembly 19 years ago to codify women's equality, 19 years ago. Since then more than 160 nations have ratified CEDAW. Also, more than two-thirds of the U.N. members have gone on record dedicating themselves to ending state sanctioned discrimination against women and girls. The one glaring exception is the oldest democracy in the world, the United States.

Mr. Speaker, since 1994 the President has repeatedly submitted this treaty to the Senate where it has languished in the Committee on Foreign Relations. The position of the United States as an international champion of human rights has been jeopardized by its failing to consider and ratify CEDAW. Worse yet, our failure to act strips the United States of its ability to sit on an international committee established in the treaty to ensure that nations are adhering to the treaty's guidelines. This action sends a message loud and clear to women in this country and all over the world. The message is that we are unwilling to hold ourselves publicly accountable to the same basic standards of women's rights that other countries apply to themselves. This is despite the fact that since federal and state laws already prohibit many forms of discrimination against women, the United States could ratify the convention without changing domestic law.

The President, the Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, and national and international women's groups have expressed their commitment to CEDAW. Let us ratify CEDAW this year and make the 21st century the first century in the history of humanity where women do not know government sanctioned discrimination.

I encourage my colleagues to join me on this resolution with 41 other original cosponsors and make our desires known loud and clear that we want CEDAW, we want it ratified and we want it now.

TRIBUTE TO CHICAGO POLICE OFFICER JAMES H. CAMP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I solemnly rise today in tribute to a Chicago police officer who has fallen victim to the senseless violence that is suffocating far too many of our Nation's neighborhoods. Just today we are now mourning the death of Officer James H. Camp, a 35 year old gang tactical officer who was gunned down during a routine traffic stop made across the street from the Albert Einstein Elementary School located in my district.

When Officer Camp approached the vehicle and ordered the driver out, the driver refused. As Officer Camp began to remove the driver from this vehicle, a struggle ensued. The driver grabbed Officer Camp's gun and fatally shot him in his face. Just like that Officer Camp lost his life and became the second Chicago police officer to die in the line of duty this year.

Mr. Speaker, many of his colleagues described him as a young, aggressive, effective police officer whose focus and whose hard work produced many good arrests. Others of his colleagues, his fellow officers, say that he was a polite man who was friendly, he was well liked and he was dependable. These are all wonderful descriptions of this man who committed his life and who contributed quality to his service to the citizens of Chicago.

Today I would like to also add another personal characteristic to this list describing Officer Camp. Officer James Camp was heroic. Every day for the last 4-and-a-half years he bravely and unselfishly served the citizens of Chicago. Yesterday his efforts cleared the way for the children of Einstein Elementary School so that they could walk home in peace. His efforts brought that neighborhood closer to a community that is free of drug activity. His efforts made the first congressional district of Illinois specifically and the City of Chicago in general a much better and a much safer place to live.

It is very important for us, Mr. Speaker, to remember at this time that

Officer James Camp's service and dedication is duplicated a thousand times by brave members of the Chicago Police Department. Their bravery, which is exhibited day and night, should never ever be taken for granted. They literally risk everything that they have, including their lives, for our protection.

In closing I would like to reiterate that Officer James Camp in his short life of 35 years made quite a difference to the city, to our Nation. Indeed the Nation should thank Officer Camp for his service, for his commitment and for his dedication, and we as a Nation should extend to his widow of just three months our continued prayers for God's strength and God's grace during her time of bereavement.

HUNGER IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has proposed that the emergency supplement appropriation bill, a bill to help those ravaged by storm in Central America, be offset by hurting those ravaged by hunger in North America. This proposal, inappropriately so, requires offset from the food stamps to pay for it. This proposal fails to recognize a hunger in America is more than just a word. It is a harsh and cruel reality that affects millions and millions of Americans, including children.

According to the Catholic charities, the demand for emergency food assistance increased by 26 percent in the first half of 1998. The United States Department of Agriculture and the Census Bureau report that one in eight families in America remain on the edge of hunger. We are in an economic boom, but many working people, their families, their children, far too many, face a food crisis and a hunger burst. Indeed the U.S. Conference of Mayors tells us that close to 40 percent of those seeking food aid in 1997 were members of families where at least one person in the household was working.

That is why I support allowing participants in the Food Stamp Program to own a reliable car. Under the current law, food stamp participants cannot own a car valued at more than \$4650. This limit in the law discourages progress and promotes poverty. A reliable car is essential for daily necessity, but more importantly, this is essential for getting to work. It is important, lifting the artificial cap on rent, mortgage payments and utility bills that are used in calculating food allowance for food, also indeed is addressed. Nearly a million households, the vast majority of which include children, receive low food allowance because a cap on their housing expense is there.

In addition, the food stamp program should be available to all legal immigrants, including elderly legal immigrants, especially those that were in the country before the welfare reform was enacted, and the WIC program should be fully funded so that the nearly 10 million women, infants and children who are now eligible can be covered by this vital program. Children Nutrition, the School Lunch Program, is very, very important.

It seems to me that if there is any Federal program that has worked consistently throughout the years and has stood the test of time, it is our National School Lunch Program. Nearly 26 million children are served every day. Through this program children have a healthy meal, a healthy start so they can be alert in school, thereby giving them a chance, a chance for a change, a chance for improvement in their lives.

□ 1930

One does not have to be a rocket scientist to know that a child needs to eat to function. To educate our workforce, we must have a good school system and good teachers. That is why I believe we should fully fund the school breakfast program authorized in the 1998 child nutrition authorization program.

Whether this Congress will make the substantial and significant investment in the school breakfast program is yet to be seen. The debate over how to use this Nation's resources now, fortunately centers around what we do with the surplus.

Now that the deficit has been eliminated, we want to use our resources to help people, especially our children.

I urge my colleagues in the House to reject the Senate proposal to help those in Central America by hurting those in North America.

Everyday, twenty-six million children are served.

When a child has breakfast, that child is going to be more attentive, more alert, and his grades will improve.

When a child has breakfast, he will not have to visit the school nurse or the school principal for discipline as often.

It doesn't take much to understand that.

If America is to be competitive in the world market, we must educate our workforce.

But, good teachers can only be effective if our children are fed and not hungry in the classroom.

As you know, the President, in his budget, has requested Thirteen million for Fiscal Year 2000 for the School Breakfast Pilot Program.

It is very important that we fight for these funds. We must not take them for granted. School breakfast is not a welfare program. It is an education program. School breakfast is not charity. It is a chance for our children

Thirteen million dollars is a modest amount. But, for the children who will eat, it is an amount that will have a major impact. It seems strange that we must fight for food for those who can