

While a tournament is not complete without its cheerleading and entertaining antics, CIAA supporters and fans have helped expand the CIAA from its meager \$500 starting budget to a tournament that today generates approximately \$7.5 million for the host city's economy. They, along with the coaches and players, make the CIAA the hottest—sold out—ticket in town.

Mr. Speaker, I, along with the many alumni, fans, and supporters, look forward to this year's 50th anniversary CIAA tournament in Winston-Salem, NC, taking place this week and to many successful years to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MILLER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FEDERAL FOOD ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to join my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], in recognizing the CIAA tournament. We both will be in attendance, and we both have schools in that that will be participating and, indeed, it is commendable that he has brought to the attention of the Nation that this tournament has been in operation for 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 is irresponsible. Federal nutrition programs for children and families will not be the same if this bill passes. School lunches and breakfasts will be slashed. Thousands of women, infants, and children will be removed from the WIC Program. National nutrition standards will be eliminated. And States will be able to transfer as much as 24 percent of nutrition funds for nonnutrition uses.

But, the impact of this proposed change goes even deeper. Retail food sales will decline by ten billion dollars, farm income will be reduced by as much as \$4 billion and unemployment will increase by as many as 138,000. The security of America's economy is at stake. From the grocery stores, large and small, to the farmer and food service worker—everyone will suffer. Most States will lose money. That is why, if I may borrow a quote, I will resist the change, "with every fiber of my being." Some want capital gains cuts. Some of us want an increase in the minimum wage. Others want block grants. We want healthy Americans.

Some want a full plate for the upper crust and crumbs for the rest of us. We want, and we will restore Federal food assistance programs. It is irresponsible to do otherwise. Nutrition of our citizens should not be left to chance. We

have a choice. During the second half of the 100-day push under the Contract With America, we will vote on the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995. Title 5 of that act proposes to consolidate all Federal food assistance programs and convert them into a block grant program.

I intend to offer an amendment in the Agriculture Committee and on the House floor should my effort in committee prove unsuccessful. My amendment would restore these vital nutrition programs. Most are working and working well. If the block grant program is passed, children and seniors will face immediate, unnecessary nutrition and health risks. There will be instantaneous cuts in Federal food assistance programs. National nutrition standards will be eliminated. And, money designated for nutrition programs will be transferred to nonnutrition programs, thus further reducing available resources.

It is also important to note that there is no real accountability in the block grant proposal, there is no contingency plan in the event of economic downturns and, the proposal does not streamline or eliminate bureaucracy as promised. School-based nutrition programs, such as school lunches and breakfasts, have been particularly successful. Even the proponents of H.R. 4, I believe, will concede this point. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, if the block grant program is put in place, in fiscal year 1996, funding for school-based programs would be \$309 million less than the current policy.

And, such funding would be over \$2 billion less over the 5-year period between 1996 and 2000. In fiscal year 1996, as much as \$1.3 billion could be transferred for nonfood programs. Such a transfer would mean as much as 24 percent less than the fiscal year 1996 level. Additionally, for more than 50 years, America has maintained a set of national standards that have guided school-based nutrition programs. All school meals must meet certain minimum vitamin, mineral and calorie contents. Those national standards are regularly updated, based upon the latest research and scientific information.

Those national standards would give way to State by State standards—standards which could be as many and varied as there are States. Those varied standards run a greater risk of being compromised by tight budgets and different perspectives. Family nutrition programs face a similar fate if they are converted into a block grant program. Spending for these programs would be \$943 million less in fiscal year 1996, and \$5.3 billion less over the 5-year period from 1996 to the year 2000, under the block grant program. Incredibly, up to \$900 million could be transferred by the States under the block grant program.

Mr. Speaker, change for the sake of improvement is good. Change for the sake of change is not. Something dif-

ferent does not necessarily create something better. The nutrition programs do not need the kind of sweeping change as proposed by the proponents of H.R. 4.

□ 2120

TRIBUTE TO THOSE WHO FOUGHT THE BATTLE OF IWO JIMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that my colleague, Mr. DORNAN, from California, is going to be addressing the House a little bit later this evening on the subject of Iwo Jima. In advance of his presentation, I want to take a few minutes to address the House to talk about what a great day this is.

Fifty years ago today, the flag was raised proudly atop Mount Suribachi during the Battle of Iwo Jima. It is a great day for World War II veterans. It is now 50 years ago that we were winding down World War II. This was one of the last major battles that was fought. But it was also a great day for Marine veterans and those Marines, sailors, who were involved in that battle.

But there is one aspect of the flag raising that I would like to call some attention to. Specifically, we are all familiar with the famous photograph that was taken by Joe Rosenthal of the Associated Press and what a great landmark photograph that that was, probably one of the most famous combat photographs ever taken, certainly in world history one of the most familiar ever taken.

But that was the second photograph of a flag raising. I want to devote a minute to talk about the photographer of the first flag raising on Mount Suribachi, a Marine Corps staff sergeant by the name of Lou Lowery.

Lou was a Marine Corps combat correspondent. Many who maybe have not had experience in the military might not understand the important role that combat correspondents, both photographers and journalists, play. Literally in every action in which American servicemen and women are involved, combat photographers and journalists follow.

Lou Lowery, as a staff sergeant, was with the first patrol that raised the first flag. The photograph that was taken wasn't as dramatic as the one that was taken by Mr. Rosenthal, but yet it was just as significant, because it symbolized the triumph over extreme odds of a determined group of Marines and sailors who were determined to fight and achieve victory for this great country.

But it was also an important photograph in the sense that Lou may not have ever received the credit that Mr. Rosenthal did. But in many ways his photograph and his memory is as fitting a tribute to World War II veterans