

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

as Mr. Rosenthal's. Because there were millions of men and women, not just in World War II, but in every action we have been engaged in, who, without a whole lot of credit, did their duty, performed their service, achieved great victories for this country against all odds, but yet never quite received the credit that others might have received.

So on this great day, the 50th anniversary of the flag raising on Iwo Jima, I certainly am proud to stand here, not only as a reserve lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve, but also as an American, to salute those men and women who have served in our Armed Services, who were involved in World War II, and the veterans of that great conflict, and in particular the veterans of Iwo Jima, one of the bloodiest battles in American history, and certainly a battle that is well worth our remembering on this important day.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by paying homage and respect to those who give their lives and sacrifice also at Iwo Jima 50 years ago. We all owe them a great deal of debt and gratitude. Of course, as I think about all of the sacrifices that were made at Iwo Jima, I think that this was four years before the Executive Order, 5 years before the Executive Order by President Truman that made it possible for many of the men who made sacrifices at Iwo Jima to get some semblance of the recognition that they were due.

□ 2130

Because it was by Executive order of President Harry Truman that the Armed Forces were integrated and that men of color were then able to take their rightful places in the overall defense of our Nation. And we have come a long way from that, all the way up to having recently celebrated a person of color to hold the highest military office in our land. And we all join tonight with those who have gone before us this evening to celebrate those sacrifices.

Of course, that brings me to the issue that we are here to discuss tonight, an issue that we are hearing a lot about today, the issue of affirmative action. I am pleased to be joined tonight for this special order by my good friend, the Representative from Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON, BENNIE THOMPSON, and my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama, who is Representative EARL HILLIARD.

The three of us tonight are going to spend just a little time, hopefully trying to shed some light on a subject that has been the object of a lot of heat in the last few days.

Let me begin by stating what I think is the obvious for all of the people of goodwill in our great Nation. And that is the goal that we all strive for, and that is a goal of a color-blind society. That is what our goal is. I would suspect that that is the goal of most honest, right-thinking, reasonable people in America.

The question becomes, how do we get there? I do not believe that anybody would read the recent census figures that arrived in my office today over exactly where all of the segments of our society stand; that is, where they stand as relates to equality of pay, the relative pay of one group as opposed to the other. We all understand that that is something that needs to be addressed.

One of our Supreme Court justices said a few years ago that in order to get beyond color in our society, we must first take color into account.

Let me share, Mr. Speaker, with the listeners tonight something that I think makes that point very, very vividly. I hold in my hand an article from a newspaper in my State, published on February 6. It is interesting. This article says that of the 119 occupied seats on boards and commissions in a particular county, 77 percent are filled by men and 95 percent are filled by whites.

Now, the interesting thing about this is that the gentleman in charge of all of this had this to say, and I quote: "I do not think anybody has ever really paid any attention to it. Women can do the job as well as men. But I don't know if we have ever taken a look at it. Maybe we should."

Then one of the elected officials from that same county had this to say about this: "The racial and gender makeup of commissions is something I had really not thought about. Maybe we should commission a study of the issue."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we want to talk about here tonight is exactly this. This is something that people just do not seem to think about, because it is taken for granted. For some reason people just feel that things, we have been doing it this way, so there is nothing wrong with continuing to do it that way. But the fact of the matter is, for us to reach a color-blind society, we must first take color into account. And so tonight I am pleased to be joined first by my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. HILLIARD, who I am going to refer to at this time, for him to sort of set the stage for us as we try to discuss this issue to the point that maybe we can get some good, high-level intelligent discussion of this rather than all the heat that we have had in the last days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD].

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I would like to say, first of all, that I think perhaps we may want to give some type of quick historical analysis of why affirmative action, because that

is the subject we want to talk about tonight.

Soon after the Civil War, we had a period in our history that we called Reconstruction. And during that period, there were those who wanted to make sure that former slaves could participate in the political process in every respect and participate fully as Americans in our society.

So we had a great deal of bureaus that were established to do just that. They had certain objectives. And, of course, you know that was about very close to 150 years ago. And during that time, the Reconstruction period, the State of Alabama was represented by three different congresspersons who were all black Republicans and they were, so to speak, my predecessors.

After reconstruction, it took about 117 years before Alabama, once again, had an African-American to represent the State of Alabama in Congress.

Well, it is interesting to note that during the period of Reconstruction, there were a large number of affirmative action policies and, in fact, affirmative action laws. And those laws were passed by various State legislatures and by the U.S. Congress itself.

But by 1895, and very close to 1900, none of those laws existed, because of all types of problems that occurred from the majority to deny participation fully in the American society. Blacks did not and were not able to participate in the laws, lawmaking bodies of the State of Alabama or any of the former Southern States. And they were not allowed to hold Government jobs. They were not allowed to do other things that the average citizens took for granted, the average white citizen.

Of course, this went on until about 1954 or earlier, maybe a few years earlier in some of the States. But between the period of 1865 and 1954, about an entire century, there were those that rode the curve, so to speak.

□ 2140

There were periods of times in several States where blacks were able to perform according to their capacity, their ability. They received certain preferences, and this was for only a short period of time during Reconstruction. Then the curve dropped back to where it was before the Civil War. All of the programs that had been put in place to protect them, to make sure that they were able to participate in the American Government society, were terminated.

During this void from Reconstruction up until 1954, some States realized that African-Americans should be able to participate in the electoral process, should be able to participate in certain governmental activities, so there were a few laws made that were not affirmative in nature, but they did state affirmatively that segregation or discrimination would not exist in certain areas of our society, or in certain industries, or with certain Government