

Farrakhan's purposes, although he is reported as having said during his tour, "You can quote me, God will destroy America by the hands of Muslims."

I do not know his motives or his intent, and I do not wish to bring up his situation to disparage him, because I really do not know. But it does call to our attention the fact that there are states like Libya and the Sudan and Iran who could provide money to the wrong hands in the United States in large quantities, potentially under current law. We need to close that loophole. That is what my amendment does. That is why I offered it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I support the amendment, Mr. Chairman, for a simple reason. I think it is wrong for anyone in the United States, I think it is wrong for anyone in the United States to knowingly deal with a country that sponsors terrorism. Why should we allow countries that sponsor such horrible acts as blowing up our barracks or blasting our airliners out of the sky to benefit from dealings with U.S. citizens?

As I understand the measure, it essentially ties together in one place existing prohibitions that depend on a series of executive acts. I want to salute the gentleman for doing it. I think it is not controversial, and hope we can move the amendment with alacrity.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. DOOLITTLE] having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2703) to combat terrorism had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 163, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 163) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, when called up; and that it be in order at any time to consider the joint resolution in the House; that the joint res-

olution be debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]; that all points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration be waived; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly would not object, I would like to inquire of the chairman if he has any idea what time tomorrow this would be brought up on the floor.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman that we expect to bring this up sometime mid-afternoon tomorrow. I would tell the gentleman that, had we received a more speedy process on the current bill that passed the House last week, that this might not be necessary. But in view of the fact that we have not been able to go to conference, it does become necessary.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

□ 1730

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL ROTUNDA FOR PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45) authorizing the use of the Capitol rotunda on May 2, 1996, for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to Reverend and Mrs. Billy Graham, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLITTLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 45

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the rotunda of the United States Capitol is hereby authorized to be used on May 2, 1996, at 2 o'clock post meridian for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to Reverend and Mrs. Billy Graham. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 359.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 359.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the Following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

WOMEN IN THE HISTORY OF THE NATION

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me this time. I guess we are not finishing the bill today. I must say I hope Members think about the bill that we had under debate when the committee rose, because at this moment we still have the President in Egypt talking about terrorism, and what I think has happened is we have gutted the terrorism provisions in this bill. So while the President is away trying to say we will not

allow terrorists to terrorize us into not pursuing peace, we are here undoing the terrorism bill, and I do not think that is a happy conclusion for anybody. I feel like we should ring him up and say, hello, President, guess what we just did.

I do not think the President is going to be too happy about that. I think tomorrow we are going to have an opportunity to reinstate the terrorism provisions, and I hope Members think about that. This was a very strange day procedurally.

While I have the floor and while it is still March, I would like to also continue talking a bit about Women's History Week, because it has been a very interesting month in that every time I talk about it, it seems there are some people who absolutely cannot stand the fact that women have done anything in the great history of this Nation. I have been talking about women in the history of the military, the fact that there were women in the revolutionary war. In fact, one of them is buried at West Point. About Mrs. Washington going off there. Today let me talk about Mary Goddard. Let me talk about Dr. Walker, who was one of the surgeons during the civil war.

There are so many women in history that contributed to this country and so few of us know about it that that is why we have this month, to try and reinstate some of the history that we know about.

On July 4, we all celebrate the wonderful independence day, the Declaration of Independence, how exciting it is, but the thing that very few people really realize is that while these esteemed forefathers wrote this, writing it was not a crime. Printing it was a crime. Because obviously you didn't have radio, you did not have television. Printing it was how you could distribute it. If you had to sit down and hand write every copy of the Declaration of Independence, we would probably still be waiting for the revolutionary war. So as a consequence, printing such a document was treason by virtue of an act of the crown, and when they got done with this, they went around trying to find somebody who would print this document.

Everyone, many, anyway, would see it and say, well, thank you very much. We wish you well with the revolution, but we are not really into treason this year. You know, that is kind of a high price to pay, and it will be my neck that they will come after.

After searching diligently to try and find a way to get this printed so they could disseminate it to the 13 colonies, they found a woman named Mary Goddard who had a printing press, agreed to print this, and in fact wrote her name on the bottom because the register of the press had been in the name of one of the male members of the family, and she wanted the king to know that she had done this because she had not transferred the seal over to her name yet.

I think that was a very courageous thing to do. If this thing had not worked, she would have been the first one they would have gone after and she would have been the first one to lose her head by order of George III. Now, for that she became the highest paid Federal employee in the history of America and that was postmistress of Baltimore.

If you look at where we got freedom of religion, it is no secret that many of our forefathers who came here really were about freedom of religion. They were about freedom to practice their way but they did not want anybody practicing any other way, so they were very repressive once they got here to anyone who did not agree with them.

It was Anne Hutchinson, her husband and her followers who were chased out of Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Bay Colony, through a trial that took them two or three times to finally try and convict her because she was so popular in the area. They tried her for heresy, and she left and went down to what we now know as Rhode Island.

It used to be called Rogues Island because they thought only a bunch of rogues would live together and be for freedom of religion. It went from Rogues Island to Rhode Island. It is wonderful and many women are very proud that a woman founded the colony, and it was the first colony that had freedom of religion in its charter.

There were many, many women who were forgotten. We all remember Abigail Adams, wife of John Adams, who kept writing him during the time that the Constitution was being drafted. She kept saying, "Remember the ladies," and he wrote back sarcastic things like many of our radio hosts fire off over the radio every day. He would write back these sarcastic things, and of course they did not remember the ladies. They wrote the Constitution and left women out.

But Abigail raised her son very properly, and many years later he was writing in his memoirs and letters how tragic it was that with each year that passed, people knew less and less about the contributions many brave women had made during the colonization of America and during the Revolutionary War period. We all know about Paul Revere riding through Boston, but we do not know about Sarah Luddington saving Connecticut, riding through there.

These things are all important. These things we celebrate. I must say I get very, very tired of people trying to minimize this. It is not that we are saying we did it all and men did nothing. We are saying both men and women contributed to this great country.

That is our model of standing shoulder-to-shoulder, and this is a time where we should really go back and reinstate women in history rather than continuing to pretend like they did not do anything, they came here on cruise ships, they sat around and ate bonbons,

sat around and got their hair done and nails done, waiting for everything to be done so they could celebrate.

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

[Mr. MCINTOSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

CUTS IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR EDUCATION

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, as we have progressed in this House through the appropriation for the education program, especially for our title I program, we have found a continuation of the philosophy on the majority side that these funds for elementary and secondary education can be cut without causing any harm to the students in the school systems throughout the United States, that the majority of the Republicans feel, under the leadership of NEWT GINGRICH that these funds can be cut and no harm will be done.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you and other Members of this House do as I have done, and that is to contact your local school districts and talk to them about what a 17- or 20-percent cut in title I funds for remedial reading and reading recovery or math, remedial math, and those programs will do to those local districts.

I have done so and I would like to read to you, without naming the names of the school districts, some of the comments that have come from those schools. One says a 17-percent cut in funding will be a cut of \$15,000 to \$16,000 real program dollars. They currently have two full-time teachers, elementary level, who teach remedial reading and math. Since the calculation for change this year, they actually get more money and will have a little carryover. They plan to use the carryover to fund a reading recovery program. They do not have a summer school program.

Another one currently has 35 or 36 full-time teachers, about 18 aides, who serve 400 to 500 students. They deal with remedial reading and math during the regular school year and summer school, which includes pre-kindergarten level, to start a reading recovery program for at-risk first graders which is working out wonderfully. A 20-percent cut, which is what is heard, will be a great impact on their schools. Off the top of his head, the superintendent said that they would do all they could to save the reading recovery, but cuts will be done to regular remedial programs.

□ 1745

Another one, currently one of every two teachers with two aides full-time;