

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;

they deal with two remedial reading classes. Total program costs \$75,000 to \$80,000 to fund, no math program, no reading recovery program. They have had astounding success with remedial reading, do not want to lose this program, program serves grades 1 through 6. Majority emphasis is on 1, 2, and 3, although it continues to grade 6, and they have students in 4, 5, and 6 who still participate in the program. The majority of students graduate after grade 3. Cuts in the program would hurt this system.

Another one currently has 3½ teachers in grades 1 through 6 teaching remedial reading and math, are anticipating loss of 1 full-time teacher. Each teacher there serves 45 to 60 students. If you lose one teacher, 60 students will not be served in remedial reading. Feels that remedial reading is a good program, has had good results.

Here is one from another school district. They get a little over \$200,000 in title I funding, have about 7 full-time teachers plus two aides. Figures they would be cut about \$40,000. This means a loss of one teacher, probably one aide and one program. Currently have remedial reading and math in extended-day kindergarten and a transition program for first graders. Those who seem to be struggling are placed in classroom with two teachers. Figures the program that would be cut would be the extended-day kindergarten. They currently serve about 200 kids. Said they are not a high-impact district.

And there are other local school districts closer by that are high-impact and would have more adverse effects on those.

Here is another one. They are every dollar they receive from the title I to directly benefit a child. Currently have three full-time teachers who teach remedial reading and math. Besides regular program during the day, they have had an evening program which provides tutoring. The three teachers serve about 500 students, 25 percent of school population. Cuts in the program funds would directly cut one or more of the teachers. Could not absorb the cuts, and they thank our staff for calling. They say they are quite concerned with it.

I have many others here that have answered our questionnaire, and all of them are to the gist that with a couple of exceptions where the school districts are fairly well funded, that they would not be able to replace these programs with local funds, that they would have to do without, and many children would be hurt by these cuts that are being made in education for the title I programs.

Every one of them said that these moneys, our Federal dollars, are being used wisely to help educate, they are being used to make sure our children learn as they progress through the elementary grades. And I think it is poundwise, very foolish for their House to continue on the road to cutting education for our youngsters. They are the

future of our country. To say we do not need to educate them, I think is a vast mistake.

Another thing I would like to comment on is some of these school districts are in very economically low-grade or poor areas, and they need this money. They are not going to be able to replace it with local tax dollars.

So I urge the House to restore the funding for our educational programs.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES AND FUNDING OF THE EPA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLITTLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address the House this evening and talk about the Vice President's speech today. The Vice President was on a mission to distort what the Republicans are actually doing in Congress relating to environmental changes and funding the EPA. I think it is important that the Congress and the American people know what is happening.

Today Vice President GORE said we are putting our kids in danger. He said that today more than 10 million American children under 10 currently under 12 currently living within 4 miles of a toxic waste site are at risk. The Vice President also said, yes, the era of big Government is over.

My colleagues, unfortunately, I think, the Vice President is talking out of both sides of his mouth to us. I think we need to set the record straight, and let me share with you some of the facts relating to what is going on with this great current Superfund site.

First of all, the Superfund Program has been in existence for 15 years, and only 75 sites out of several thousand identified sites out of several thousand identified sites have been cleaned up, an average of 5 sites per year. The average cost of a cleanup of a site is \$30.7 million. The total cost to date in the Superfund Program to the Government and private sectors is about \$25 billion. The Superfund costs the Government and private sector \$4 billion annually for nonfederally owned sites.

However, only 53 percent of the total Superfund dollars are spent on cleaning up the sites. The rest of the money, and this is the Paul Harvey part of the story, the rest of the money, \$1.3 billion annually, is spent on attorneys and studies.

So we are, under this current system of Superfund that the Vice President is so concerned about protecting, the money does not go to clean up these sites. The money goes back for attorneys' fees and studies, and you see out of all of the sites identified, several thousand, only a handful have, in fact, been cleaned up.

What about those children the Vice President spoke about today when he addressed group here in Washington? Are we taking care of the risk to

human health and safety and welfare? How did the GAO report? This GAO report is June 17, 1994. Let me read this GAO report about the sites we are cleaning up.

Although one of the EPA's key policy objectives is to address the worst sites first. Relative risk plays little role in the agency's determination of priorities. EPA headquarters leave the task of setting priorities to the regions. Yet the regions do not even rank the sites by risk. So we find that we are not cleaning up the sites that pose, in fact, the most risk to our children, public health, and safety, and that the system that President GORE is protecting is really out of whack.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have also heard comments that EPA is going to, in fact, make polluters pay. We have to look at the record. The Vice President says this great system, in fact, currently makes polluters pay and we do not want to change that. In fact, look at these headlines, "EPA Lets Polluters Off the Hook." In fact, under the current system, you find that very few of the dollars are collected by EPA.

The Lincoln Star reported, June 21, 1993, that internal EPA figures obtained by Associated Press showed the Agency has recovered only \$843 million, or less than one-fifth of the \$4.3 billion, in cleanup costs that could be recovered from polluters under the current law. So they are not doing it now. And these are the kinds of changes we want to make here.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you what this is about. This is about command and control bureaucracy here in Washington, DC. This is about how many employees EPA has. EPA has 5,924 of its nearly 17,850 employees in the entire agency. There are 6,000 here in Washington, DC. This is about command and control and bureaucracy, not about the environment.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1972

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I lent my name to the Independent Contractors Simplification act without fully comprehending the implications of this bill. I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1972.

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

There was no objection.

DEVASTATING EDUCATION CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURIO] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURIO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are likely to take up another temporary spending bill to keep the Government open. Unfortunately, that bill will very likely contain the same