

H.R. 45 has its roots in expediency over public health and welfare. H.R. 45 throws out existing radiation safety standards and replaces them with dangerous levels of radiation exposure that would be, quote, acceptable. The temporary dump cannot meet the current standards, so H.R. 45 permits Nevadans to be exposed to four to six times the amount of radiation allowed at any other waste site. H.R. 45 allows exposure 25 times the level set by the Safe Drinking Water Act.

EPA administrator Carol Browner said H.R. 45 would authorize exposures to future generations of Nevadans which are much higher than those allowed for other Americans and citizens of other countries. Congress in 1982 called for nine potential nuclear storage sites to be assessed. By 1987, due to political considerations, not scientific findings, Yucca Mountain alone was targeted for site characterization.

As it became increasingly clear Yucca Mountain is not suitable under stringent and responsible law that Congress passed in 1982, the rules have been repeatedly relaxed in favor of Yucca Mountain and against health and safety. And now comes H.R. 45, a bill which achieves nothing but risks the health and safety of current and future generations of Nevadans.

The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board advises that there are no compelling reasons to move the nuclear waste in short term. H.R. 45 would be a terrible and needless mistake. If passed, it would be fought in courts by Americans across this country. I would stand with them in court or on the roads and rails if necessary to stop this disastrous policy.

REMEMBER PAOLI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this special order to discuss America's patriots. The patriots of America have been extremely important in the struggle for this great Nation over the past 220 years, to allow us to enjoy the freedoms and the independence that oftentimes we take for granted. My discussion today will focus on the patriots of America of the past and the patriots of America today, those who are defending our country around the world.

Let me start off by discussing a situation I think requires national attention.

Over 220 years ago, Mr. Speaker, this Nation was fighting for its existence. Young patriots, many of whom were undertrained, who were not properly fed, who were ill-equipped, were fighting against the forces of England to

allow us to have a free independent Nation. There were some very serious battles in that process. We know those battles from our history books, the battles of Valley Forge, the battles that took place in Brandywine.

But, Mr. Speaker, what we have failed to understand is that one key battle that many historians would argue was the turning point in the morale of our troops to defeat the British was the battle that resulted in the outcry of our troops, "Remember Paoli." It occurred in the spring of 1777 when the British were conducting the Philadelphia campaign to then take over the capital of our Nation because at that time Philadelphia was the capital of the United States. There was a major effort on the part of the British to move to capture Philadelphia, and in the process a series of battles took place.

The first of two American attempts to stop the British invasion that fall was the battle of Brandywine, September 11, 1777, and the unsuccessful Battle of the Clouds, September 16, 1777. There was also a third attempt to contain the British General Sir William Howe's advance on Philadelphia, and each of them were unsuccessful.

But a very important history lesson shows us that in the Battle of Paoli the British troops sought and successfully committed a surprise attack on our troops that were encamped at Paoli at a cornfield, a cornfield that still exists today. The British went to do this in the early morning hours so as to avoid detection, and they did not want to use their guns because they wanted a surprise attack to wipe out the patriots for the fight for our independence.

The battle took place, and the British massacred the American patriots. Their bayonet attacks on the American young men who fought there, many of whom were 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 years of age, were by all accounts devastating. Fifty-three young Americans were slaughtered, slaughtered by the British. They were slaughtered in such a fierce way that the story of that battle traveled throughout the Revolutionary War troops and the cry of "Remember Paoli" became a rallying cry for the American patriots in all future battles of the revolution which we all know we successfully won.

"Remember Paoli" was about a battle fought on a 40-acre site in Malvern and Chester County in Pennsylvania, not far from Valley Forge and not far from Brandywine. Today there are 53 young American patriots whose bodies lay in rest at that site.

The challenge we have, Mr. Speaker, is that that 40-acre battlefield adjacent to the burial site of these young American patriots is about to be sold. It is about to be developed; perhaps another shopping center, perhaps another housing project, perhaps being paved over by someone who wants to build some

new type of development in the area that we call the Main Line coming out of Philadelphia, a very affluent area.

But the owner of the property, a private school right next to the site, has issued a challenge, that America, the State, the county and the local community should undertake an effort to preserve that 40-acre site so that those 53 young American patriots, so that their memory is never forgotten.

Two and a half years ago when the owner of that property came forward, the owner of the school, the board of directors said, "We challenge the community, we challenge the country to protect this site and allow us to move on to other things. But if you do not take up that challenge, we will sell the site to developers."

Mr. Speaker, that sale is imminent, and if in fact the Paoli site is sold, it will be one of the last remaining significant sites that was a part of our Revolutionary War history. It is a site that needs to be protected. It is a site that needs the Federal Government, the State, the county and the local government to come together with the private sector to show those American patriots and all of our war heroes, including those serving the country today, that we will always remember and honor their service, and in this case especially because of the symbolism associated with the battle at Paoli and the massacre that occurred there.

Two and a half years ago a local group led by citizens in Malvern Borough, where Paoli is located, joined together to begin to raise the private money to acquire this site. Now many would argue this site should be protected by the Federal Government. After all, it was a major battle, just as Valley Forge was a battle and Brandywine was a battle and other historical sites were battle grounds. But they decided they would set the tone, so they set out to raise money. To date they have raised over \$500,000 in actual money and commitments to help protect this site.

They came to me one year ago, and they said, "Congressman, can you assist us? Because there are patriots of the Revolutionary War who are buried at this site." And I said absolutely unequivocally I would help to have the Federal Government include this site as a part of the history of this great Nation.

Throughout last year we worked on a bipartisan piece of legislation that worked its way out of the Committee on Resources. With the full support of JIM HANSEN and his subcommittee and DON YOUNG on the full committee the bill was passed in the Senate, but because of a difficulty in getting the bill under unanimous consent on the floor on the last day could not be brought up for passage. I have reintroduced that measure in the House this session.

Yesterday I introduced the Patriot Act, Mr. Speaker, which would, in fact, allow us to assist the local folks in protecting the site of the Paoli massacre and the revered site where those 53 young Americans are buried. The bill has the unanimous support of the entire Pennsylvania congressional delegation, our neighbor in Delaware, Congressman CASTLE, our neighbor in south Jersey, ROB ANDREWS, because they understand, as I do, the historical significance of this site.

The legislation, Mr. Speaker, would allow us to authorize up to \$2.5 million to show this local school that we want to work with the local folks to acquire this site. This act would require that a study be done by the National Park Service as to whether or not the site of the Paoli massacre should be included as a part of the Valley Forge National Park right down the road. In the meantime, it would allow the Federal Government to an appropriate on a dollar-for-dollar basis one-half of the \$2.5 million needed to acquire this site.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the local folks in Chester County have already raised \$500,000. What we would do is then move to provide a matching dollar-for-dollar basis up to a cap of \$1.25 million, so we would have a combined total of \$2.5 million to acquire the 40-acre site.

The Borough of Malvern, where the battlefield is located, has agreed to maintain the site until the Park Service determines whether or not it will take the site as a part of Valley Forge National Park. In the meantime, they will police it, they will oversee it. That site will remain as it was 222 years ago. It will still be the cornfield that it was when those soldiers bravely fought for our independence.

To do anything less than protect that site would in my opinion be a national embarrassment, and I urge my colleagues to sign on, to jointly support and honor those brave patriots who fought for America's independence, to allow us to help protect one of those final sites in our history that is today threatened by developers.

Mr. Speaker, the precedent is clear here. We are not asking for the Federal Government to go out and buy the land itself. The local community is raising the funds. The local community is committed.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, two days ago I visited one of the elementary schools right near the Paoli site, the Exton Elementary School, where the combined students of the fourth grade class of the Exton elementary school handed me 41,000 and 500 pennies. In their Pennies for Paoli campaign these young students for the past five months collected pennies from throughout their neighborhood because they want to show the Federal, State and county governments that they think it is important that we take the time to protect this sacred site where these 53 American heroes are buried.

□ 1530

They handed me the money and the accompanying check for \$415 as a part of their ongoing commitment to help indicate their support and their involvement in saving Paoli.

Other schools in the region have taken similar initiatives to help protect the Paoli site. Mr. Speaker, the Sugartown Elementary School, the KD Markley Elementary School, the Charlestown Elementary School and the Exton Elementary School all have conducted letter writing campaigns.

My office has received thousands of letters from young people, not just in our region, but because this story was the subject of a national news story on Good Morning America on July 4th of last year, thousands of people around America have written to say that we too think America should protect and preserve this final site that is so important to understanding the history of America during our struggle for freedom and independence. I think our students have set the example for us.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit some of the letters from these elementary students about what they think about the Paoli site.

From Nick, dated January 4, 1999: "Dear Mr. Weldon, please save the Paoli Battlefield. It is very special to us. It helps us learn about our country's history." He drew pictures of the battle.

I have another letter from Myles Neuman from Sugartown School: "Dear Curt Weldon, the Paoli Battlefield should be preserved as a national park because those graves should honor the brave soldiers that fought for our country. If you were one of the honorable soldiers that fought on this field, would you like builders to develop something or develop it for other uses in Paoli? This would be a great honor for us and the kids that are learning about our history. It would be a wonderful addition to Valley Forge Park." That is from Myles Neuman.

Or Alyssa Jackson, who says: "I am in Mrs. Weigal's fourth grade class. I live in Frazer, PA. I am writing to you to do all that you can to save the Paoli Battlefield. I think the builders are wrong to want to build homes or businesses where over 50 people are buried. I hope you can do something about it."

Finally, from Emily: "Please save the Paoli Battlefield. It is very special to us. It helps us to learn about our country's history. I have seen the Paoli Battlefield. It is very pretty."

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the thousands of letters that I have received from young people, not just in my district, but throughout the region and throughout the country, that are asking this Congress to do something very small, very simple, yet very historic, and that is to pass the authorizing legislation that passed the Senate in the last session, that passed the In-

terior Committee, to allow us to work with the local folks to preserve the Paoli Battlefield. Nothing I think of could be more important for the remembrance of our patriots.

Also in our P.A.T.R.I.O.T. Act, Mr. Speaker, we authorize the continued funding of approximately \$6 million for the full definition of the Brandywine Battlefield. The Brandywine Battlefield, where another historic battle was fought between our patriots and the British, has not yet been fully completed in terms of acquiring the space around it.

We are not talking about money to build buildings. We are talking about the easements necessary to keep this battle site as it was 222 years ago.

In the case of Brandywine, again, we are saying that the authorization is for \$6 million, but the local folks must raise \$3 million, so on a dollar for dollar basis, with state money, with county money, with private dollars, we will match on a dollar for dollar basis the funding necessary to complete the full dimensions of the original site of the Brandywine Battlefield.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the third provision in my P.A.T.R.I.O.T. Act would allow us to approve an agreement between the National Park Service and the largest collectors of Revolutionary War artifacts in America.

For the past 5 years I have been working with the collectors, those people who have the largest private collections of Revolutionary War materials. Most of these materials are today being housed within their own control or they are loaned to museums when they see fit.

The collectors approached me and said, "Congressman Weldon, we would like to work with you to privately fund a major new display area and museum at the site of Valley Forge. We are not asking for Federal money. We are asking you to work with us in an agreement with the Park Service that will allow us to have a trade of property that is currently owned by the Valley Forge historical society to allow us to raise the money to build this new 21st century learning center about the Revolutionary War."

The collectors that I have been working with, Mr. Speaker, have agreed that they would make their collections available to this site, that they would be permanently on display for all Americans to see, artifacts that Americans otherwise would not have access to, to compliment those artifacts that are already existing at Valley Forge.

All we are asking in this bill is to give the Park Service the approval to finalize that agreement between the private collectors and the National Park Service. We are asking for no authorization of dollars to allow this new museum to go forward.

Mr. Speaker, he thinks these three initiatives are very logical. I think

they are the kind of thing that Republicans and Democrats can jointly support. I think there is no better series of actions that we can take in 1999 to remember the Pennsylvania patriots who fought to give us the freedoms and liberties and independence of this great Nation. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting the patriots of the Revolutionary War and to cosponsor the P.A.T.R.I.O.T. Act of 1999.

MEETING THE NEEDS OF AMERICA'S PATRIOTS OF TODAY

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the second half of my special order I would also like to discuss America's patriots of today, because we have some major problems that need to be addressed in this session of the Congress.

We need to address these, Mr. Speaker, because the patriots of today are finding it extremely difficult to do the job that they voluntarily signed up to do on behalf of our great Nation.

I am ashamed to tell you, Mr. Speaker, today, as a senior member of the Committee on Armed Services, as the chairman of one of our key subcommittees, that we have some of our fighter wings where up to one-third of our airplanes are not flying because they have had to be cannibalized to use the parts from those planes to keep the other two-thirds flying.

I am ashamed to report, Mr. Speaker, that we have ships at sea, our carriers, where we are hundreds of sailors short, going out to complete missions and coming back home without the proper staffing that we have identified as appropriate for these most important vessels of our Navy.

I am embarrassed that we are asking our Marine Corps to fly in CH-46 helicopters that were built during the Vietnam War that we will continue to fly until they are 55 years old. I am embarrassed that we will be flying the B-52 bomber when it is 75 years old.

Mr. Speaker, we have problems in our military that we need to address, and these problems did not happen overnight and these problems need to be addressed in a bipartisan manner.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we have to understand why we are where we are today. Let me take a few moments to inform our constituents and our colleagues, especially our colleagues who are sitting in their offices or perhaps back in their homes, about the problems that our military is suffering today, because the perception in America is that we have given so much money to our military that they should have the need of no new dollars. In fact, there are some who say we should cut the defense budget even more than we have cut it.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 14 to 15 years, the only area of the Federal budget that we have cut in real terms has been our defense budget. Fourteen consecutive years of real cuts, not in-

flationary cuts, but real cuts, in the level of defense spending.

Now, some would say, well, that was justified because the Cold War ended. Let me give you a simple comparison, Mr. Speaker. Let me use the time of John Kennedy, not Ronald Reagan.

When John Kennedy was the President in the 1960's, this country was spending 52 cents of every Federal tax dollar on our military, on those brave patriots who serve our country. That was a time of peace. It was after Korea, yet it was before Vietnam. Yet in those years that John Kennedy served, 52 cents of every Federal tax dollar sent to Washington went to support the men and women in the military. Nine percent of our country's gross national product was used on defense.

In this year's budget, Mr. Speaker, we are spending 15 cents of the Federal tax dollar on the military. We are spending approximately 2.8 percent of our country's gross national product on the military. By anyone's calculation, that is a dramatic decline.

Now, some would say that is still enough money. It is more than other nations spend collectively, and we should be able to handle that because, after all, the Cold War has ended.

But, Mr. Speaker, things have changed since the 1960's. Let's go through a few of those changes.

First of all, when John Kennedy was President, we had a draft. We sucked young people out of high school, we paid them next to nothing, they served the country for two years, and then they went on to do their chosen career or their job in the private sector.

We no longer have the draft, Mr. Speaker. Our troops today are well paid. Our troops today have high school educations, many have college degrees, many are married, they have children. Therefore, we have housing costs, health care costs, education costs, travel costs, that they never had when John Kennedy was the President.

Mr. Speaker, even though we have cut defense spending dramatically, the portion of our defense budget that we use for the quality of life for our troops has increased dramatically. This is where the bulk of our money goes today, to educate the young offspring, to take care of health care needs, to provide housing for our troops and families and travel to move them at home and around the world.

But some other things have happened, Mr. Speaker. Back when John Kennedy was the President, we spent no money in the defense budget on the environment. In this year's defense budget, Mr. Speaker, we will spend \$12 billion of DOD money on environmental mitigation. Approximately half of that money goes for our nuclear program, to deal with our decommissioned nuclear vessels. The other half goes for a variety of programs, ranging from base cleanups to environmental co-

operation with nations and militaries around the world. But that is \$12 billion more out of our defense budget that wasn't spent during John Kennedy's era. That is increasing each year.

But perhaps the most dramatic change, Mr. Speaker, since the 1960's, is best reflected by this chart. From World War II until approximately 7 to 8 years ago, the commanders-in-chief of our country, who were both Democrats and Republicans, committed our troops to just 10 deployments at home and abroad. Ten times over 40 years our troops were sent into harm's way. They were sent into Vietnam, they were sent into Grenada, they were sent into Chicago and Detroit and Watts, but only 10 times in 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, in the past 7 years, most of them under the current administration, this commander-in-chief has deployed our troops 32 times. Thirty-two times in 8 years, 10 deployments in 40 years. At a time where the bulk of our money is going for quality of life, at a time where we are spending \$12 billion a year on the environment, we have 32 deployments, and the President is talking today about sending 4,000 to 5,000 troops to Kosovo, which would raise this to 33 deployments.

Now, why is that important, Mr. Speaker? Because every time the commander-in-chief commits our troops, he has not identified the dollars to pay for those deployments. He simply commits the troops, and then we are left to pay the price that is required to pay for those deployments around the world.

The deployment to Bosnia, Mr. Speaker, as of today, has cost the American taxpayers \$9 billion. Where did that money come from, Mr. Speaker? Because we did not allocate that money in advance, all of that \$9 billion had to come out of an ever-decreasing defense budget.

So what did we do? Instead of building replacement helicopters for the CH-46, we slid the replacement program out to some other administration. Instead of building the Army's replacement helicopter for their existing helicopter, we shipped the Comanche out to the out years. Instead of taking care of the replacement parts for those fighter planes, we slipped that out and we have to cannibalize existing planes. And because we cannot recruit new young people to fill the slots for the Navy and the other services, we have had to go to deployments with less than the required slots filled. In fact, Mr. Speaker, our retention rates for pilots in the Navy and the Air Force is the lowest rate since World War II.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, these deployments have robbed our modernization and our research for the future. It has caused us, in my opinion, to face the time when

we will look back on these eight years as the worst period of time for undermining our national security in the Nation's history.

Now, Mr. Speaker, critics will look at this and say, "Wait a minute, wait a minute, what about President Bush?" Because eight years ago he was the one who sent our troops into Desert Storm, and after all, that was a major war. Mr. Speaker, they would be right. President Bush did send our troops into Desert Storm. He sent 400,000 of our troops over there. But, Mr. Speaker, when Commander in Chief Bush sent our troops into Desert Storm, he went to all of our allies and he said, "You either send troops, or you pay for the cost of Desert Storm."

Desert Storm cost the American taxpayers \$52 billion, but unlike this administration, President Bush was able to receive \$53 billion in reimbursements. Those allied nations that did not send troops to Desert Storm gave us the dollars to pay for that deployment, so the net cost to us in terms of dollars was zero. And the deployments under this administration, every one of them, have been paid for by the U.S. taxpayer by robbing the DOD budget.

When we sent our troops into Haiti, President Clinton said it was going to be a multinational force, and some would say it is. But what he did not tell us, Mr. Speaker, is that we are paying for the salary and the housing costs and in some cases the food costs for foreign troops to go into Haiti. Bangladesh sent 1,000 troops. It was a good deal for them because American taxpayers are paying for the costs of keeping them in Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, unlike Desert Storm, these most recent 31 deployments or 32 deployments have been paid for by the U.S. taxpayer, taking money out of the defense budget that was already dramatically being decreased. The irony of all of this, Mr. Speaker, is I have to focus on two points.

First of all, by deploying American men and women around the world, this President has created the impression that all of a sudden the world is safe. There are no more wars in Bosnia, there is no more conflict in Haiti, there is no more conflict in Macedonia and there will be no more conflict in Kosovo, because America has our troops around the world. And the irony is that the American people think by perception that therefore we must cut the defense budget because the world is so much safer today, when in fact it is safer because we have troops on standby and on alert around the world that is costing us dearly in terms of dollars necessary to modernize our military.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, the President got a standing ovation when he went to the U.N. If I were the President and went to the U.N. and all of those nations out there saw America ready to put our troops on the spot around

the world and not pay for it, I would get a standing ovation too.

Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon's own numbers show that for these deployments just in this administration, the American taxpayers have spent a total of \$19 billion, \$9 billion for Bosnia alone. Mr. Speaker, \$19 billion, to send our troops to places some of which I support, but which should have had our allies pay the bill.

When many of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, both Democrats and Republicans, objected to deploying our troops into Bosnia, it was not because we did not think that Bosnia was important or that we did not think we should be part of a multinational force, because we do. What we objected to, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that America was going to send 36,000 troops into Bosnia, both in theater and in the support around Bosnia, when neighbors like France and Germany were only sending in token components. In the case of Germany, 4,000 troops; in the case of the French and the other neighbors of Bosnia, much smaller amounts.

The question we had is, why is the U.S. footing the bill? Why should not these other nations do what George Bush got nations to do in Desert Storm? Why should they not chip in and help to pay for these operations?

That did not happen, Mr. Speaker, and right now we are facing a situation where the President is saying to the American people, we need to send 4,000 to 5,000 troops into Kosovo. That may or may not be justified, but, Mr. Speaker, he is not going to ask for the approval of the Congress. For the 33rd time in 7 years, he will simply send our troops, as he can do as the commander in chief. He is not going to tell us how much it will cost, because we already asked and he said we do not know. And he is not going to tell us how long they are going to stay there. He is going to send our troops and the Congress is going to be left to foot the bill.

The second irony of this whole thing, Mr. Speaker, is as we in this Congress, Republicans and Democrats over the past four years have tried to replenish some of these funds, to reimburse the military for the extra costs of these deployments, we have been criticized for putting more money in the Pentagon's budget than what the service chiefs asked for. In each of the past four years, Democrats and Republicans came together in both the House and the other body and we said, we want to replenish some of these funds because they have been taken away for military operations and the Pentagon was not reimbursed for the cost. Each year that we did that, this White House that sent our troops on these deployments and did not ask for our approval publicly criticized us for putting more money into the defense budget than what the service chiefs had asked for. Amazing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, \$19 billion to pay for these deployments. This Congress, in a bipartisan way trying to reimburse the Department of Defense for those deployments, gets criticized because we are putting pork that was not asked for back into defense budget.

Because of these shortcomings, Mr. Speaker, we are facing a crisis today. We have slipped the modernization of our military systems to the next administration. The service chiefs have now publicly come on the record, and in a hearing last week before the House and the week before before the Senate, they said this year they are \$19 billion short just to meet their needs.

Now, the President has given some great speeches over the past 30 days. We heard the Secretary of Defense give a speech where he said the White House had now agreed with the Congress that the threat of external missile proliferation is now real and it is here, and therefore they put hundreds of millions of dollars into the outyears budget for missile defense, something we have been saying for the past three years.

The President gave a speech on cyber terrorism. He said we need to put more money in the budget to protect this country from those who would threaten to take out our smart systems, both our weapons systems and our information systems that control our quality of life. He gave another speech where he said we needed to spend more money against terrorism and for detection of use of weapons of mass destruction.

But what he did not tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, is that his budget request for next year actually does not increase funding for any of those areas. The missile defense budget decreases by a significant amount over five years. The budget for antiterrorism does not increase the way it needs to, in spite of this Congress's leadership in that area; and the budget for cyber terrorism and information warfare likewise does not increase. In fact it stagnates and, I would argue, decreases, when the Defense Science Board three years ago told us we should be spending \$3 billion more on the issue of information warfare to protect America from a cyber attack.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a very unusual situation. We have an administration that has used our military more than any administration in this century, in this country's history. Mr. Speaker, 32 and soon to be 33 deployments in 7 to 8 years, versus 10 in 40 years. Yet, during that time the administration has continued to decrease the funding for the services, has paid for none of these deployments, has asked to take all of that money out of the backbone of our military budget and then has criticized the Congress for wanting to put more money back in, and goes around the world saying how nice and calm things are.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be real. This is not an argument between Republicans and Democrats. In the House and the Senate, the defense battles have been won by Democrats and Republicans coming together to tell this administration that they have got it all wrong. And in this Congress, the single most important debate we will have is about the future of the support of our patriots.

I started off my talk today by focusing on the patriots of 222 years ago. I end my talk today in talking about the patriots of 1999, young people around the world who are being asked to go from Bosnia to Haiti, from Haiti to Somalia, from Somalia to Macedonia. In the trips I have taken to meet with our young troops they talk about their pride in America and their pride in the service and they are the best in the world, but they also say, "Mr. Congressman, can you please stop sending us from one deployment to the next? We need some time off with our families. We need some time off just to have some rest."

We need to stop being deployed around the world, because while we have not done that for them, our morale has declined. That is why our retention rates are so low. That is why we do not have the staffing needs that we should have for the military. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this period of time is going to go down in history as the worst period of time for undermining our Nation's security in the history of America.

In spite of the presence of our troops all around the world in all of these deployments today, I would argue the world is more unstable than in some cases it was during the Cold War. Russia has many internal problems: economic instability, massive proliferation that is in many cases totally uncontrollable. We have instances where China and North Korea have been caught sending technology to countries like North Korea. We know that Pakistan and India both got their technology from Russia and China. We know that Iran and Iraq have developed missile systems because of cooperation from those nations. And all of this instability is causing us to face increasing threats in the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be real with the American people. This administration has not been real with the American people. They have painted a rosy picture. They have had the photo ops of the commander in chief walking down the White House lawn with the troops behind him. They have had the photo opportunity of the commander in chief on the decks of the carrier when it was dedicated. But that is not what supporting our troops is all about. It is about funding them. It is about asking for the dollars to support these deployments. It is about giving them the systems to protect their lives.

Mr. Speaker, another example of an attempt to back-door the defense budget is the administration's backhanded effort to pay for the Wye River Agreement. The Wye River Agreement, which I applaud the administration for achieving, is important for security, and we need to understand the importance of that. But instead of coming to this Congress and asking us openly to support the funding for the Wye River Agreement, the administration has proposed and has informed the Congress that they will take an additional \$230 million out of our defense budget for missile defense purposes to fund the Wye River Agreement, which has nothing to do with our defense budget.

Mr. Speaker, how much longer will this continue? How much more will we tolerate the efforts of this administration to undermine the security of this country? Democrats and Republicans alike have been working together in this area to do the job that America needs.

I urge my colleagues in this 106th Congress to pay attention, to work together as we have in the past to convince the administration that this must stop, that we must support our troops, that we must make sure that everyone understands that the reason we have a strong military is not just to deploy our troops around the world but to deter aggression. No Nation has ever been defeated because it was too strong, and we must understand that one of most important responsibilities outlined in the Constitution is the defense of the American people wherever they might be, at home or abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the students of the outstanding schools in my Congressional District—Sugartown Elementary School, KD Markley Elementary School, Charlestown Elementary School, and East Goshen Elementary School. The fine students of these schools have contacted me to inform me of an issue which is important to them, to their schools, to their community and to our nation—they are fighting to save the Paoli Battlefield.

The Paoli Battlefield, which is located in my Congressional District, remains one of the only historic sites from the Revolutionary War left untouched since 1777. This land was the site of the "Paoli Massacre" in which British troops led by Major General Grey attacked the American Army of Pennsylvania Regiments on the wooded hillside and two fields between what is now Sugartown Road and Warren Avenue. The ensuing battle resulted in at least 52 American deaths and 7 British fatalities. The British night-time bayonet charge was aided by the fact that Americans were silhouetted against the light of their campfires. Some American troops panicked and fled and general disorder spread throughout the American line. British dragoons, arriving on the field, shattered the American column and pursued retreating Americans as far as Sugartown Road. Only the more disciplined American soldiers escaped the original onslaught unscathed, but a following British assault completed the rout.

The Paoli Massacre was part of the Revolutionary War's Philadelphia Campaign, a chapter of the war that witnessed the occupation of Philadelphia and the famed American encampment at Valley Forge in the winter of 1777–78. The first two American attempts to stop the British invasion that Fall were the Battle of Brandywine, September 11, 1777, and the unsuccessful Battle of the Clouds, September 16, 1777. The Paoli Massacre was part of the third effort to contain British General William Howe's advance on Philadelphia.

In an effort to save the Paoli Battlefield, I will be introducing the P.A.T.R.I.O.T. Act—Preserve America's Treasures of the Revolution for Independence for Our Tomorrow. Passage of this legislation will forever insure that the sacrifice made by our nation's first veterans will be remembered. This legislation will also protect the Brandywine Battlefield. The Battle at Brandywine was the most significant battle of the Philadelphia campaign. My bill further memorializes this campaign by authorizing the Superintendent of Valley Forge National Historical Park to enter into an agreement with the Valley Forge Historical Society to build a museum which would house the world's largest collection of Revolutionary War artifacts and memorabilia, including the tent in which General Washington slept at Valley Forge.

And so Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize the outstanding young patriots of my district who have made their voices heard in the fight to preserve this piece of our nation's history. The students of these schools sent me almost five hundred letters, pictures, and banners with their plea for this body to "Remember Paoli!"—this small piece of land that is so important to their communities. As a former school teacher and a father of five, I am heartened by their dedication and commitment to this cause. The future of America lies with our youth, and with youngsters like these, I am confident that America's future will be bright.

I would like to congratulate these young patriots of my district, and thank them for taking part in this campaign to preserve the history of the Revolutionary War. I would also like to thank their teachers and parents who also sent me letters, and taught these students that their involvement could make a difference. I would like to include the letters of Melissa Clark, who is in the first grade at KDMarkley; Bonnie Hughes-Sobbi, mother of a fourth grader at KDMarkley; Bess McCadden who is in the fourth grade at Charlestown Elementary; and Catherine Wahl who is in the fourth grade at the Sugartown School for the record so that my colleagues can also appreciate them.

JANUARY 6, 1999.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to ask you to save the Paoli Battlefield. We need to remember the men who fought to make our country free. Please do not build houses on the Paoli Battlefield.

Sincerely,

MELISSA CLARK.

JANUARY 5, 1999.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WELDON: It has come to my attention, through my daughter's fourth grade class, that a part of our local history is being threatened by "progress". The site to which I refer is the Paoli Battlefield, located in Malvern, PA.

Our children are being taught the importance of this site in their local history lessons and are also being taught to respect sites such as this for their intrinsic and irreplaceable value. We should be willing to support our lessons to our children by protecting the Paoli Battlefield from development.

Thank you for your efforts in support of protecting this site, hopefully with permanent registry as an historic landmark. I will be happy to lend any assistance, as I am able, to further this cause.

Very Truly Yours,

BONNIE HUGHES-SABBI.

DECEMBER 22, 1998.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WELDON: People know that it is wrong to build something on historical land. Valley Forge Park is part of our history, so we should also save the site of the Paoli Massacre Battlefield. My classmates and I have been studying it, and I think that building things on historical land is destructive. If General Anthony Wayne were here, he would do all he could to stop people from building something on the ground of our past.

Don't let people build on the site of the Paoli Massacre Battlefield! Please save it!

Sincerely,

BESS MCCADDEN.

DECEMBER 11, 1998.

DEAR MR. WELDON: I think that you should stop this craziness because it should remain a burial ground. Paoli isn't very popular except for the Paoli Battlefield. That puts us in the battlefield book. It is a historical sight [sic]. It's disrespectful to knock down a memorial battlefield. One of my ancestors was buried at that battlefield there so I care very deeply about this battlefield.

CATHERINE WAHL.

JANUARY 4, 1999.

DEAR MR. WELDON, please save the Paoli Battlefield! It is very special to us. It helps us learn about our country's history.

SUGARTOWN SCHOOL,
MALVERN, PA,
December 15, 1998.

Hon. CURT WELDON,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR HONORABLE CURT WELDON: The Paoli Battlefield should be preserved as a national park because these graves should honor the brave soldiers that fought for our country.

If you were one of the honorable soldiers that fought on this field would you like developers to build something over you? We have enough developments built in Paoli. This would be great for us kids that are learning about history. This would be a wonderful addition to Valley Forge Park.

Sincerely,

MYLES NEWMAN.

P.S. Thank you for reading my letter.

DECEMBER 22, 1998.

DEAR REP. WELDON, I am in Mrs. Weigal's 4th grade class. I live in Frazer, PA.

I'm writing to you to ask you to do all you can to save the Paoli Battlefield. I think that the builders are wrong to want to build houses there when 50 people are buried there. I hope you can do something about it.

Sincerely,

ALYSSA JACKSON.

JANUARY 4, 1999.

DEAR MR. WELDON, please save the Paoli Battlefield! It is very special to us. It helps

us to learn about our country's history. I have seen the Paoli Battlefield it is very pretty.

Sincerely,

EMILY.

CHESTER COUNTY, PA,
December 22, 1998.

DEAR REP. WELDON, you should strongly support saving the Paoli Battlefield because many people lost their lives fighting for freedom and if you didn't it would be dishonorable to the soldiers. But really what would you rather have more population or more historical sites? Have a good time in Washington, D.C. with that legislation (I hope it will be positive.)

Sincerely,

TREY MORRIS.

DEAR REP. WELDON, my name is Steven Binstein. I am in fourth grade at Charlestown. I live in Malvern. I would appreciate it if you don't let the developers make houses on the Paoli Battlefield because that is a very nice peace of land. Soldiers fought their and some died and some didn't. The real reason I think the developers shouldn't build houses there is because people were buried there, and they can't just build over them.

That's why I think you shouldn't let the developers build there.

Sincerely,

STEVEN BINSTEIN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. LOFGREN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for Tuesday, February 9, and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for Wednesday, February 10, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FROST) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOYD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOOLEY of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OSE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COMBEST, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. EMERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 11, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

469. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Citrus Canker; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 95-086-2] received January 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

470. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Illinois Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Plan [SPATS No. IL-093-FOR] received January 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

471. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Summer Flounder Commercial Quota Transfer From North Carolina to Virginia [I.D. 121598I] received January 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

472. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific cod and pollock in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 981222314-8321-02; I.D. 012099B] received January 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

473. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inshore-Offshore Allocations of Pollock and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch; Inshore-Offshore Allocation of 1999 Interim Groundfish Specifications [Docket No. 981021263-