

dredged properly, water quality standards will not be violated. DNREC and ACOE are coordinating to make sure this spot is properly dredged and disposed at the Killcohook site, where it will be confined and monitored.

I have also raised concerns about the potential impacts of this project on the rate of erosion at Pea Patch Island, which threatens the structural soundness of one of Delaware's historic jewels—Fort Delaware. I have been a strong advocate of providing federal funds to repair the seawall protecting the island. In FY 1999, Congress provided \$750,000 toward the repairs, and the ACOE has assured me the repairs will be made prior to the Delaware River Deepening Project.

It is worth noting that ACOE is not alone in its determination that this project will have no significant impacts on the environment. The state environmental agencies, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have examined the record and independent reports others have produced and they concur with ACOE's conclusion. Combined together, these agencies, which have the proper expertise and authority to evaluate the impacts, present a compelling case. Therefore, I would find it difficult to disagree with their conclusion. Should DNREC or another agency determine that Delaware would suffer unjustifiable environmental impacts, I would be pleased to reexamine this issue.

Finally, the ACOE figures underestimate the benefits to Delaware and the region, because ACOE's regulations prohibit them from taking into account business that ports along the Delaware River may take from other ports in the country. In fact, the Port of Wilmington is taking steps to compete for more business through its recent proposal to move its berth from the Christina River to the Delaware River. Even without this move, ACOE estimates that Delaware will gain over 300 jobs and \$3.4 million in annual tax revenue. Other benefits to Delaware include \$78 million in clean sand material that will be used for creation of wetlands at Kelly Island and Port Mahon. Furthermore, sand deposits placed along Delaware Bay beaches, such as Broadkill will provide storm damage protection against potential annual damages of \$1.6 million each year. All these benefits are attributed to Delaware and Delaware's share of the cost is only \$7 to \$10 million. With estimated tax revenue increases from the project of \$3.4 million a year, Delaware should recoup its cost in less than three years.

I have given the Delaware River Deepening Project close scrutiny. Given the conservative reputation of the ACOE's economic figures, the overwhelming benefits of the project both to the region and to Delaware, the progress in protecting Pea Patch Island, the special attention being given to proper dredging and disposal of the "hot spot," and the overwhelming conformity of opinion by the appropriate environmental agencies, I am satisfied that the economic and environmental justification is strong enough to move forward with funding the project in FY 2000. I also believe Delawareans should be given a strong voice in the future implementation of this project, particularly with the design and construction of the dredge disposal sites. Therefore, I am prepared to contact ACOE and the Environmental Protection Agency to encourage them to accommodate more public input into the process.

Mr. Speaker, ACOE and the Environmental Protection Agency have expressed a willingness to work closer with citizen groups in actively informing them about the progress of the Delaware River Deepening Project to prevent misunderstandings. Although all the interested parties will not always agree on the correct course of action, each one plays a role that is essential to our democratic process and produces a better product in the end.

As with all long-term government projects, the Delaware River Deepening Project must be monitored to maintain cost controls and compliance with environmental safeguards. I look forward to working with the House Transportation and Appropriations Committees in their oversight of this project.

#### TOWN MEETING

### HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1999

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed in the RECORD this statement by a high school student from my home State of Vermont, who was speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people today. I am asking that you please insert this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I believe that the views of this young person will benefit my colleagues.

[June, 1999]

REGARDING: THE WAR IN YUGOSLAVIA

(On behalf of: Brendan Hurlbut and Anthony Blair)

Anthony Blair: American involvement in the war in Yugoslavia is morally defensible on one level: It is the right thing to do to stop atrocities. But are there not other options for America than to conduct a war against Yugoslavia in which many innocent civilians and American soldiers may be killed? Is it America's duty to be a police force all around the world, even when an action is morally right? Do we want America to be playing the role of international policeman all over the world?

Many reasons have been put forward as to why the United States should avoid being the world's police force in Kosovo. There are reasons, such as the cost. We are spending tens of million of dollars a day. The United States is carrying out about 90 percent of the bombings, while our other allies should be carrying a heavier load than they are carrying right now. Numbers of civilians are being killed by misguided cruise missiles, hitting large groups of innocent people instead of their targeted locations.

Brendan Hurlbut: The U.S. has few strategic or economic interests in Yugoslavia.

And are we really willing to damage our long-term relations with Russia over this issue? Communist and Russian nationalist groups are gaining support for their anti-American message due to this war. Hostile anti-American groups may be aided in their efforts to gain control of Russia due to this war. The threat of force did not stop Milosevic. In fact, some say it has strengthened his position among the patriotic people of Serbia.

Morally, our actions in Yugoslavia are right, but are they in the best interests of our country, and are we not in a way also committing atrocities against innocent people? Can't the U.S. find other ways to stop Milosevic? Obviously, the bombings have not

worked. The U.S. could declare Milosevic a war criminal and pay \$1 billion to whoever captures him. The captors could be also granted citizenship in any one of the NATO countries. This would save lives, money, and maybe a country from poverty.

Current U.S. policy is not consistent. We respond to atrocities in one nation, such as Yugoslavia, but ignore atrocities in other regions, such as Rwanda. If the U.S. now takes the role of worldwide policeman, the U.S. will have to respond to every tribal or ethnic war worldwide. Do we really want the U.S. to be like a puppet on a string that must respond to every problem around the world?

[June, 1999]

REGARDING: TOBACCO

(On behalf of: Andy Tyson, Carey Levine, Zach Pratt, Tina Reed and Doug Lane)

Carey Levine: People who smoke are at increased risk of heart disease, cancer, emphysema and other smoking-related illnesses that contribute to over 420,000 deaths per year. These people dying from cigarettes are our mothers, fathers, aunts, uncles, sisters, brothers, colleagues, peers, and friends. Smoking is no longer just a problem, it is an epidemic that is expanding nationally and globally.

Zach Pratt: In the wake of the recent landmark tobacco settlement, which awarded \$206 billion over the course of the next 25 years to fund programs aimed at aiding smoking victims, debate regarding the most appropriate use of the funds has been fierce. The current proposals very drastically by state.

According to a recent USA Today poll, popular opinion favors utilizing the appropriated money in an effort to improve public health care systems. Most Americans believe that the tobacco cash should be returned to those most affected by smoking and not split towards expanding health coverage for impoverished or uninsured families. The same poll reports that 27 percent of Americans would like to see the money spent on antismoking education. However, many governors would prefer to see the funds utilized in existing state education programs, feeling that the development of new programs would raise state expenditures to dangerous levels.

Doug Lane: I believe that the money would best be spent in educational programs. The risk of getting addicted to nicotine are reduced through a national educational program targeting preteenagers, and highlighting the negative effects of smoking. The money the government has obtained through cigarette taxes and lawsuits of tobacco companies should be used for preventative measures, to stop this addiction before it starts.

Recently, President Clinton has publicly announced that he is making it part of his agenda to reduce the amount of teenage smoking that goes on in America.

Tina Reed: The "Stop Teenage Addiction to Tobacco" on Oklahoma's Teenage Facts sheets states that, every day, 3,000 teens smoke their first cigarette, and approximately one-third of these children will eventually die due to smoking-related illness. These are serious enough statistics that they demand a more intensive and proactive stance from schools to encourage students not to smoke.

The new program would take a fresh new approach in informing students about the negative effects of smoking, through hands-on projects such as seeing a healthy lung compared to a smoker's lung, science projects breaking down the actual contents of the cigarette, and guest speakers. Through these types of activities, students will see the devastating effects of smoking

by guest speakers that have lived to regret ever taking a puff of a cigarette, and touching a lung that is black and distorted due to smoking.

Andy Tyson: There are many possibilities as to where the tobacco money can be spent.

The money could help everything, from preventative measures to improving health and funding education. The truth is, all of these are worthwhile causes. The only thing that we must be especially careful of is the possibility of spreading the money too thin.

Wherever this money goes, there must be enough of it to make a difference. Smoking should stop, and this is our opportunity to do so.

Congressman Sanders: Good job.