

not approve the report language. Usually, report language tracks the provisions of the bill. In the case of this appropriations measure, the report language goes far beyond the authority of the appropriations committee, directly contradicts recorded votes taken by this House, and is inconsistent with the FY05 Defense Authorization Act which the House has passed.

I will vote for this Bill, which in itself generally provides funds necessary for Department of Energy to execute its important responsibilities in scientific research, energy, and national security. In fact, I applaud its increase in research funding for the Office of Science.

But with my "yes" vote today, I also feel compelled to speak in favor of the majority in this House and put in the record our well documented objection to a number of directions to the Department of Energy in the accompanying Report.

The Report language seeks to undermine initiatives supported by recorded votes in the Defense Authorization bill for the past two years, supported by votes on the House floor for two years, and sustained in the other body for two years. These initiatives have been advocated by the House majority in a policy statement; have been supported and requested by the Department of Defense and the Defense Science Board; and have been a sustained part of this Administration's development of a strategic forces policy for the 21st century consistent with reducing our nuclear forces to the lowest levels possible.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that Committee Staff sometimes overreach in reports, and I would bet a dozen Krispy Kreme Donuts that fewer than half a dozen members of this House are even aware of what has been included in the report accompanying this bill in very prescriptive terms. But this report seeks to give legitimacy to policy positions directly contravened by recorded votes in this House and we cannot allow there to be any confusion about where we stand.

The Bill appropriates \$6,514,424,000 for Weapon Activities. The Report seeks to give the appearance that the House has limited funding for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. But we have not. We will vote today to spend those funds and we voted in the FY05 Authorization bill on May 20th of this year to authorize \$6,577,953,000, including \$27.6M for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator study, approving that bill by a vote of 391–34. An amendment to explicitly remove authorization for this study failed on that same day by a vote of 214–204.

The Report seeks to give the appearance that we would like to restrict Laboratory Directed Research and Development at Department of Energy Laboratories. But we have not. We will vote today to fund out laboratories. Only the House Armed Services Committee can pass legislation to limit the LDRD program. On May 20 we passed the FY05 Defense Authorization Act that continued the previously authorized LDRD program at our laboratories.

After September 11, 2001, we were grateful that those Laboratories had been doing this kind of exploratory research under the LDRD program. The fact they have done so has helped secure our homeland and aid our troops in the field. To chill such research would be unwise.

Further, the Report would have you believe that we are voting to restructure the future

LDRD program. But we have not. This bill does not change the LDRD program in any way.

Further, the Report language would have you believe that we are voting to have the NNSA focus solely on its missions of life extension of the existing stockpile and the current stockpile stewardship program. But we are not. The bill does nothing of the sort. In fact, if we were to pay any attention to the report language, we would be threatening those priorities. The Report suggests that we make major reductions in one Life Extension Program unsupported by an assessment of the impact and risks this would imply. It would also require a higher priority for dismantlement activities in a way that will likely come at the expense of meeting current Life Extension milestones for the Department of Defense. It would make significant reductions to numerous areas of the stockpile stewardship program that were designed by the NNSA to address technical needs to assess with adequately small uncertainty the safety, reliability, and performance of our weapons without nuclear tests.

None of this makes any sense and the report language would not stand up to any serious review by elected Members of Congress.

The Report suggests that by voting for this bill we are changing the way NNSA operates with other entities within the DOE. But it does not. The report suggests that we are adding a burdensome procedure for approval of NNSA activities at the request of, other elements of the DOE, and would hold hostage numerous unique activities of the NNSA labs within these energy and science programs.

The Report would suggest that we are approving a review of future requirements for the weapons complex development plan, to be conducted only by people with no experience in doing that work. That would be silly and the bill includes no such thing.

The reason we cannot vote to amend report language under the rules of the House is because report language is not law and does not have the authority of law. The law we are voting on is in the bill before us. In most cases, report language explains and supports the bill.

In this case, those writing the report went far beyond any reasonable authority as staff members and I think we need to make it clear that the measures included in the Report are inconsistent with statute, inconsistent with the FY05 Defense Authorization Act, inconsistent with recorded votes taken by this House and have no force or authority whatsoever. An error of this magnitude must be jettisoned in the conference committee so that agencies affected are not confused by the mixed messages sent here.

Mr. Chairman, the problems in this Report are many. I felt it important to clarify for the record that members of the House are approving the text of the Bill. We do not approve of the Report language, which is replete with practical problems and inconsistent with the law.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS #2055 RECOGNITION

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 2004

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to the Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post #2055. Every year the third weekend in September is set aside as National Prisoners of War and Missing in Action Day. For the last six years, the Ladies Auxiliary of VFW Post #2055 has honored the 196 soldiers from Illinois that are considered to be a prisoner of war or missing in action. I join the Ladies Auxiliary in honoring these brave individuals.

As well, I commend the auxiliary for their efforts to honor these men and their families. May God bless not only these 196 that will be honored by VFW Post #2055 but also those serving today. May God continue to bless America.

ENCOURAGING CONGRESS TO CONTINUE TO FUND INTERNATIONAL CREDIT UNION DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 2004

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, more than 85 million Americans are familiar with the benefits offered by credit unions of a safe place to save, a place to get a good deal on a consumer or home mortgage loan and solid advice on how to manage their families' financial affairs. However, not everyone in the world has the same advantage of being able to choose to save and borrow at a credit union as we do here in the U.S. The World Council of Credit Unions is working on USAID-funded projects on six continents to develop and strengthen credit unions in ten countries. Current development projects have already resulted in nearly three million credit union members who have saved \$1.6 billion and received affordable loans up to \$1.3 billion in a number of developing countries such as the Philippines, Romania, Ecuador, Guatemala, Poland, Uganda, Rwanda, Uzbekistan and Mexico.

I met recently with representatives from Mexico's two largest credit unions, Caja Popular Mexicana and Caja Libertad, men who spoke with me about how the World Council of Credit Unions, with funds from USAID and U.S. credit unions, has helped more than a million of Mexico's poorest citizens through access to the benefits of credit unions.

The World Council of Credit Unions, as part of the credit union system that includes the Credit Union National Association (CUNA) in the U.S. and its affiliated state credit union leagues, is working in partnership to close the gap between people of the world that "have more" with those who "have less." Today, 1.1 billion people on the planet "have more" and 5.2 billion "have less." By 2050, projections indicate that while the "have more" number will remain constant, those "having less" will rise to 7.8 billion people. This widening gap represents a security risk to the U.S. Credit unions can help alleviate this crisis.

The World Council of Credit Unions' Caja Popular Mexicana project is a \$3.5 million four-year project funded by USAID's Office of Microenterprise Development. Since the project began in late 2001, membership in Caja Popular Mexicana has increased by more than 60 percent and loan delinquency decreased by nearly 70 percent, enabling more of Mexico's citizens to access the services of a safer credit union. The World Council of Credit Unions provides Caja Libertad in-house technical assistance to support the credit union's efforts to strengthen its operations, increase its outreach and better compete in the evolving Mexican financial market. Last year, Caja Libertad opened four rural microfinance branches to serve very poor women and strengthened its financial structure with increased provisions for delinquent loans.

Both of these credit unions are involved with the International Remittance Network (IRnet), an international remittance product developed by the World Council of Credit Unions. Caja Popular Mexicana began distributing remittances in August 2003 on a pilot basis and increased distribution to three hundred branches by November of last year. As of May 2004, more than fifteen thousand remittances totaling \$6.6 million were distributed. The overwhelming majority of receivers are women, and most receivers are credit union members. Non-members are encouraged to consider taking advantage of the benefits of membership, and are joining at a rate of 5 percent per month. Caja Libertad is on target to begin distributing remittances through IRnet later this year.

Through IRnet, money is sent safely and affordably to friends and family members who use the remittances to pay for food, housing, education, to start new businesses and to save for the future. It is this last part that makes receiving international remittances at a safe and sound credit union so important. Receivers can safely and easily deposit a portion of the remittances into their credit union accounts. A new product being launched by one of these Mexican credit unions will mean a consistent remittance history is even basis for loan approval. Remittance distribution, through credit unions, is enabling the Mexican people to improve their financial standing exponentially.

I congratulate Caja Popular Mexicana and Caja Libertad for their successes in becoming safer credit unions reaching out to more of Mexico's poorest people, and thank them for traveling to the U.S. to share with my colleagues and me the importance of U.S. support of their projects. I encourage Congress, through USAID and other avenues, to continue to fund international credit union development projects that promote the credit union ideal of "people helping people to help themselves," and encourage the World Council of Credit Unions to continue its important work of making credit union membership available throughout the world, especially to those in underdeveloped countries.

THE DEDICATION OF UNION CHURCH IN BERRIEN TOWNSHIP

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 2004

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the dedication of Union Church in Berrien Township, as a Michigan Historical Marker. This celebrated Church has stood and continues to stand as a symbol of faith, hope, and reverence. It is vitally important to preserve our nation's sense of history and ideals, and this marker will certainly maintain both for many years to come.

On July 4, 2004, one hundred and forty-six years after its construction, Union Church's long and illustrious history was honored as a Michigan Historical Marker. I am very pleased that the communities of Southwest Michigan and Berrien Township in particular, were able to come together for this wonderful occasion and historic achievement.

Because of the dedication of individuals within the Union Church Historical Preservation Society, Southwest Michigan and our country continue to be great places to live, work, and worship.

DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL DREDGING

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 2004

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to set the record straight on the issue of dredging in the Delaware River Main Channel. I fear that some of my colleagues have been misinformed as to the economic and environmental impacts of dredging in the Delaware River.

Mr. Speaker, Delaware River's regional ports handle approximately 58 million tons of cargo yearly. More than 54,000 jobs in the region are dependent upon the Port of Philadelphia alone. The ports in my district bring \$3.5 billion into the regional economy, creating \$1 billion in wages, and contributing \$486 million in state and local revenues. Those effects are not just felt in my district, or in the City of Philadelphia, or even just in Pennsylvania. They are felt in suburban Philadelphia, and in our sister states, Delaware and New Jersey. This project is economically sound and a good use of the taxpayer's money. In February 2004, a supplement to the Comprehensive Economic Reanalysis Report identified \$24.2 million in annual benefits and \$21 million in annual costs, yielding a net benefit of \$1.15 for every \$1 spent on the project.

Shipping is a volatile industry, which is increasingly moving toward larger ships. Today's container ships can be more than 1,000 feet long and require at least 45-foot channel depth.

Ports in the United States and throughout the world have undertaken projects to deepen their channels in order to accommodate larger vessels. In order to remain competitive with

other ports across the Eastern seaboard, the Delaware River's Main Channel must be deepened.

And, this project is not simply about jobs and the competitiveness of my region's ports. The dredging of the Delaware River main channel is vital to the nation's energy needs and to our ability to wage the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense selected the Port of Philadelphia as a Strategic Seaport for the Northeast Corridor of the United States. Since that selection, material has been shipped from Philadelphia in support of our troops under fire. We must have a deep, clear channel in the event that larger vessels are required to meet DoD's needs.

Military logistics often rely heavily on commercial shipping and thus are impacted by industry trends toward larger vessel.

Three quarters of the East Coast's refinery capability is located in the Philadelphia region. Due to the Channel's shallow draft, oil tankers cannot reach the Port of Philadelphia and must off-load oil on to small ships through a process called "lightering." This is environmentally hazardous. Every time oil is off-loaded, there is a real risk of a spill. By deepening the Delaware, oil tankers will be able to sail straight to port, cutting the chance of a spill.

And when some raise the specter of environmental damage due to dredging, I must point out that several series of tests were conducted using EPA testing procedures which mixed and stirred Delaware River sediment with Delaware River water to approximate dredging, and no toxic releases were found. New York EPA Region 2, and Philadelphia EPA Region 3, have both independently analyzed the river sediment and found the claims of toxic sediment false. Furthermore, both Pennsylvania and New Jersey Departments of Environmental Protection have evaluated the sediment to be dredged and also found it to be not toxic.

It is true that the dredged sediment from the existing Delaware River maintenance project has been placed at Tamaqua, PA, as one of my friends has stated on the floor of this House. However, it was placed there at the request of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in order to prevent pollutants from entering streams from existing, unused mines. Mine reclamation is the reduction of acid mine drainage, which is the number one cause of stream degradation in PA. Before being used, the material was tested and passed inspection by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection. And we are safely using this material even now in my district. The City of Philadelphia is using these so-called spoils to reclaim unusable wet lands at our old Navy Yard and for pier reclamation. And we'll take even more in the future. So, let's put to rest this false rumor about Philly sludge being dumped up state or in New Jersey. We're taking our fair share.

Mr. Speaker, the Delaware River deepening project is important for my constituents, for our region and for the entire nation. I trust that, when they examine the facts about it, every one of my colleagues will join me in supporting it.