

provide for future cybersecurity in an insecure world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the staff of the Committee on Science and Technology for their assistance in drafting this legislation, as well as the strong and hard efforts of Ms. Brooke Davidson on my staff, who has worked on this issue very diligently.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE AND RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF SENATE UNTIL TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 85) providing for conditional adjournment of the House and recess or adjournment of the Senate on Tuesday, November 27, 2001.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 85

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, November 16, 2001, Saturday, November 17, 2001, Monday, November 19, 2001, or Tuesday, November 20, 2001, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 27, 2001, or until Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Friday, November 16, 2001, or Saturday, November 17, 2001, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, November 27, 2001, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate concurrent resolution is concurred in.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VISIT NATION'S CAPITAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon not only to wish a happy holiday to my colleagues, but to ask them this Thanksgiving to carry a message home. I ask my colleagues to ask their constituents to visit them and visit their Nation's capital.

This is one way to send a visible, powerful message to the terrorists. Let them see Americans streaming into their capital to show they simply cannot be terrorized. The city has been hurt by September 11 because September 11 continues for us. It simply has not stopped. First came September 11. But then came the shutdown of National Airport, the only airport in the United States to be shut down, and it was shut down for 3 entire weeks. Try to think of your hometown without an airport.

Then came fear of flying and then fear of anthrax. Nothing has happened in our city and in our country since September 11. The only people to be struck by anthrax are those who worked in the back room of Brentwood. Even those who opened the envelope in the Hart Building have not gotten the disease. Surely people coming to the city have nothing to fear. The close-down of the airport and the anthrax scare were a one-two punch right at the gut of the Nation's capital.

Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for funds for the Nation's capital. I am asking for Members' constituents to visit the capital of the United States.

I spoke to a student group on the Mall last Saturday, and I am speaking to a group of teachers and principals this Saturday from around the country. No student should graduate from high school without coming to the Nation's capital, and yet there have been cancellations after cancellations of student tours.

□ 1600

The capital needs your help. In the D.C. Subcommittee we learned that double-digit unemployment may be predicted here, 10,000 small businesses hanging on, half of our hotel and restaurant workers out of work. This is heartbreaking because the Nation's capital was doing so well coming out of a control board period. But now we are on the front line of the homeland war.

Of course, we need a targeted stimulus for the Nation's capital like New York got, but we are not asking for that this afternoon. We are asking you to help us let the free market do it. Bring the tourists back. Remind your constituents that your capital is open for business and you want to see them in your offices, you want to see them and begin to have the same kind of dialogue with them that you had before September 11.

Tell them to visit, not to cancel. Tell them there are bargains here now, bargains there will not be here a year from now. Of course, tours are not available in the Capitol and I very much regret that. But we are coming up to the point where tours once again will be available. In any case, they can come and sit in the gallery, they can come to your office and they can come and walk around the Capitol on their own.

This is not the time for Americans to turn their back on their own capital. A war in our homeland is the time pre-

cisely to come to the capital. As a little girl growing up during World War II, this capital was crowded with people from all over the United States, people in the service, civilians. It was a bustle of activity. It needs to be a bustle of activity today not only because the capital needs the capital that people would bring in the form of funds, but it needs the bustle of activity in order to help the country return to normalcy.

Members going home to their constituents can lead the way. If they hear from you, the leader in your district, that it is safe to come to Washington, you can help wipe away fear of anthrax, and especially fear of flying now that we have passed the airline security bill so proudly here this afternoon. When you come back, bring some of your constituents with you to the Nation's capital.

Happy Thanksgiving.

IN OPPOSITION TO ANDEAN TRADE ACT'S TUNA PROVISIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORBES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but feel it necessary to take this special order with the hope that my colleagues in the House, as well as the American people, can appreciate my concerns about the provisions of a certain piece of legislation that was just recently passed by this Chamber. This is in reference to H.R. 3009, the Andean Trade Agreement bill.

Mr. Speaker, the current trade policy with regards to canned tuna has provided significant benefits to certain Latin America countries, namely, Bolivia, Colombia, Peru, as well as Ecuador, while maintaining an industrial tuna processing base in the United States. Since the enactment of the Andean Trade Agreement 10 years ago, the number of tuna factories in that region, the Andean region in South America, has actually increased by 229 percent. Production capacity now is up 400 percent. Direct employment is up by 257 percent. U.S. exports have grown from about \$15 million to \$100 million annually.

In addition, the U.S. tuna industry has invested well over \$30 million in new facilities and vessels. However, I must repeat, extending this agreement by providing duty-free treatment to canned tuna from our Andean friends and countries there in Latin America, especially Ecuador, in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, will practically destroy the entire U.S. tuna industry.

I have heard the argument that Congress has included canned tuna both in the Caribbean Basin Initiative, as well as NAFTA, and some have questioned why are we not doing the same for Ecuador and the Andean region. The simple answer is that no other country

that has been extended this benefit has the potential to literally wipe out and destroy the entire U.S. tuna industry.

Mr. Speaker, Ecuador alone has a production capacity equivalent to 2,250 tons per day. Using a 5-day workweek, this equates to a production capacity equivalent to 48.6 million cases per year. Using a 6-day workweek, Ecuador's production capacity will be equivalent to 58.5 million cases per year.

To put this in perspective, U.S. consumption is at 45.3 million cases per year. In short, Ecuador could produce enough canned tuna to flood the U.S. market. Brand names like Chicken of the Sea and Bumble Bee, brand names that Americans have come to trust, in my opinion will be eliminated from the grocery shelves. It is even questionable whether tuna from Ecuador is dolphin-safe. So serious are these issues that Mexico now even levies a 24 percent duty, last year, on canned tuna exported from Ecuador.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to note that Ecuador levies a 20 percent duty on imported tuna from the United States.

I am all for free trade, but I am also for fair trade. The fact of the matter is, more than 10,000 jobs in American Samoa, Puerto Rico and California will be lost if H.R. 3009 passes in its current form. Why? Because the minimum wage rate for cannery workers in Ecuador is 69 cents per hour, Mr. Speaker, which in my humble opinion brings us to the real issue of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.J. Heinz Corporation, the parent company of StarKist Tuna Company, has lobbied aggressively for the inclusion of canned tuna in the Andean Trade Agreement. But it must be made clear that StarKist Tuna Company is the only U.S. tuna processor that supports duty-free treatment for canned tuna exported from Ecuador. Put another way, StarKist is the only U.S. tuna processor willing, in my opinion, to sell out American workers in exchange for 69-cent-per-hour wages that StarKist now pays its tuna workers in Ecuador.

As you know now, Mr. Speaker, American Samoa is the home of the largest tuna cannery facility in the world. One facility, currently operated by StarKist, a subsidiary of Heinz Corporation, employs about 2,700 workers. The other facility is operated by Chicken of the Sea of California and currently employs about 2,500 workers. Together, these two companies employ more than 74 percent of my district's workforce in the private sector. Approximately 85 percent of the private sector jobs in my district are dependent, either directly or indirectly, upon the tuna fishing and processing industry. As Malcolm Stockwell, the former vice president of StarKist Seafood, recently testified before a Senate committee, "A decrease in production or departure of one or both of the existing tuna processors in American Samoa could devastate the local economy, resulting in massive unemployment and insurmountable financial problems."

The CEO of Chicken of the Sea has already noted that if the Andean Trade Agreement includes duty-free treatment of canned tuna, its operations in American Samoa will be forced to lay off over 1,000 cannery workers, and that is just for starters. StarKist has testified that if Ecuador is given the same trade preference as the U.S. territory of American Samoa, its production would almost immediately shift to low labor cost areas like Ecuador.

Mr. Speaker, I specifically asked StarKist and Heinz executives what financial loss StarKist would incur if canned tuna was not included in the Andean Trade Agreement. I was told that StarKist would suffer no economic loss. In other words, StarKist is the only one who is pushing for this because of the low labor costs among Andean countries.

I wish to note that the minimum wage in American Samoa is at \$3.20 per hour, which is, by far, way below even our own national minimum wage structure. It reminds me of the words offered by the late Senator Borah from Idaho when the issue of fair labor standards was debated in the Congress as far back as 1937.

Senator Borah said, "I look upon a minimum wage such as will afford a decent living as a part of a sound national policy. I would abolish a wage scale below a decent standard of living just as I would abolish slavery. If it disturbed business, it would be the price we must pay for good citizens. I take the position that a man who employs another must pay him sufficient to enable the one employed to live."

Senator Pepper from Florida then asked the Senator, "What if he cannot afford to pay it?"

Senator Borah responded, "If he cannot afford to pay it, then he should close up the business. No business has a right to coin the very lifeblood of workmen into dollars and cents. Every man or woman who is worthy of hire is entitled to sufficient compensation to maintain a decent standard of living. I insist that American industry can pay its employees enough to enable them to live."

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I agree with Senator Borah. StarKist, like any other industry, should pay its employees proper wages. That was one of the big issues in the 1930s when the question of labor minimum wages was debated in the Congress. The fear was that if some kind of a minimum wage standard would be established, there would be chaos in the business industry, especially in those days in the South, which was always looked upon as an area of low labor costs, 10 to 12 cents an hour for a 10-hour workday, even among children at the time, I suppose. What they found out is that when they did establish a minimum wage standard since the 1930s, there was tremendous economic growth in the economy.

When all is said and done, Mr. Speaker, tuna processing is the only industry

holding together the economy of my district. American Samoa's only advantage in the global marketplace is duty-free access to the U.S. market. What price has American Samoa paid to have U.S. trade privileges, I ask.

As a Territory of the United States, our men and women have paid the ultimate sacrifice in military service to our Nation. American Samoa pledges its allegiance to the United States. Ecuador and other Latin American countries do not. American Samoa has been the backbone of StarKist sales. The Andean countries have not. In the past 25 years, StarKist and Chicken of the Sea have exported almost \$6 billion worth of canned tuna from American Samoa to the United States. Thanks to American Samoa, StarKist is now the number one brand of tuna in the world today.

Mr. Speaker, why is it that StarKist and the parent company Heinz Corporation are pushing to allow tuna imports to come to the United States duty-free from the Andean countries and yet are opposed by two other major tuna processing centers here in the United States and even by the entire U.S. tuna fishing fleet here in our country?

At a recent hearing, a StarKist official testified, "StarKist will continue to sell and can tuna. However, the history of tuna canning in the U.S. and Puerto Rico has demonstrated quite clearly that StarKist will also take whatever action is required to remain cost competitive." Is this why StarKist and Heinz Corporation are such strong supporters of the trade agreement that the entire U.S. tuna industry opposes? At 69 cents per hour for wages earned for cannery workers in Ecuador, I can understand why StarKist is pushing for passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. International Trade Commission conducted section 201 and section 332 investigations in 1984, 1986, 1990 and 1992 to determine if canned tuna was an import-sensitive product. In each case they overwhelmingly concluded that canned tuna is an import-sensitive product. The facts that made canned tuna an import-sensitive product in the ITC studies still apply today. With the advent of canned tuna from low-wage countries, retail pricing of canned tuna, when adjusted for inflation, has dropped by 53 percent between 1980 and 2000.

Canned tuna represents a tremendous value versus other sources of canned protein. In May of 2000, light meat tuna retail prices were 10 cents per ounce while albacore retail tuna prices were 23 cents per ounce. Competitive proteins were significantly more expensive. That is, canned chicken was selling at 40 cents per ounce, canned turkey at 40 cents per ounce, Spam at 33 cents per ounce and corned beef was selling at 20 cents per ounce.

Due to the intense competitive environment caused by low-cost foreign imports, retail prices of canned tuna in

the U.S. are the lowest among all developed nations of the world. The comparison includes Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom.

U.S. tuna processors face significant wage disparities when compared with foreign tuna processors. Average hourly wages in the U.S. processing facilities in California, Puerto Rico and American Samoa are approximately \$11, \$6.50 and \$3.20, respectively.

□ 1615

Average hourly labor rates in the key exporting countries of Thailand and Ecuador are approximately 60 cents and 69 cents per hour respectively.

It should also be noted, Mr. Speaker, that tuna processors in foreign nations are not required to abide by the same health, welfare, safety, regulatory, conservation or even environmental standards imposed upon U.S. tuna processors. In addition, they often receive government and other financial subsidies that provide an unfair economic advantage.

The quantity of tuna imports measured in kilograms between 1990 and the year 2000 has increased by 20.3 percent. Within this number, canned tuna imports have increased by 10 percent, while imports of frozen tuna loins have increased by 67.3 percent.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to Ecuador and Colombia in 1990 before the U.S.-Andean trade agreement was enacted, Ecuador and Colombia tuna exports to the United States represented only 2.6 percent of total U.S. tuna imports. In other words, in 1990 the total value of tuna that was imported from tuna loins and canned loins from these two countries was at \$9.7 million.

In the year 2000, after 10 years of the Andean trade agreement in force, Ecuador and Colombia tuna exports to the U.S. represents now 23.3 percent of the total U.S. tuna imports. This represents a 796.2 percent increase, Mr. Speaker, over 10 years and an annualized rate of growth of 24.5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, these increases in exports have been enabled by a tremendous expansion of Ecuadorian and Colombian tuna processing and fishing industries. As I stated earlier, factories are now increased from 7 to 23 percent. Annual production capacity has increased from 108 million cases per ton to 500 million tons. Direct employment has increased from 3,500 employees now to 12,500 employees or an increase of 257 percent. The fleet, which was nonexistent 10 years ago, now represents the second largest tuna fishing fleet in the eastern tropical Pacific, right below Mexico. The Ecuadorian fleet now catches more than 35 percent of the total tuna landed out of the east tropical Pacific.

As imports have increased, U.S. production volumes have declined because trade benefits provided to foreign nations make it difficult for U.S. processing facilities to compete.

For example, in 1990, four of the five tuna processing facilities in Puerto Rico have closed. Once the largest employer in Puerto Rico, with more than 15,000 jobs in 1990, Bumble Bee now operates the last processing facility in Puerto Rico with less than 1,000 workers.

Bumble Bee has stated that they will close their Puerto Rico factory within 6 months if tuna is included in the ATPA. The key reason is the hourly labor rate differential of \$6.50 an hour in Puerto Rico versus 69 cents an hour in Ecuador. That is obvious.

Chicken of the Sea has closed their tuna processing facility in Terminal Island in California, while Bumble Bee still operates its Santa Fe Springs plant in California. Total employment has dropped from 1,000 now to a mere 300.

Bumble Bee has stated that if tuna is included in ATPA, they will shift at least half of their California production to Ecuador within 12 months, resulting in the loss of more than 100 jobs. This will probably lead to the full closure of their California factory within 2 years.

My district has not lost either of the two tuna processing facilities yet, operated by both Chicken of the Sea and StarKist, Mr. Speaker. However, in Department of Labor wage hearings over the past 10 years, both Chicken of the Sea and StarKist have stated emphatically that any increase in wage rates will increase in the shift of production to lower-wage countries.

Based on these testimonies, a total hourly wage increase since 1990 has been approximately 20 cents per hour, which to me personally, Mr. Speaker, is an insult, much less than the increase in the U.S. minimum wage over the same period of time. The minimum wage in Samoa is less than half that of the U.S. despite American Samoa being a U.S. territory. American Samoa recognizes that any decreases in tuna sector employment can decimate their fragile economy where the tuna industry represents 88 percent of private sector employment.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, how would you describe the disparity in wage rates, whether or not 69 cents per hour in Ecuador would be considered cheap labor or slave labor. I sometimes have a very difficult time distinguishing between the two standards.

Chicken of the Sea has stated that if tuna is included in ATPA, they will shift about half of their workers in American Samoa to Ecuador within 12 months; and like I said, that is just the beginning.

Concerning our tuna fishing fleet, this is one of the other great concerns that I have concerning this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

In 1990, the U.S. tuna fishing fleet was the dominant fleet in the world, allowing the U.S. to exert leadership in international conservation efforts. The U.S. fleet developed the eastern tropical Pacific fishing grounds and then

developed the western tropical fishing grounds where they operate today.

In the year 2000, the U.S. tuna fishing fleet now has been surpassed by Taiwan, Spain, South Korea, Mexico, Ecuador, Venezuela, Japan, and France; and we are no longer the dominant fishing nation that we once were.

U.S. tuna boat owners are disadvantaged, as they are required to abide by strict safety, personal liability, regulatory and environmental and conservation standards that are vigorously enforced by the U.S. Department of Commerce National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Coast Guard. These standards are not observed by foreign-flag vessels and are not even enforced by their respective governments.

Mr. Speaker, as an example, between 1997 and the year 2000, Ecuadorian- and Colombian-flag tuna fishing vessels incurred more than 900 violations of Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission regulations, with the acronym of IATTC. The IATTC is a multilateral organization that establishes fishing regulations in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. While the IATTC reports violations, the flag countries of the violating vessels are to take enforcement action. To date, of the 900 violations only three, only three have been resolved.

The U.S. State Department, which represents the U.S. and the IATTC, is well aware of these violations and has the authority to impose a U.S. embargo on fishery products from Ecuador and Colombia to force compliance with international conservation regulation. However, and unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, they have not yet taken any action.

Mr. Speaker, if tuna is included in the ATPA, the eastern tropical Pacific fishing grounds will become more valuable. However, the U.S. tuna fishing fleet, which developed this fishery in the 1960s and the 1970s, cannot return to the ETP, as Mexico, Ecuador and Venezuela have systematically taken up all available fishing licenses and quotas.

If tuna is included in the ATPA, employment in my own district in tuna processing facilities will be reduced, the U.S. fleet will lose their largest market for selling their catch, and they will become competitively disadvantaged versus all other international fleets.

All of the major U.S. tuna boat owners have stated that if tuna is included in this bill, they will immediately begin the process of divesting their ownership positions in their vessels worth hundreds of millions of dollars, and the vessels will ultimately move to foreign ownership.

As the vessels move to foreign ownership, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. would lose its voice in multinational conservation efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. tuna processing and fishing industry has supported the objectives of the Andean

trade agreement for the past 10 years despite the fact that canned tuna was excluded from the actual agreement. To ensure the survival of the U.S. tuna processing and fishing industry, and to recognize the support they have provided for the Andean pact nations, I would certainly hope that the U.S. Congress would continue to exclude canned tuna from the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, excluding canned tuna from APTA will not negatively impact the economies of Ecuador and Colombia, I can assure. In fact, Bumble Bee, which has a \$30 million tuna processing facility with more than 1,200 employees in Ecuador, will continue to invest and grow in that region.

Excluding canned tuna from APTA will support more than 10,000 U.S. tuna processing and fishing jobs in California, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the entire U.S. tuna fishing fleet whose jobs will be at risk, obviously.

Excluding canned tuna from the APTA will support my district's economy where some 85 to 88 percent of the private sector employment is provided by the tuna industry.

Exclusion of canned tuna for the APTA will support the U.S. tuna fishing fleet of approximately 50 vessels, as I have stated earlier, out of American Samoa and supply the U.S. canneries while giving the U.S. a strong voice, hopefully, in multinational fisheries conservation.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. represents the largest market for canned tuna consumption in the world. It is estimated that the U.S. represents 28 percent of that global consumption.

Canned tuna is consumed by 96 percent of U.S. households.

Canned tuna represents the number three item in U.S. grocery stores based on dollar sales per linear foot per shelf space.

Three U.S. brands, Bumble Bee, StarKist and Chicken of the Sea, represent more than 85 percent of U.S. tuna consumption.

I would like to share with my colleagues some interesting facts to consider. Bumble Bee Seafoods, Incorporated, is a U.S. corporation headquartered in San Diego, California, with revenues of approximately \$750 million and employment of approximately 5,000 people.

Bumble Bee is a wholly owned subsidiary of ConAgra Foods, a U.S. corporation headquartered in Omaha, Nebraska, with annual revenues of approximately \$27 billion and employment of approximately 80,000 workers, almost all of which is in the United States. ConAgra is the second largest retail food company in the United States and the largest food service provider.

Bumble Bee is the number two brand of canned tuna in the United States with a 27 percent branded market share. Within canned tuna, Bumble Bee has the number one position in albacore and the number two position in light meat.

Bumble Bee is the leading brand of canned seafood with number one or two positions in salmon, shrimp, crab, sardines, and other canned seafood varieties.

Bumble Bee operates tuna, shrimp and surimi processing facilities in California, Puerto Rico, Louisiana, Minnesota, Ecuador, Fiji, and even Trinidad.

Bumble Bee is the largest buyer of canned salmon in the world and the largest customer of U.S.-owned processing locations in the State of Alaska.

Bumble Bee sources raw material from U.S. fishing vessels harvesting tuna, salmon, pollock, whiting, shrimp and other fish species in the major oceans of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to personally thank again the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), our senior ranking member, for their offered assistance to continue our efforts to formulate some resolution to my concerns relative to the U.S. tuna industry.

I would be remiss if I did not also express my personal thanks and appreciation especially to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), without whom we would not have gone this far to find a solution hopefully to the needs of our workers and the entire U.S. tuna industry.

I also want to thank Mr. Dennis Mussell, the CEO of Chicken of the Seafood Company, and Mr. Chris Lischewski, the CEO of Bumble Bee Seafood, and Mr. Julius Zolezzi and Paul Crampe who represented some 50 boat owners and who make up the entire U.S. tuna fishing fleet through the United Tuna Cooperative.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mind that we work with our colleagues to address the social and economic needs of our friends in the Andean region. We have been doing this now for the past 10 years since the Andean trade agreement was enacted.

My only concern, Mr. Speaker, is that our national policy also now is to sacrifice the entire U.S. tuna industry in order to accommodate the economic needs of our friends from Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru and Colombia. I hope not, Mr. Speaker. I sincerely hope not.

One of the issues or reasons why we are trying to do crop substitution in helping these Andean countries was to lessen the drug trafficking going on coming from Latin America into our country. I recall one of the previous presidents of the Republic of Colombia made a very interesting observation. He said if there was not so much consumption and demand by Americans maybe there would not be a supply or a need to have a supply of drugs coming from Latin America.

So I look forward to continuing consultations with our House colleagues, as well as with the Members of the House when this bill will be further reviewed, I hope, in conference.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. CRANE, following the remarks of Mr. SHAW during debate on H.R. 3009.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of illness.

Mrs. BONO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending the dedication of a statue to her late husband, Sonny Bono, in Palm Springs, California.

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. BAIRD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. DAVIS of California, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BAIRD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills of the Senate and a concurrent resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1202. An act to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Office of Government Ethics through fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Government Reform in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period to be subsequently determine by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 1270. An act to designate the United States Courthouse to be constructed at 8th Avenue and Mill Street in Eugene, Oregon, as the "Wayne Lyman Morse United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 1573. An act to authorize the provision of educational and health care assistance to the women and children of Afghanistan; to the Committee on International Relations.

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day; to the Committee on Government Reform.