

think about immigration policy just because these people were killed by illegal immigrants in this country, people that most of them have been deported more than once for committing other crimes in this country, and then you have cities in this country passing laws, telling their police officers, telling their law enforcement personnel that they cannot enforce the law.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the television audience.

BRAND NEW, BOLD VISIONARY ENERGY POLICY FOR AMERICA
NEEDS TO BE ADOPTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for the remaining time to midnight.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) that there may be time left at the end of my presentation.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INSLEE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TANCREDO. May I take that time?

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would yield any remaining time to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of history made in this building, and one of the most magnificent things that happened in this building happened right behind me on May 9, 1961, and that decision by young President in 1961 I will talk about a little bit is a model that I think we ought to follow given the challenge our country now faces.

On May 9, 1961, John F. Kennedy came to this Chamber to the rostrum behind me and challenged America in a very bold, visionary challenge to put an American on the Moon within that decade, and it was an extraordinarily ambitious challenge, and he did so because he had the innate understanding of the can-do attitude of Americans, of the tremendous technological creativity of Americans, and the recognition that America is not a country that ever rests on its laurels but always is looking over the horizon.

Indeed, that challenge was met, and when you think about it, it was a relatively historic thing to meet that challenge because, at the time he made it, frankly many pundits thought that the challenge was wildly unrealistic, wildly optimistic and there was no way that America was going to meet the challenge. Kennedy's sense of optimism was fulfilled, and America indeed put a man on the Moon within the close of that decade and brought him and them home safely.

That decision and that challenge and that sense of optimism of John F. Kennedy is something we now need to recreate this year, in the year 2003, in adopting a brand-new bold, visionary energy policy for America because many of us here believe in this Chamber that the moment is ripe for the Congress to create a promise and a challenge of America that is equally bold, equally visionary, and ultimately equally achievable as Kennedy's challenge to put a man on the Moon in the next 10 years.

As a result of that, I am working with a group here in the United States House of Representatives in an attempt to propose and pass into law what we call the New Apollo Energy Project, and we do so because we believe that we need to seize the moment of technological promise and the can-do spirit of America to, in fact, move forward to a new clean energy future for America, an energy future that will not be bound by the chains that are hampering us so much in our foreign policy, by the fact that we are now losing jobs to other countries who are moving ahead of us, regrettably, in new, clean energy futures and in an energy future that will reduce the amount that we are contributing to global climate change gases in our atmosphere.

So what we are doing is working to build a consensus in the House to adopt not an old, previous century policy that is dependent on the technologies of the past, but one that leans forward to the technologies of the future and the industry of the future and the jobs of the future; and we believe this is the year to do that.

Right now, the other Chamber is considering an energy package. The House has passed one which is regrettably very, very short of this goal; but we want to continue to work on that, and I have come to the floor to address the House tonight about what a New Apollo Energy future would look like and why it is necessary.

This New Apollo Energy future we think needs to accomplish three goals, and we think goal-setting is important for a Nation as it is for any other group or team. So we would set three national goals in the New Apollo Energy Project.

Goal number one, we believe we should set a new national goal of creating 3 million new jobs, well-paying jobs in the next 15 years that would, in fact, be dedicated to these new technologies that are on the cusp of coming to become market-based technologies, and we believe it is fundamentally important for America to say those jobs need to be American jobs. They need to be home grown, and the reason they need to be home grown is that we know, looking over the horizon just a bit, that there are going to be new industries built up with these new technologies, wind, solar, a huge number of efficiencies from cars to air conditioners to housing implements, to geothermal, a whole slew of new tech-

nologies and new industrial bases that are going to come on line, and we want the jobs to manufacture those goods, to build those transmission lines, to build those wind plants to be right here in America.

Sadly, right now, that is not happening. Sadly, because of our retrograde policies, we are giving away those jobs. We are giving away the jobs for solar cell production to German companies. We are losing the jobs in the auto industry to energy efficient vehicles in Japan. We are even losing good, high-paying manufacturing jobs to the little, though impressive, country of Denmark which is ahead of us in wind turbine technology.

□ 2330

We think it is time to right that ship and say that this Nation is going to seize its manifest destiny of being the technological leader of the world and at the same time grow these 3 million jobs at home.

This is an economic development issue, and we believe that one of the most prudent, highest payoff investments that America can make is to invest \$300 billion over the next decade in the research and development, in the incentives, in the incentives for manufacturers to help them retool their industries, incentives to consumers to help them buy energy-efficient products, to the use of the government facilities to help spread this new technology. That is an extremely wise investment to make sure that we grow jobs at home in the new technologies of the future. This is an industrial development program for this millennium, and we need to seize that moment.

Second goal: We need to break our addiction to Middle Eastern oil. We all know that on a bipartisan basis we have been slaves at various moments to the addiction of oil coming from the Persian Gulf, and it has tainted our foreign policy in various ways. It has made America, for its own economic interest, act in ways that is not in its long-term liberty interest or security interest. And it is high time that America become more energy-independent so that we can make decisions about foreign policy free from the chains of this addiction.

So we believe that we need to set a national goal to reduce our oil consumption, and we believe there is some very realistic goals we can set. Again, goal-setting is important, and we need to set a national goal in three parts: Number one, to reduce our oil consumption by 600,000 barrels a day by the year 2010. Now, that is roughly the amount of oil that we previously had gotten from Iraq. It is doable, it is achievable, and it is important to our foreign policy and our economic development.

By the year 2015, we ought to adopt measures to reduce our oil imports by 1.5 million barrels a day, which is roughly the equivalent we have imported from Saudi Arabia historically.

And by the year 2010, we should have an ambitious but achievable goal of reducing our consumption by 2.4 million barrels a day, roughly the equivalent of what we have historically imported from the Persian Gulf.

These are goals that will set us free both in our foreign policy and in our industrial base. As we will talk about a little later, they are achievable goals using the technological creativity that is so important in this country.

Now, let me address the third goal as well. We need to deal with the issue of reducing our emissions of global climate change gases, and we need to do so because it is clear from the science that the concentration of these gases, these pollutants that are now going in the air when we burn oil, when we burn coal, when we burn any fossil fuel are radically increasing the concentrations of carbon dioxides and methane and other global climate change gases, which have the impact of essentially trapping energy in the Earth. And we will talk about that in a few minutes.

So we would basically set a goal to keep our emissions of these pollutants at 1990 levels so they do not increase.

Now, let me address why these are achievable goals. They are achievable goals for a couple of reasons. One, any historical review will show that our country is the most technologically creative and productive and forward-thinking group of human beings ever on Earth. That is quite a mantle, and we want to harness that energy, and we want to harness that genius. We have to have an attitude that recognizes that we are not satisfied with the technologies of today. We want to go forward and have the same type of creativity that we had in the software industry, in the biotech industry, in aerospace, and we now need to unleash that power of thought and intellectual capability by creating a new energy future for America.

It is doable, and it is achievable, and I will show some reasons why we believe that is so today.

I want to refer to a picture of a home in Virginia, the home of Alden and Carol Hathaway. This is a home, it is quite a nice-looking home, and I have been in a similar home, which is very comfortable. It has kind of a classic architecture style. It was built in Virginia, and you will notice there is some snow in this location when this picture was taken. It cost about \$365,000 to build, roughly in the neighborhood of what it would cost to build essentially a standard home in the Virginia area.

This home has a feature with today's technology that is pretty extraordinary, and that feature is that this home, using a combination of solar panels that take the sun's energy, that create electricity, and are integrated right into the shingles of the roof. It uses an in-ground heat pump and passive solar heating in the windows, and essentially, at some point, having net metering, where the excess capacity of electricity it generates goes back into

the grid, goes back into the utilities, and has a net energy consumption of zero using today's technology.

That means that the Hathaways, to heat and cool their home, do not burn any fossil fuels, do not buy any Mid-east oil, do not put any global climate change gas emissions in the air, and, perhaps most importantly, have created jobs for the American industrial base that are now involved in building homes of this type and this type of technology. This is a plus-job home, it is a plus-environment home, and it is a plus-national security home. And it is here today in a kind of standard climate that does include heat in Virginia, it sure is hot here tonight in D.C., and snow as well. This technology is possible.

But if we can, let us look on a larger scale as to why these technologies have tremendous potential if, in fact, we have the wisdom to put them to use. Basically what has happened, because of the combination of intelligent design by American scientists and economies of scale, the renewable energies, some of which we are talking about tonight, have come down in price dramatically over the last couple of decades. What were once sort of dreamy little ideas about new technologies 10, even 6, or 7 years ago, are now very close to being market-based. Let us look at some of those examples.

For wind power, for wind turbine prices, in 1980 it was costing about 30 cents a kilowatt hour. This has come down dramatically over the last two decades. It is now at about the 3½-cent range and will continue to come down when economies of scale are realized, meaning when we build more wind turbine plants, the per-unit price comes down. We need to be utilizing the fact that wind is becoming more economically competitive, and we need to make the small tax credit that this industry now enjoys permanent and predictable so that this industry can blossom and so that we can build American jobs building those wind turbines and building those transmission lines to get the power where the wind is to the power where the people live. Those are jobs that we ought to have in building those transmission lines. That cost has come down.

If you look at photovoltaic, basically solar energy, in 1980 it started at basically \$1 a kilowatt hour. That has come down dramatically now. It is in the range of about 20 cents per kilowatt hour, and will continue to come down fairly significantly as we increase the production capability, and the unit price will continue to come down.

I may note, too, that these prices actually are very conservative, because in distributed energy, that means energy you create at your home or business site, you do not have transmission costs.

□ 2340

So actually, you can pay a little more for the cost of photovoltaics but

come out ahead because you do not have to pay the transmission costs.

The same thing has been the case in thermal energy. The price has come down dramatically for thermal and biomass, which we have tremendous potential within our agricultural industry. So the fact is we have an economic model which has demonstrated the ability of these new technologies to become market based, and they just need a little boost and some incentives to get them off where they stand today.

Let me turn to the environmental reason for this. We have talked about security. We have talked about the job reason, but there is another reason that calls on us to adopt these new technologies, and that is the phenomenon of global climate change. Global climate change is a phenomenon that is fairly well understood in science and basically involves a physical fact which essentially every scientist in the world agrees on, and that accepted scientific principle is that we have gases in our atmosphere that essentially trap energy in the Earth. The way this system works is that energy comes in from the sun in essentially ultraviolet wavelengths of light. It strikes the Earth and is reflected back into space except for one fact: we have a blanket of gases in our atmosphere which traps that energy from going back into space. The light comes in the ultraviolet range or spectrum, but it bounces back in the infrared spectrum, and these gases are a one-way door, if you will. It will allow the ultraviolet light in, but it will not allow the infrared light out. So it traps radiant energy in our planetary system. Every scientist who understands anything about meteorological systems understands that phenomenon and accepts it as a fact.

The other uncomfortable fact is that the concentration of these gases that essentially are responsible for this phenomenon are going up dramatically. If I can demonstrate this chart here, this is a chart of carbon dioxide concentrations. Carbon dioxide is an odorless, colorless gas. It is emitted any time we burn fossil fuels. Basically, since the dawn of the industrial revolution, we have had a dramatic increase in concentrations of carbon dioxide. As you see on this chart back in 1860 when we really started burning fossil fuels, the levels were about 285 parts per million in the atmosphere. If we look at the concentrations since 1960, they are beginning to skyrocket. And we are now at levels approaching 370 parts per million, radically increased compared to the preindustrial levels.

The thing that is disturbing about this is what is not on this chart, which is that this line if projected out goes through the ceiling of this roof in the next 100 years or so. This line continues to go up if we continue to do what we have been doing for the last 100 years. As that line continues to go up, it is not too surprising that we are playing Russian roulette with our global climate systems.

If we have a gas that traps energy and we double that gas, it stands to reason and it is an accepted fact that it is going to have an impact on the world's climate. Generally speaking, there will be a warming, but there may also be very untoward results of increased tornadoes, of increased dry spells, the lack of snow melt in the Pacific Northwest, and today the Arctic ice sheet demonstrably is smaller and thinner. The tundra in Alaska is melting, snow packs are being reduced. Alpine meadows in Mount Rainier National Park are disappearing in part because the tree level is rising.

The International Meteorological Society of the United Nations issued a report last week pointing to the dramatic increase in very significant high-energy abnormal meteorological events, including tornadoes and hurricanes. We are experiencing significant changes in our climate and someone, some country, is going to make money off responding to this challenge, and it needs to be America. We need to grow the jobs in this country which will create the technologies that sure as the Creator made little green apples are going to be used by the world in responding to this problem. We in America ought to be the ones fulfilling our destiny to do that.

What we have proposed in our plan is a multi-pronged approach. We realize that there is no silver bullet to this issue. We realize that we are going to have to do several things to jump start this new technological revolution. So what we have done is to look at various ways to approach this problem. We have recognized there is no one magical solution. There is going to be a multitude of technologies. There are going to be a lot of roads to get where we need to go, and we have not been prevented to have the genius to know which are the right ones.

What we have suggested in our plan is to take a very smorgasbord approach. We have essentially in our plan proposed research and development in a whole slew of new technologies, including clean coal technology to try to find out if there is a way to burn coal without putting carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. We think research and development is appropriate to find out if there is a way to do that. We think research and development is important to find out a way to find efficiencies of our heating and cooling systems. We have put in significant research and development dollars to do that. To address the cost of that investment, the number we have proposed of \$300 billion, or in that range, is a significant sum. But to put it in context, it is less than each of the last two tax cuts which have passed this Chamber and will be signed into law.

What we are suggesting is that the future of growing jobs in this Nation and the priority, the imperative to grow our economy by capturing these new industries in our country of retooling our industrial base, of making sure

these high-paying manufacturing jobs are in our country, we think that priority is at least equal to the priority of passing the very significant tax cuts, two packages which have now passed the House.

If Members believe in technology, if Members believe in America's destiny to lead the world in doing so, surely this investment in our future is every bit and probably more important than the tax cut package that passed, and we are suggesting an investment of that nature and that magnitude because this is not a time for baby steps.

Our challenges to our economy, to our environment, and to our personal security associated with being addicted to Middle East oil does not permit timidity in that regard. We need to act boldly and with visionary thought.

The other thing is we have used many of the tools in the Federal Government's tool belt to try to move this plan forward. We have suggested tax credits. We have suggested tax credits for our industries that need to retool, very generous tax credits for our automobile industry. We want our domestic automobile industry to lead the way in fuel-efficient vehicles, and we have suggested very generous tax credits to our automobile industry to be able to retool their plants so they can be the technological leaders in the world. Those tax credits also need to go to consumers, and so we have suggested generous tax credits to consumers who buy fuel-efficient vehicles, who buy fuel-efficient refrigerating systems, who buy energy-efficient homes. We think there should be a better financing system for energy-efficient homes. We are exploring ways to improve financing of energy-efficient homes and vehicles.

But we have also realized that we need to use all of the tools of the government, which include the abilities to have standardized regulatory systems to require where possible, where technology exists that we move forward.

One of the things that is pretty interesting to me is that if we had simply continued the rate of improvement in efficiency of our automobiles that was occurring in the late 1970s and early 1980s, if we had continued to improve the efficiency of our vehicles at that rate, we would have been free from imports of Saudi Arabian oil by now. Think about that. Unfortunately, we fell off the wagon. We stopped in the mid-1980s making any improvements in the fuel efficiency of our vehicles, and as a result here we are, still stuck in the morass of the Middle East, addicted to oil, losing jobs to the Japanese, the Danish, and the Germans.

□ 2350

And if we had simply continued on the path of efficiency, we would have been in a much better situation today. Now it is time, we believe, to get back on the road to efficiency and use all of these methods that we can to really seize the destiny of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to wrap up here just by a comment. America's history has always been forward and up, and we believe now that this is a pivotal moment to take a bold step in our energy future. Anything less short-changes both America and the promise of America. And we are going to be working, we hope, on a bipartisan basis to build a consensus around this new Apollo Energy Project. We would like to make this a bipartisan plan. Unfortunately, the President's plan falls woefully short of the promise that we think America deserves, but we are going to try to continue to push this ball because America's future depends on it to grow these jobs in this country to make sure our industry leads the world. That is the American way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

VICTIMS OF OUR POROUS BORDERS

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just in the remaining time, I want to wrap up my remarks by once again referring to and recalling the fact that the problems that this Nation faces with the inability or the lack of determination on its part to actually defend its own borders creates more than problems in the job market. It creates more than problems for our schools and our hospitals in terms of the infrastructure that has to be created in order to support the illegal aliens who do come into the country. It creates other problems that are very dramatic and very real.

And we are going to focus on those problems, and we are going to hold an event here in this year in September. Mr. Speaker, it will be the week of September 11, and we are inviting people to come to Washington, D.C., people who have been victims of our porous borders, and these can be people as the folks that I have identified here, the friends and relatives of the people that have been individually harmed by the fact that our borders are porous and that we do not defend them. And they can tell their story, and they can come to this Congress, and they can meet with their Representatives and their Senators and explain to them that there is a cost, a huge cost, to illegal immigration that is perhaps thought of relatively infrequently. It is not factored into much of the discussion that we have about it, but it is a very serious cost. It is a real one.

And they are not people that necessarily have had just their lives disrupted by the loss of a loved one who may have lost their life as a result of someone coming across the border illegally and taking that life, whether on purpose or by accident, because there is story after story after story; as I go through them, it is of somebody who is killed or severely injured by people who have crashed into them, but it turns out they are here illegally, that they do not have insurance, and they take off, run back across the border. It is just amazing how many stories like that there are.

And I want these people to be able to tell these stories. I want them to know that somebody does care, and they are not just numbers, they are not just statistics that have no real meaning in the larger sense of the term. And I want to allow them the opportunity to tell their story here.

And it could be people who have lost their jobs as a result of the fact that our borders are porous, people who have come across and taken these jobs; maybe people who are underemployed, maybe people who work in the high-tech industry, but have been displaced by H1B visa workers, people who have come under that particular program and taken their jobs away from them because they will work for less.

All of these people are victims of our porous borders, and they have a story to tell, and they can go to a Website, Mr. Speaker. It is called victimsvoice.com, and they can tell that story on that Website. They can register for the event in September. And I encourage people, as I say, to do that, Mr. Speaker.

And I just want to say that this is a problem of, I think, a magnitude that we really have not understood, and that we desperately need to understand, and that we cannot allow cities and States throughout the Nation to begin developing their own immigration policies, begin ignoring the requirements of the Federal laws that we have in place, begin telling their law enforcement agencies that they will not cooperate with the Federal Enforcement Agency and the INS in the apprehension of criminal aliens. This is absolutely unconscionable, and something has got to happen. Some attention has got to be drawn to this problem.

So I want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to wrap up my remarks.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FARR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOEFFEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FROST, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. HART) to revise and extend

their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, July 14 and 15.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, July 16.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, July 16.

Mr. FEENEY, for 5 minutes, July 16.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, July 16.

Mr. CHOCOLA, for 5 minutes, July 16.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 10.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HILL) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 10, 2003, 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:

3059. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Salmonella Enteritidis Phage-Type 4; Remove Import Restrictions and Salmonella Enteritidis Serotype Enteritidis; Remove Regulations [Docket No. 00-107-2] (RIN: 0579-AB31) received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3060. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irradiation of Sweetpotatoes From Hawaii [Docket No. 03-062-1] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3061. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fruits and Vegetables [Docket No. 02-026-4] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3062. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Small Grains Crop Insurance Provisions and Wheat Crop Insurance Winter Coverage Endorsement (RIN: 0563-AB63) received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3063. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification with respect to a proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to sell defense articles and services, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

3064. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of De-

fense, transmitting a notification, pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act, of the intent to sign an Amendment to the Funding Arrangement for the Contracting of Legal and Technical Assistance Required for the Definition Phase in Support of the Alliance Ground Surveillance (AGS) Steering Committee between the United States, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Spain, Turkey, and the United Kingdom; Transmittal No. 13-03, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

3065. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold under a contract to Greece (Transmittal No. DDTC 054-03), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3066. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Technical Assistance agreement with NATO AEW&C Programme Management Organization (NAPMO), including Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain and Turkey (Transmittal No. 045-03), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3067. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold under a contract to Ecuador (Transmittal No. DDTC 056-03), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3068. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting text of agreements in which the American Institute in Taiwan is a party between January 1 and December 31, 2002, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3311(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3069. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report consistent with section 403(a)(3-6) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended; to the Committee on International Relations.

3070. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Organization of the Government for Personnel Management, Overseas Employment, Temporary and Term Employment, Recruitment and Selection for Temporary and Term Appointments Outside the Register, Examining System, and Training (RIN: 3206-AJ99) received June 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3071. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Texas Regulatory Program [TX-043-FOR] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3072. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — North Dakota Regulatory Program [SATS ND-46-FOR, Amendment No. XXXII] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3073. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Illinois Regulatory Program [IL-099-FOR] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.