

their pensions. Instead, we give tax breaks when they outsource it. I would like to ask both of my colleagues, and maybe I just don't get it. I want you to know that I am not angry that I wasn't invited to the press conference, I am angry because I know what we can do. This is why we have this majority. If we are going to keep this majority, we have to stand up for ordinary people.

Before I turn this over, I want to end with a quote here. One of my political heroes is Hubert Humphrey, and he said in one of the last speeches he gave before he died to the Minnesota AFL-CIO, he said, "I would rather live 10 years like a tiger than 100 years like a chicken." These trade agreements are going to put us back more than 100 years. We are never going to be able to recoup these jobs we have lost. That is why I am here.

I am not going to go back to my district, and I am not going to be lobbied to change my mind unless I am convinced that these trade agreements are in the best interest of our American workers, and that there are provisions built in to help keep jobs.

While I applaud the efforts of the leadership to do some things, I want to make sure that the language is in here. I don't want to go back to Dave Brevard and say, if you can just hang on, we will work on the currency exchange. That is not going to help Mr. Brevard and the people in my district and in the State of Ohio.

Let me say to my colleague, it doesn't matter if you are just from Ohio or just from Illinois, we have lost manufacturing jobs all across this country. I have yet to see, yet to see, a fast track deal that has been in the best interests of the working people of this country. So as long as I am a Member, and I know that is going to be at least another 19 months, and hopefully a little longer, I am going to work very hard to make sure that American workers have somebody.

And I have wonderful people that I am honored to have here this evening, and I would like to enter into a discussion of how are we going to keep manufacturers here.

Does anybody see anything in this bill about how we keep our jobs?

Mr. MICHAUD. I think that remains to be seen. I have been in negotiations before when I worked at Great Northern Paper Company. We put together ideas, but the devil is in the details.

I think it is very clear that the American people want a new direction. They want us to look at the rules of trade. We have to give them that direction because we as Democrats, we are in the majority in both the House and the Senate. There is no excuses, no excuses. We have to give this country a new direction as it relates to trade. We have to look at the trade rules, and now is the time to do it. It is not let's pass a couple of them and see how it works out. We have to take a comprehensive view on what we want for a trade policy. The American people,

they want that. We are here. They voted the Republicans out. They fired the Republicans.

As we heard from our leadership, they haven't hired the Democrats. This is our time to show them that the Democrats can lead this country. We must lead this country, and what better way to show that we can by taking a global look at trade and trade policies and how it affects us here in the United States.

Mr. HARE. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Ms. SUTTON. Thank you, Congressman HARE.

Let me start out by saying I am so honored to be a Representative from Ohio. The people of my district and my great State are the salt of the Earth. All they want is a job where they can work and raise their families and give them an opportunity for a future that we all dream of.

That is the kind of opportunity that my parents had. My dad worked in the boilermaker factory his whole life. Here I am, his daughter, standing in Congress. Every day that I am here, I am going to make sure that I am looking out for the people who have the same dream that probably your parents and my parents shared, and that is just for a good day for themselves and their family and a bright future based on those opportunities.

Now, I, like you, Congressman HARE and Congressman MICHAUD, I believe trade can benefit American businesses and workers and be a tool to help developing countries looking to access our markets. But this that has been presented is not a new trade model that will get us there.

Our window for creating a new trade model is closing because it is becoming increasingly hard for our businesses to survive here, and that is not the American way, is it? That is not acceptable. I, with you, I know will continue to fight to change that.

Mr. MICHAUD. That is a good point. It is not only about the workers and unions; the business community is very upset. Those small businesses, the United States Industry Council, which is an organization which represents small manufacturers all across the country, are very concerned about these trade deals, and we have to make sure that we look at it globally. That is why I think it is important for those of us who have seen it firsthand, not read about it in the paper, but actually seen it firsthand, that we are part of this discussion because it is very important.

I have seen my fellow mill workers end up on the unemployment line. They ended up in food lines as well where food banks actually in Maine went dry because there are so many people applying or getting food at food banks because paper mill after paper mill had shut down because of trade.

□ 2045

Yes, we did get trade assistance, but that's not what they want. They want

their jobs, and that's why it's very important that we do look at the rules of trade, changing the trade model so it's fair. It is, as Ms. SUTTON mentioned, the American dream, and we have to bring that dream back once again.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, let me just say this, too. These are the very people who fought our wars, defended this country. They just want a decent pension. They'd like some health care, put their kids through school, play by the rules, pay their taxes. They're not the fat cats. These are the thin cats we're talking about

And for the life of me, I don't understand. As you said, we have both chambers, and I believe it's time that both of these chambers stand up because I'm afraid if we don't, we'll go back and our base, those folks who elected us here, are going to say what were you thinking.

I want to just close with this. I know we just have a few minutes remaining here. I want to thank you all for coming this evening, and this is going to be a tough battle. We don't make any bones about it, Mr. Speaker, but look, nothing comes easy for hardworking people, and we're going to work very hard on this. I don't care where you come from, I don't care what State, but I think we have a moral obligation.

I want to close. I did a commencement speech last night at a high school, and I ran into the grandfather of one of the kids that graduated. His father used to work with me in my factory that closed down because of trade, and he's out West now. And I got to thinking, what a shame we couldn't have the opportunity to see each other. He comes back periodically. He's a good, decent man.

I'll close by saying this. This isn't the end on this trade issue. Mr. Speaker, this is only the beginning. We're going to fight, and we're going to win this battle.

HONORING JORDAN CARLSON AND THOR-LO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend THOR-LO, Incorporated, of Statesville, North Carolina, for its commitment to fighting breast cancer. This company, which makes specialized socks for almost any activity, has pledged \$250,000 as a national sponsor for the Breast Cancer 3-Day campaign.

The campaign will raise funds through a dozen 3-day 60-mile walks in cities across the Nation and will support the Susan G. Komen for the Cure foundation. But the story doesn't stop there.

THOR-LO first became involved in this effort through the example and spirit of a young woman in Mocksville, North Carolina. Jordan Carlson is the

daughter of Jan Carlson, a woman who has twice fought off breast cancer. Jordan has the ambitious goal of participating in all 12 of the 60-mile walks. By walking more than 700 miles, Jordan plans to raise \$1 million to help fight breast cancer.

It was her request for walking socks that brought THOR-LO into the picture last year. THOR-LO has not only committed \$250,000 to the 3-day campaign, the company has also designed a sock especially for the thousands of 3-day walkers. They call it the HERO Everyday Walker and are donating one additional dollar for every new sock that they sell. The special HERO sock is almost entirely pink and sports a pink breast cancer ribbon to commemorate the cause for which 3-day walkers will be raising money.

THOR-LO employees designed the new sock after going on a trial walk with Jordan last year. The sock is specifically designed for the form of the female foot and is made to withstand the tough conditions of 3 days of almost nonstop walking.

The partnership of THOR-LO with Jordan Carlson is a triumph of the spirit of American compassion and generosity. Jordan's example has inspired THOR-LO to support a great philanthropic cause and to offer not only generous financial support, but to bring THOR-LO's sock making know-how to the thousands of walkers who will raise millions to find a cure for breast cancer.

It is my hope that Jordan's story and partnership with THOR-LO will serve to inspire her family, friends and classmates and everyone who hears about it to follow in her footsteps.

I commend her and all those at THOR-LO, especially the employees who worked to design and produce these special socks. How fortunate for us to live in a country where people care so much.

Jordan has discovered one of the secrets of a life well-lived: selfless devotion to a cause larger than herself. I believe that this young woman's passion to help find a cure will lead her to inspire countless Americans to grasp the great American ideals of generosity and hard work in the service of noble causes.

BROKEN PROMISES ON EARMARK REFORM AND ETHICS RULES

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am switching subjects, and I'm very sad for the occasion to have to do that. I much prefer to talk on this floor about the great things that American people are doing and hold them up as examples for others, but unfortunately, tonight, I need to talk about a very sad situation that has occurred in the House of Representatives.

Today, Representative MIKE ROGERS offered a privileged resolution to force the full House to vote on whether to reprimand senior Democrat JOHN MURTHA, Democrat from Pennsylvania, for threatening ROGERS on the House floor last week. The actions by Representa-

tive MURTHA constitute a violation of House rules which preclude Members from conditioning earmarks on another's vote.

Curiously, Speaker NANCY PELOSI chose to defend MURTHA yesterday even though, according to the Associated Press, Representative MURTHA did not deny that he violated House rules.

Congress Daily PM reports that Democratic leadership aides, "want to make this go away as soon as possible," but Representative MURTHA's violation is part of a growing pattern of abuses that show the House has moved away from earmark reform under Democrats, rather than toward it. Today Republican Leader JOHN BOEHNER sent a letter to Speaker PELOSI to renew his long-standing request for a bipartisan working group tasked with recommending fair, sensible and understandable House ethics rules. A little bit later in my comments, I'm going to read that letter and insert it into the RECORD.

As has been reported previously, this is the second incident where Representative MURTHA has threatened a GOP Member who dared challenge his questionable earmark, which has been deemed, "an expensive and duplicative use of scarce Federal drug enforcement resources," according to the May 8 edition of *The Hill*. Fox News has also previously reported on his threat to Representative TODD TIAHRT from Kansas, including the video of it on the House floor.

House Democrats have repeatedly promised the most open and ethical Congress in history. It's so ironic that during a week when Democrats will bring up their lobbying and ethics reform bill, which we hear has been watered down considerably, will they back Representative MURTHA and make a mockery of their own rules, or will they keep their pledge to the American people?

And let me remind everyone what some of those pledges were. I want to contrast some of the promises from the top two Democratic leaders with how they are running things today: violations of earmark disclosure rules, no debate, no amendments to strike, no transparency, no scrutiny, no sunlight. The American people are beginning to catch on to the Democrats' sham pledges and broken promises.

First, let me quote from the Majority Leader, Representative STENY HOYER, Democrat from Maryland. "We are going to adopt rules that make the system of legislation transparent so that we don't legislate in the dark of night, and the public and other Members can see what is being done."

Second quote. "We need to have [earmarks] subject to [more] debate. That's what debate and public awareness is all about. Democracy works if people know what's going on."

And this has appeared in www.tpmcafe.com, and I'm going again to make this available so that anyone who wants to go to check that quote

can go to it without accepting what I'm saying for it.

Then Speaker PELOSI, the number one Democrat in the House, "There has to be transparency," on earmarks. That's in www.usatoday.com.

Here's a question that was asked of her. "Yes. They're saying that you would need to put the earmark into a text of a bill instead of in a conference report so that they can—"

And Representative PELOSI answers, "Well, I think, first of all—anything that is in any bill, any provision, whether it's an earmark or not, should be—there should be transparency, so that—that's why we have said—and I hope you would agree—that before Members vote on the bill, there should be an appropriate time for people to be able to read it, that it be a matter of public record. And if there's an earmark that can stand the scrutiny, then that transparency will give the opportunity for it to be there."

"There are many earmarks that are very worthy—all of mine, as a matter of fact—" and remember, I'm quoting Speaker PELOSI, "but it is—because we're talking about helping people in the community—it's the special interest earmarks that are the ones that go in there in the dark of night, that they don't want anybody to see, and that nobody does see and that are voted upon."

"So transparency—yes, by all means, let's subject them all to the scrutiny that they deserve and let them compete for the dollar. But myself, I would not be unhappy." And this was in her weekly press conference, 3/17/06.

Now, the earmark that is under question is an earmark that was in the Intelligence bill last week. There were many, many efforts to bring that out, all of them thwarted by the Democratic leadership.

Now, here is Congressman BOEHNER's letter to Speaker PELOSI. I don't have the exact text. I'm going to read what it said. But the process "has become less transparent and less accountable than it was during the 109th Congress, directly violating pledges made last year by Democratic leaders." BOEHNER's letter comes as the House prepares to consider a privileged resolution offered by Representative MIKE ROGERS concerning an earmark-related House rules violation by Representative JOHN MURTHA, Democrat of Pennsylvania, who was the Speaker's preferred choice for House majority leader.

BOEHNER's letter lists a series of rules abuses by the Democratic majority he argues have made a mockery of House rules that are supposed to ensure that no taxpayer-funded earmark is passed without appropriate scrutiny and debate.

In addition to the MURTHA incidents, BOEHNER notes Democrats have refused to allow Members to challenge questionable earmarks on the House floor,

certified a huge spending bill as earmark free though it contained hundreds of millions of dollars in earmarks, and preserved special privileges for State and local government lobbyists seeking earmarks from Congress, including lobbyists for public universities.

BOEHNER says in the letter, "At the outset of this Congress, Republicans and Democrats jointly pledged to make the earmark process more transparent and more accountable to the American people. A rules package was adopted that was supposed to enforce this pledge as one of its central objectives by ensuring no earmark would be passed by the House without appropriate scrutiny and opportunity for debate. Recent actions by the majority have begun to make a mockery of this vow and of the rules themselves."

□ 2100

I go on quoting from the letter.

"These actions by the majority have become increasingly flagrant and bold with each passing month of the 110th Congress, fueling public cynicism about our institution and disheartening many who believe fundamental change is needed in the way in which Washington spends the taxpayers' money."

Boehner goes on to say, in the letter, "We have now reached the point at which the congressional earmark process has become less transparent and less accountable than it was during the 109th Congress, directly violating pledges made last year by Democratic leaders."

What this is about is an action by Representative MURTHA to secure tens of millions of dollars for a questionable project in his district by highly suspect methods that either flaunted the new rules without penalty, or, at best, nominally complied with them, proving in either case how utterly ineffective the new rules really are.

Again, in February, the majority was able to certify a massive spending bill as earmark-free, despite the fact that it contained hundreds of millions of dollars in earmarks. Under the rules, there is no way a Member can challenge an earmark that is included in a bill brought to the House floor as long as the bill contains a list of earmarks, even if the list is inaccurate and fails to include the earmark the Member seeks to challenge. This is a terrible way to get around the situation and continued to fund questionable projects, which Members of the majority want to fund, and they are very disingenuous in this process.

But perhaps most appalling, the majority has twisted House rules and procedure to prevent questionable earmarks, once identified, from being challenged in any way on the House floor by Members seeking nothing more than up-or-down votes on these suspect provisions. In fact, on at least two occasions, Republican Members objecting to illegitimate earmarks have

been directly threatened with retaliation by a senior Democratic Member in open defiance of the new rules.

I would like also to read a piece which Congressman MIKE ROGERS has written, and it's called "The Sopranos on Capitol Hill?"

"Bridges to nowhere, the \$100 hamper. A rainforest in Iowa. Billions of taxpayer dollars unaccounted for.

"It's no wonder the American people are disgusted with the way Congress spends their money. In the latest incident certain to cement the public's frustration, a powerful chairman threatened and attempted to intimidate me when I tried to stop wasteful duplicative spending from what the U.S. News and World Report has called a taxpayer 'boondoggle.' Even more troubling, this pork-barrel project takes precious intelligence resources from spies on the ground catching terrorists in places like Fallujah, Iraq, and sends it to bureaucrats in Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

"Two weeks ago I offered a proposal to the Fiscal Year 2008 Intelligence Authorization Act that would have taken funding away from an illegitimate, wasteful earmark that happened to be in the district of House Defense Appropriations chairman JOHN MURTHA, Democrat, Pennsylvania. Chairman MURTHA's earmark would authorize tens of millions for the National Drug Intelligence Center, NDIC, a government office that the House Government Reform Committee has deemed an 'expensive and duplicative use of scarce Federal drug resources,' according to an article in the May 8 edition of The Hill.

"Last week, on the House floor, Chairman MURTHA violated House rules in an expletive-laced tirade, pointing his finger and threatening my priorities 'now and forever.' Just last week, Chairman MURTHA 'exploded' and 'unleashed a loud, finger-jabbing, spittle-spraying piece of his mind' at a colleague on his committee, according to The Hill. Chairman MURTHA then . . . threatened to withdraw support from a defense project . . . vital to his colleague's district, according to the article. This week he attempted to intimidate me, and when I had the audacity to question the merits of the project, his reaction was more finger pointing and intimidation.

"Today I will introduce a resolution outlining this egregious action which is not only beneath the dignity of Congress, it constitutes a violation of House rules, which preclude Members from conditioning spending in other districts on another Member's vote. The House should reprimand Chairman MURTHA for his conduct.

"This incident in the people's House highlighted arrogance of power at its worst, and both political parties are guilty. This is why the American people throw up their hands and are fed up with Washington politicians. If we are ever going to restore the trust of the American people, Congress can and must do better.

"This reminds me how far some in Congress have gotten away from America's founding. When General George Washington led a rag-tag group of Americans to defeat the most powerful military in the world, many in this new land wanted him to be King. Many feared without a strong, all-powerful leader, our new Nation would be vulnerable to attack. A beautiful painting hangs in the Rotunda of the U.S. Capitol Building highlighting Washington's next action, which was perhaps unprecedented in all of history. George Washington voluntarily resigned his commission as head of the Revolutionary Army, giving up personal gain for the greater good of the new Nation. Too many in Washington, D.C., of both parties have instead taken from the greater good for their own gain.

"The House floor is not the place for an episode of 'The Sopranos,' and protecting the public's tax dollars is a basic duty of all Members of Congress. The good news is this could be an opportunity for Republicans and Democrats to change the way Congress does business and to change the way taxpayer money is spent. The country and our citizens' pocketbooks would be better off for it."

That ends the article by Congressman MIKE ROGERS, a Republican from Michigan, and a former FBI Special Agent.

As has been said and alluded to by the comments that I have read here tonight, this is simply the latest but most egregious situation where the Imajority party is doing exactly the opposite of what it promised to do.

It promised many times on this floor last year, many times in campaigns, the most ethical Congress ever. That simply has not been the case.

We have people up here every day saying things that are not true. They keep saying they are not raising taxes in the budget. We know they are. Even some of their Members have said it. Some of their Members voted with the Republicans against the budget, and at least one of them said, I simply cannot vote to let these tax cuts expire. That means the tax increases are there.

They have said they would be the most ethical in terms of earmarks. I really dislike that term, "earmarks," it's very negative, but it means money sent to a special project by a Member. I don't have any problem with money going to certain projects by certain Members. That's part of our constitutional responsibility. It should be out in the open every time.

If we, as Members of Congress, are ashamed of where we are sending the money, then there must be something wrong with it. If I were to ask for money to go to a special project, I would be very proud of that and would want the people of my district to know it.

However, it's obvious that Congressman MURTHA does not want the people of his district or this country to know where he is sending certain dollars,

partly because that project has been evaluated and deemed to be wasteful, as I gave you some quotes.

This was going to be the Congress that was going to do so much. Not any bill of any consequence has passed both Houses and been signed by the President. None of their bills that they promised, their Six in '06, small ideas. Even they don't do what they said they do.

I would like to use the example of the student loans. All for last year, the Democrats said over and over and over again, oh, we are going to bring down the cost of going to college. Students have to borrow too much money. We are going to lower the cost of interest rates.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, what they did was a giant shell game. It takes 5 years for them to lower the interest rate on one small program that students borrow money from, making up, probably, less than 20 percent or fewer than 20 percent of the loans out there. It takes 5 years to get that interest rate brought down to half. The interest rate stays half for 3 whole months, and then it goes straight back up to the full rate. But they would like the American people to believe that they really have done something that they said they were going to do, which is not true.

It's over and over again. They would not raise taxes, the budget raised taxes. They would cut spending. Everything that they have done is increase spending.

They said that they would always support our troops. They do not support our troops. They have played games here for the last month or so, trying to embarrass the President, they think, and try to get through, again, more of their pork-barrel projects by putting unnecessary spending onto a war supplemental, which, again, is a giant shell game, because it would allow them to take \$24 billion off-line spending, because if it's in the supplemental, they don't have to count it against their budget. That gives them \$24 billion more they can spend somewhere else, and they pass it off as emergency funding. It's not emergency funding at all.

So, they are not supporting our troops, and they are not doing anything that they promise to do last year. Again, this latest episode, with Congressman MURTHA, should send a clear signal to the American people that that is what is happening.

You know, there is an old saying, you can fool some of the people all of the time. You can fool all of the people some of the time. But you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

I think that the American people are waking up to the hypocrisy that has been going on here by the Democrats, and they are seeing not only aren't they fulfilling their promises, but they are doing even worse. They are trying to hide everything that they are doing and trying to make it look like they

are fulfilling their promises, but they are not.

I want to say, in terms of their insisting on a surrender date, I have said this before on the floor, I have never in my life been around leaders in our country that talk about failure and impossibility as much as these people do. America is a place where we believe in things getting done, where everything is possible. We could do it all. We will win this war. We have to win the war, because our freedom is at stake.

All they talk about is surrender date. Every bill that they have passed has had surrender dates in it. It has been 105 days since the President first requested additional troop funding. While we are trying to help get that funding, Republicans are, the Democrats want to choke off or ration funding for American troops in harm's way. More of their hypocrisy. They don't want to fund the troops.

Sometimes I think they want failure just to prove a point. Yet, they would tear down the freedom that we have to stay in power and to prove a point.

We need a clean troop-funding bill. We need to give our troops the resources they need to be successful, no strings, no timelines, no pork, and it needs to be done by Memorial Day so that we show the troops how we really feel about them, and not this sham that the Democrats have been portraying here in the Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. GERLACH (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. KIRK (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a family emergency.

Ms. DEGETTE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of family obligations.

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of family medical emergency.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of death in the family.

Mr. KIND (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of family commitment.

Mr. STUPAK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of family matter in the district.

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:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CLARKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, May 23.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes each, today and May 22, 23, and 24.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes each, today and May 23 and 24.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes, May 23.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 22, 2007, at 9 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1861. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetochlor; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0203; FRL-8126-2] received May 11, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1862. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Aspergillus flavus* NRRL 21882 on Corn; Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0160; FRL-8130-6] received May 11, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1863. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorantraniliprole; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0800; FRL-8128-2] received May 11, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1864. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pendimethalin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0995; FRL-8120-2] received May 11, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1865. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental