

Congressman Gray, like his father, was a strong supporter of education and leading advocate for strengthening America's educational systems.

He earned several degrees: a bachelor's degree in 1963 from Franklin and Marshall College, a Master's of Divinity in 1966 from Drew Theological Seminary, and another Master's in Church History from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1970.

Additionally, he was awarded more than 65 honorary degrees from America's leading colleges and universities.

At an early age, he accepted his calling to become a preacher, and from that day, he proclaimed the Gospel of Jesus in the church, in the community, and even in the halls of Congress. His faith was unshakable. It was evident that he lived his life based upon what he preached.

Congressman Gray was the pastor of Bright Hope Baptist Church in Philadelphia for more than 25 years, a church pastored by his father and grandfather.

Elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1978, Congressman Gray was a persistent voice for equal rights, educational access, and opportunity for all persons, in the United States and abroad.

In 1985, Congressman Gray became the first African American in history to chair the House Budget Committee, where he introduced H. R. 1460, the "Anti-Apartheid Action Act of 1985," which prohibited loans and new investment in South Africa and imposed sanctions on imports and exports with South Africa.

In 1989, Congressman Gray was elected by his colleagues Chairman of the Democratic Caucus and later that year was elected Majority Whip.

As the first African American to hold these two senior leadership positions, Bill Gray's success inspired a generation of African American elected officials.

In 1991, Congressman Gray resigned from Congress to become the president and chief executive officer of the United Negro College Fund (UNCF).

Approximately one-half of the more than \$1.6 billion raised in UNCF's history was collected during Congressman Gray's tenure.

During the Clinton Administration, Congressman Gray served as President Clinton's special adviser on Haiti.

As a result of his commitment to Haiti, Congressman Gray and President Clinton received the Medal of Honor from Haitian President Jean-Bertrand Aristide.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one word to convey the sweep and scope of Congressman Gray's life of service: giant. He was a giant of Philadelphia, of the Congress, and in the history of our country.

By designating "30th Street Station" to "William H. Gray 30th Street Station," the American people, not just the residents of Philadelphia, will be reminded of Congressman Gray's illustrious legacy of public service to his city, his state, his country, and the world.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 2430.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4838.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2013

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 935) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 935

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013".

### SEC. 2. USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.

Section 3(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Except as provided in section 402(s) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Administrator or a State may not require a permit under such Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under this Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide."

### SEC. 3. DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.

Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(s) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—

"(1) NO PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a permit shall not be required by the Administrator or a State under this Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.

"(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following discharges of a pesticide or pesticide residue:

"(A) A discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of a provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act that is relevant to protecting water quality, if—

"(i) the discharge would not have occurred but for the violation; or

"(ii) the amount of pesticide or pesticide residue in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation.

"(B) Stormwater discharges subject to regulation under subsection (p).

"(C) The following discharges subject to regulation under this section:

"(i) Manufacturing or industrial effluent.

"(ii) Treatment works effluent.

"(iii) Discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling prevention."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 935.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013. I introduced H.R. 935 to clarify the congressional intent regarding how the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters should be regulated.

It is the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, also known as FIFRA, and not the Clean Water Act, which has long been the Federal regulatory statute that governs the safety and use of pesticides in the United States. In fact, FIFRA has regulated pesticides long before the enactment of the Clean Water Act. However, more recently, as the result of a number of lawsuits, the Clean Water Act has been added as a new and redundant layer of Federal regulation over the use of pesticides.

H.R. 935 is aimed at reversing a decision in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals in *National Cotton Council v. EPA*, which imposed Clean Water Act permitting on pesticide use. That case vacated a 2006 Environmental Protection Agency rule that codified EPA's longstanding interpretation that the application of a pesticide for its intended purpose and in compliance with the requirements of FIFRA is not a discharge of a pollutant under the Clean Water Act, and, therefore, an NPDES permit is not required.

In vacating the rule, the Sixth Circuit substituted judge-made policy choices for reasonable Agency interpretations of the law. In the process, the court undermined the traditional understanding of how the Clean Water Act interacts with other environmental statutes and judicially expanded the scope of Clean Water Act regulation further into areas and activities not originally envisioned or intended by Congress. As a result of that court decision, EPA has been required to develop and impose a new and expanded NPDES permitting process under the Clean Water Act to cover pesticide use.

EPA has estimated that approximately 365,000 pesticide users, including State agencies, cities, counties, mosquito control districts, water districts, pesticide applicators, farmers, ranchers, forest managers, scientists, and even everyday citizens that perform some 5.6 million pesticide applications annually would be affected by the court's ruling. This substantially increases the number of entities subject to NPDES permitting.

With this ill-advised court decision, Federal and State agencies are expending vital funds to initiate and maintain Clean Water Act permitting programs governing pesticide applications, and a wide range of public and private pesticide users are now facing increased financial and administrative burdens in order to comply with the new permitting process.

Despite what the fearmongers suggest, all of this expense comes with no additional environmental protection. NPDES compliance costs and fears of potentially ruinous litigation associated with complying with the new NPDES requirements for the use of pesticides are forcing mosquito control other pest control programs to reduce operations and redirect resources to comply with the regulatory requirements.

In many States, routine preventive programs have been reduced due to the NPDES requirements. This most likely impacted and increased the record-breaking outbreaks of West Nile virus around the Nation in 2012. In response to West Nile outbreaks, many States and communities had to declare public health emergencies, resulting in pesticide use to control mosquitoes with the delay caused by the NPDES permitting process. It remains to be seen how the control of mosquitoes will be affected this year, although recent press reports are noting an increase this summer in West Nile virus and the spread of a newly introduced tropical disease spread by mosquitoes.

H.R. 935 will enable communities to resume conducting routine preventive mosquito control programs in the future. H.R. 935 exempts from the NPDES permitting process a discharge to waters involving the application of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under FIFRA, where the pesticide is used for its intended purpose and the use is in compliance with pesticide label requirements.

Exempting pesticides from the NPDES permitting is appropriate because EPA already protects human health and the environment under FIFRA. When it reviews the safety of pesticides, it determines whether to approve or not approve a pesticide for use and sets the rules for each pesticide's uses under the product label.

H.R. 935 was drafted very narrowly to address the Sixth Circuit Court's holding in National Cotton Council and return the state of pesticide regulation to the status quo before the court got involved.

EPA provided technical assistance in drafting this bill so that it would achieve these objectives. Well over 150 organizations representing a wide variety of public and private entities and thousands of stakeholders support a legislative resolution of this issue. Just to name a few, these organizations include the American Mosquito Control Association, the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, the National Water Resources Associa-

tion, the American Farm Bureau Federation, Family Farm Alliance, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, CropLife America, and Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for their leadership at the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, as well as Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON of the Agriculture Committee for their leadership. I urge all Members to support H.R. 935.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, it is Groundhog Day again here on the floor of the House of Representatives. Much of the speech we just heard actually was read 3 years ago on the floor. Three years ago, we were in a different place. There was a new pending rule. There was tremendous uncertainty whether this would be an undue burden on individuals—no, in the end, it isn't at all—on individual farmers—no, except for the largest farms over 6,000 acres—or on forestry. And no, it has not been a problem, and I have a heavily forested State. So there was tremendous uncertainty, and the House Republicans moved this legislation. Of course, it went nowhere in the Senate.

Here we are 3 years later. We have been living under the permit and general permit process, and I am going to look forward to hearing some very specific problems, denials, or litigation from the other side—not maybe, there should have, could have, would have, might be stuff, because I am not aware of any. And we have asked.

Now, sure, my Farm Bureau supports this. Hey, whatever. That is great. Others say sure, but it is not anything that we really have on our priority list.

But, you know, here we are.

Fires are burning in the West. We don't have time for a hearing or a bill to get money to the Forest Service and the Interior Department, but we do have time to do pretend legislation that isn't going anywhere in the Senate again to deal with a problem that doesn't exist.

Why doesn't it exist? Well, first of all, all individuals and applications by farmers are exempt under a permit. You follow the label, you are fine. No one can sue you.

Then you have, if you are a bigger applicator, if you are like someone who is paid to apply pesticides and herbicides, you have to give notice under a general permit. That is all you have to do. You file it online. Not too burdensome. Most applicators, I think, have access to a computer.

Is there an approval process? No. Is there a waiting period? No. You just file it, and then you are exempt from litigation if you follow the label.

So why would we have this? Well, there have been a few instances of problems, and we want to be able to track where those problems originated.

So if you have a general permit out there for an industrial application or a commercial application of a certain herbicide and it starts showing up downstream with dead fish, you know probably where it came from and you can trace it back and you will probably find out that they violated the label.

Now, why did this come about? Well, for a real reason: 92,000 steelhead were killed in southern Oregon because an irrigation district chose to use a powerful herbicide in its irrigation canals and they didn't follow the label in terms of the waiting period for it to degrade. They ran the water through and killed 92,000 fish. That is where this all started.

So we are not saying they can't use it, they can't apply it—you know, they can—but we want to know where it is coming from. In that case, it was pretty easy to track back. The trail of dead fish led right back to the irrigation canal.

In other cases of impaired waters—and I have a long list in my State, and I am sure there are other States—we are not quite sure how they got impaired or where they are being impaired, and we would have a better indication if we merely have this notice requirement.

Now, there will be a lot of fear-mongering here today: "You won't be able to use stuff on your lawn." "You will be liable." "It won't be available."

No, not true.

"Farmers won't be able to apply their own herbicides and pesticides."

No, not true.

"Very large farms, commercial applicators will not be able to use it."

No, not true, but they will need to put a notice online they are using it, and they are supposed to follow the label.

I really find it unfortunate that we are spending time on this instead of getting some additional allocation of funds to fight fires in the West. My State is burning up. Washington State is burning up. California is burning up. Other intermountain States are burning up. The Forest Service and BLM are going to run out of money this week or next.

□ 1445

They have got all their other budgets to pay for fighting fires because they can't stop fighting the fires. They can't stop.

But Congress has a bipartisan, bicameral bill agreed to by the President. There is nothing else like that in Washington, D.C., with the partisan activity around here, the conflict always between the House and the Senate.

Here is a bill agreed to by Democrats and Republicans—52 Rs, 52 Ds on the bill. Here is a bill that is pending in the House and the Senate, bicameral—it is also bipartisan on that side—and it is supported by the President.

But we can't find time to take action on that and get the Forest Service and BLM money this week because we are

doing stuff like this about pretend problems that don't exist and scaring people who use these products legitimately. It is a very sad waste of our time.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the chairman of Agriculture.

(Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

This piece of legislation before us today is very familiar to many of us. As many of you will remember, we stood here 3 years ago voting on this same bill text. That bill, H.R. 872, was passed by this body with an overwhelming demonstration of bipartisan support. The legislation was the product of collaborative work done between two House committees, along with the technical assistance of the Obama administration's Environmental Protection Agency. This is the way legislation should be handled, and I was proud of our efforts in the House.

To refresh your memory, this problem stems from an uninformed court decision in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. This decision invalidated a 2006 EPA regulation exempting pesticide applications that are in compliance with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act from having to also comply with a costly and duplicative permitting process under the Clean Water Act.

The effect to have these same products doubly regulated through the Clean Water Act permitting process is unnecessary, costly, and ultimately undermines public health. It amounts to a duplication of regulatory compliance costs for a variety of public agencies and doubles their legal jeopardy.

Additionally, more than 40 States have endured increased financial and administrative burdens in order to comply with the new permitting requirement process during a time when many States are already being forced to make difficult budget decisions. Should vector control agencies cease operations due to these costs, it will expose a vast new unprotected population cohort to mosquitoes potentially carrying a number of dangerous exotic diseases such as West Nile.

Some will argue the costs associated with this permit requirement have been small. As it stands, some people may believe millions of dollars to be a small amount, but I think most of our constituents would disagree. What nobody can document—and let's think about this again—what no one can document is a single benefit this burden has offered. In a time when our economy is struggling, regulatory burdens that add cost while providing no quantitative benefit need to be eliminated. This is an unnecessary, costly, duplicative permitting requirement. It is a poster child for regulatory reform.

Now, my friends, if you can only look at one thought, simply bear this in mind: by this misguided court ruling requiring the double permitting process, you are causing States to waste money. They don't have the money to waste.

I encourage my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

(Ms. ESTY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 935.

When the House considered this bill in the 112th Congress, before I was elected to serve here, proponents like my good friend, Mr. GIBBS, argued that unless Congress acted, the process for getting a pesticide general permit under the Clean Water Act would cause agriculture, forestry, and public health-related activities to grind to a halt.

However, after almost 3 years of implementation, I am confused about the need for this bill. The sky has not fallen, farmers and forestry operators have had several successful growing seasons, and public health officials have successfully addressed multiple threats of mosquito-borne illness while at the same time complying with the sensible requirements of both the Clean Water Act and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, known as FIFRA.

I say sensible because, as we should clearly understand, the intended focus of the Clean Water Act and FIFRA are very different.

FIFRA is intended to address the safety and effectiveness of pesticides on a national scale, preventing unreasonable adverse effects on human health and the environment through uniform labels indicating approved uses and restrictions.

However, the Clean Water Act is focused on restoring and maintaining the integrity of the Nation's waters, with a primary focus on the protection of local water quality.

It is simply incorrect to say that applying a FIFRA-approved pesticide in accordance with its labeling requirement is a surrogate for protecting local water quality. As any farmer knows, complying with FIFRA is as simple as applying a pesticide in accordance with its label. Farmers do not need to look at the localized impact of that pesticide on local water quality.

If, as my colleagues suggest, FIFRA is an adequate substitute for the Clean Water Act permitting requirements, then why is it that pesticides keep showing up in water quality samples from both ground and surface waters?

If applying a FIFRA-approved pesticide according to its label is protective of human health and the environment, then why is it that so many States continue to report significant numbers of pesticide-impaired waters?

I urge my colleagues to note that, according to a 2006 study by the U.S. Geological Survey, at least one pesticide was detected in waters from all streams tested throughout the Nation. Let me repeat that. Pesticides were detected in every single stream tested by the USGS.

State water pollution control agencies have similarly identified a number of surface waters that are currently contaminated by pesticides. States have identified over 16,800 miles of rivers and streams, 1,700 square miles of bays and estuaries, and 372,000 acres of lakes that are currently impaired or threatened by pesticides, meaning that that particular water body cannot or should not be used as a source of drinking water and be appropriate for fish or shellfish propagation or recreation.

It is also telling that States continue to identify waters that remain impaired by pesticides, pesticides which have been banned by this country for decades.

Some have questioned the environmental and public health benefits of the Clean Water Act for the application of pesticides. However, many of the benefits are so obvious that perhaps we have simply overlooked them.

First, let us look, the Clean Water Act, and not FIFRA, requires pesticide applicators to minimize pesticide discharge through the use of pesticide management measures.

Second, it is the Clean Water Act, and not FIFRA, that requires pesticide applicators to monitor for and report any adverse incidents that result from spraying. I would think that monitoring for large fish kills or wildlife kills, as my colleague from Oregon has noted, would be a mutually-agreed upon benefit.

Also, it is the Clean Water Act, and not FIFRA, that requires pesticide applicators to keep records on where and how many pesticides are being applied throughout the Nation.

Again, if data is showing that a local water body is contaminated by pesticides, I would think that the public, our constituents, would want to quickly identify the likely source of the pesticide that is causing the impairment.

Finally, and perhaps most important, I am unaware of any specific example where the current Clean Water Act requirements have prevented a pesticide applicator from performing his or her services.

Despite claims to the contrary, the Clean Water Act is not being used to ban the use of pesticides.

So, again, let's summarize a few points.

First, the Clean Water Act provides a valuable service by ensuring that an appropriate amount of pesticides are being applied at appropriate times, and that pesticides are not having an adverse impact on human health or the environment.

Second, to the best of my knowledge, the pesticide general permit has not impeded pesticide applicators from

servicing both agricultural and public health communities. In fact, most pesticide applications are automatically covered under the pesticide general permit, either by no action or by the filing of the simple electronic notice of intent.

Third, Federal and State data make it very clear that the application of pesticides in compliance with FIFRA alone, as was the case for many years, was insufficient to protect bodies of water throughout the United States from being contaminated by pesticides.

If we care about water quality, we need to do more.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have to question what this legislation is really trying to accomplish. Is it really about the so-called regulatory burden of applying for a Clean Water Act permit? As we noted earlier, in the majority of cases, a small-scale user of pesticides is automatically covered by the Clean Water Act under the general permit, provided they apply pesticides in a common-sense manner.

Again, is it about the so-called threat of lawsuits? Again, if the pesticide applicator is applying the pesticide in compliance with the permit, they are statutorily immune from lawsuits under the Clean Water Act.

Is it about compliance costs? Yet, again, there is no evidence at the hearing, in the record, to demonstrate that the Clean Water Act is significantly increasing the costs of compliance to the average pesticide applicator.

The reality is there is no substantive reason why this legislation is necessary, except to limit the scope of the Clean Water Act protections from pesticide pollution that is impairing water quality across the Nation.

I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 935.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond a little bit to some of the questions that were raised by my good friend from Connecticut.

Back in 2012, the American Mosquito Control Association polled their members, and the feeling from the poll was that a lot of the public entities in the control districts for mosquitoes were kind of holding off on the preventive mosquito control programs. Of course, we had a record number of West Nile outbreaks in 2012. I think the season we probably didn't have quite the mosquito pressure was in 2013. We will see what happens in 2014.

My point is that because of the additional permitting and the costs and the time, a lot of districts did not do their preventive control, and they caused an outbreak of mosquitoes more severe than what it would have been—and that was from the American Mosquito Control Association.

With regard to pesticide application in the agriculture sector, if not in all States, in most States, these applications have to be done by certified applicators that have a lot of training. They know they have to abide by the label, because if they don't they could risk losing their applicator's license.

I would also raise the question that if you are a certified applicator, you might not follow the permit requirements under the Clean Water Act either. It all comes down to additional costs and delays, and we all know that you don't get a NPDES permit just overnight, so the cost factor is a major issue.

Another issue I think that needs to be talked a little bit about is, why do we find in some water bodies pesticide residue? The main reason we do is because we have something we call "legacy" from pesticides used long ago, years ago, that in a lot of cases aren't even on the market anymore, or if they are they are not being used by the industry because the industry, the agriculture industry and the industry, has done such a wonderful job of research and development in developing new pesticides that are actually more biodegradable and safer and less quantities used. We have come a long way in that technology.

As a farmer, I know that because I experienced that every growing season, the new technologies, the new applications and pesticides that we have available to us. So we really need to address that legacy issue and separate that out, what is really happening in these water bodies.

Then lots of times, too, in some of the data, the data is old from the United States Geological Service and things have changed. Also, some of the testing that has been done, some of the levels are well below what the human health benchmark standards are. So I think there is a scare tactic out there.

But we have got to make sure that we are applying these pesticides under label, which I think the industry is working well at. Because as a farmer, we drink the water first. It comes through our aquifers, our wells, and then also the streams through our property where we live around it, so we want to make sure that that water is clean.

□ 1500

So we need to assess this data—and use sophisticated methods to do that—but not have more government red tape and bureaucracy. All this does is just add time and costs and more headaches for our mosquito control districts, farmers, and others.

I just want to make the point clear that we have got to have these pesticides, and we can do it in a safe way. The technology is improving pesticide use. So that is why I think this bill is necessary to overturn a very ill-advised court decision.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In conclusion, I think we have heard arguments on both sides. I am convinced more by the arguments I have heard on our side. I don't believe it is an undue burden on States. I live in a mosquito control district, and 3 years ago, they had tremendous concerns.

Last year, they went ahead with their regular program, and this year, they are going ahead with their regular permit, under a general permit which they filed online. They said it wasn't a big deal.

So I don't know where the millions of dollars comes in, unless we have States or applicators or other who don't own computers or whatever. I can't figure out where that number comes from.

So I don't believe we have created an egregious problem. Given some of the past problems and the number of impaired waterways in my State, we just want to know where the stuff is being applied. We certainly want to be certain it is applied according to the label, but if it is not, then we have some capability of tracing it back and finding the responsible party and preventing future problems and potentially penalizing those people.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, that raises a question. If it has been going so good for the last 3 years and there is no need to pass this bill, why in the world would organizations like the American Mosquito Control Association think this bill is needed?

The American Farm Bureau, the National Water Resources Association, Farmers Union, and especially CropLife America are all experts out there that want to make sure that the pesticide use is under label and we are protecting the environment and not endangering it.

So I guess I would take issue with the comment that this legislation isn't needed because it has gone so great in the last 3 years. Well, we are finding out maybe it isn't going so great. I think that is the rhetoric from the other side.

We know that, in 2012, by a poll from the American Mosquito Control Association, a lot of our mosquito control districts did not initiate their preventative programs in the early spring. I know some of them had to declare an emergency.

The irony of this is when you declare an emergency, you do aerial spraying and everything else and not have to get a permit at all, so the environment is even more at risk. If they had done the preventative treatment, they might not have had to do aerial spraying.

I know at least one instance of a major metropolitan area in the Southern part of the country that had to do that. These organizations think this is important. Things aren't going so well. We are having a duplication with more permitting, more red tape, more headaches, and adding to cost.

So I strongly support this bill. Last Congress, I think this bill had 294 “yea” votes. It went over to the Senate. Unfortunately, the majority leader would not take it up. It was put in the farm bill, and there was pressure from one or two Senators to take it out. I think it would have passed strongly in the Senate, if we would have been able to have a vote on this very bipartisan initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on H.R. 935, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 935.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### CONFERRING HONORARY CITIZENSHIP ON BERNARDO DE GALVEZ Y MADRID

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 105) conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Bernardo de Galvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Galvez.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

##### H.J. RES. 105

Whereas the United States has conferred honorary citizenship on 7 other occasions during its history, and honorary citizenship is and should remain an extraordinary honor not lightly conferred nor frequently granted;

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Gálvez, was a hero of the Revolutionary War who risked his life for the freedom of the United States people and provided supplies, intelligence, and strong military support to the war effort;

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez recruited an army of 7,500 men made up of Spanish, French, African-American, Mexican, Cuban, and Anglo-American forces and led the effort of Spain to aid the United States' colonists against Great Britain;

Whereas during the Revolutionary War, Bernardo de Gálvez and his troops seized the Port of New Orleans and successfully defeated the British at battles in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Natchez, Mississippi, and Mobile, Alabama;

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez led the successful 2-month Siege of Pensacola, Florida, where his troops captured the capital of British West Florida and left the British with no naval bases in the Gulf of Mexico;

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez was wounded during the Siege of Pensacola, demonstrating bravery that forever endeared him to the United States soldiers;

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez's victories against the British were recognized by

George Washington as a deciding factor in the outcome of the Revolutionary War;

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez helped draft the terms of treaty that ended the Revolutionary War;

Whereas the United States Continental Congress declared, on October 31, 1778, their gratitude and favorable sentiments to Bernardo de Gálvez for his conduct towards the United States;

Whereas after the war, Bernardo de Gálvez served as viceroy of New Spain and led the effort to chart the Gulf of Mexico, including Galveston Bay, the largest bay on the Texas coast;

Whereas several geographic locations, including Galveston Bay, Galveston, Texas, Galveston County, Texas, Galvez, Louisiana, and St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana, are named after Bernardo de Gálvez;

Whereas the State of Florida has honored Bernardo de Gálvez with the designation of Great Floridian; and

Whereas Bernardo de Gálvez played an integral role in the Revolutionary War and helped secure the independence of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved the Senate and HouseV RepresentativesV the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Bernardo de Gálvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Gálvez, is proclaimed posthumously to be an honorary citizen of the United States.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.J. Res. 105, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. FRANKS, for yielding.

H.J. Res. 105 would bestow honorary American citizenship on General Bernardo de Galvez. Though not born in the United States, General Galvez was a true friend to our country who played an integral role in securing the independence of this Nation.

As governor of Spanish Louisiana, General Galvez provided American forces with funds, arms, and ammunition, and he provided military intelligence to the American commanders.

After Spain's entry into the war, General Galvez recruited an army of American, Spanish, and French troops and set about a multiyear campaign that decimated British forces all along the gulf coast.

General Galvez led successful campaigns in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama before embarking on his seminal victory at the Siege of Pensacola,

where he captured the capital of British West Florida after a bloody 2-month long battle, during which he in fact was wounded by gunfire.

General Galvez's victory left the British with no naval forces or bases along the gulf coast and prevented British troops and supplies from reaching the battles along the eastern seaboard.

His efforts to assist the formation of our country were recognized by President George Washington, President John Adams, and by the United States Continental Congress. In fact, President Washington cited General Galvez's efforts as a deciding factor in the outcome of the war.

Honorary citizenship is a rare and extraordinary recognition granted to foreigners who have rendered great service to the United States of America. Only seven individuals have been granted honorary citizenship, including two Revolutionary War heroes, the Marquis de Lafayette, and General Casimir Pulaski.

When our Founding Fathers declared our independence, they knew that they were going up against probably the world's most preeminent power. They chose to take up that battle because of their unwavering commitment to liberty and freedom, but they also knew that in order to be successful, they needed the support of allies and great men like the Marquis de Lafayette, Casimir Pulaski, and General Bernardo de Galvez.

I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Chairman GOWDY, Chairman FRANKS, and the staff of the Judiciary Committee for their assistance in moving this bill through committee. I also want to thank our majority leader for bringing this bill to the floor.

I would encourage all my colleagues to support this measure to recognize General Galvez's immense contribution to the history of our country by granting him honorary American citizenship.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 105, which proclaims Bernardo de Galvez to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously and recognizes his contribution in aiding the American colonists in the fight for independence against the British.

Although he was born in Spain, General Galvez led masterful military campaigns against the British and played a crucial role in securing land and seaports on behalf of the American colonists. He additionally helped negotiate the terms of the treaty that ended the American Revolution and secured America's independence from British rule.

This is only the eighth time that Congress has bestowed posthumous citizenship, most recently in 2009, when we honored Casimir Pulaski, a Polish military officer who, like General Galvez, fought alongside American