

It is not often so simple. To pull yourself up, you must be armed with the skills to do so; armed with the skills to succeed.

By coming here, to the Job Corps, each and every one of those young men and women chose to get those skills. That in and of itself is commendable—they made the choice to work to better themselves. That choice sets Job Corps graduates apart, and they are all extraordinary.

Today, I want to express its appreciation to the Pinellas County Center for their outstanding service in improving the lives of youth.

#### STATEMENT OF INTRODUCTION— CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY AND SAFETY ACT

**HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 31, 2014*

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is time to further address the epidemic of sexual assaults at our nation's college and university campuses. During some of the most formative years of their lives, students across the country should not have to live in fear of being stalked or abused. That is why a bipartisan group have come together to introduce the Campus Accountability and Safety Act that will address ambiguities in the law, strengthen protections and enforcement, and improve reporting by universities.

The changes included in the recent Violence Against Women Act reauthorization from the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act are starting to go into effect but more must be done. Rape is a horrific crime that exacts a physical and psychological toll on survivors. Women trying to get an education should not have to worry that they might also be victimized by predators on their campuses. This new legislation establishes new campus resources such as Confidential Advisors who will serve as a confidential resource and help coordinate support services; ensures specialized training and minimum standards for on-campus personnel who oversee sexual assault cases; creates new annual standardized, anonymous surveys that will be published online to help high school students and their parents make informed choices when comparing universities; requires a uniform process for campus disciplinary proceedings; no longer allows athletic departments or other subgroups to handle sexual violence complaints separately; and establishes penalties if schools do not comply with the legislation.

I applaud the work of our colleagues in the Senate on their comprehensive and bipartisan bill, and thank my colleagues, Reps. PATRICK MEEHAN, TED POE, CHERI BUSTOS, GWEN MOORE, SUZANNE BONAMICI, SUSAN BROOKS, RENEE ELLMERS, LYNN JENKINS, SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, KRISTI NOEM, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, TOM REED, ROBERT SCOTT, LOIS FRANKEL, DAVID JOYCE, ANN KUSTER, and GARY PETERS, for teaming up on this legislation. I am hopeful that the House will take up this effort in tandem with the Senate so that we can put a bill on the President's desk.

#### REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

**HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 30, 2014*

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 935.

This debate is not one about the usefulness of pesticide use in modern society—which, clearly, pesticides have found such a role. Whether to control nuisance species, such as mosquitoes or aquatic invasive species, or to assist in the production of reliable agricultural harvests, pesticides have proven useful in sustaining the American livelihood.

At the same time, we must remember that modern pesticides can be highly toxic chemicals that need to be thoroughly studied and used with great care to limit the potential impacts to human health and the environment. It was only a few decades ago that we learned the lessons of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, and the devastation to the natural environment caused by the use of DDT.

Yet, even today, the U.S. Geological Survey has consistently found the presence of pesticides and pesticide residues in our nation's lakes, rivers, and streams, including many that serve as drinking water sources for local communities. Contrary to statements made on Monday, these are not simply the legacy contaminants of decades-old pesticides, but also modern pesticides, such as those linked to bee-colony collapse.

So, common-sense should dictate that we approach the issue of pesticide use in or near our rivers, lakes, and streams with great caution, and with an even greater understanding of the cumulative and lasting impacts of pesticides on human health and water quality.

Unfortunately, H.R. 935 would abandon any caution related to pesticide use in or near our nation's waters, and allow potential polluters to return to the regulatory shadows.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of H.R. 935 argue that the protections of the Clean Water Act are simply duplicative of the requirements of FIFRA, and are unnecessary to protect local waters from pesticide contamination.

These statements are simply not supported by the facts.

As many of my colleagues noted during Monday's debate on this bill, these two statutes, although complimentary with one another, have entirely different focuses.

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.

Similarly, contrary to statements made during Monday's debate, FIFRA's risk assess-

ment process for individual pesticides is no substitute for the Clean Water Act's focus on local water quality.

First, the FIFRA labeling process for a vast majority of pesticides do not address off-site, non-target, and sub-lethal effects of pesticide drift that can grow stronger over time.

Second, the EPA risk registration process only considers the effect of the active ingredients in a pesticide, and does not consider the synergy of multiple ingredients in a pesticide formulation, or between multiple pesticides in the environment. Yet, many of the unregulated, inactive ingredients in pesticides have significant toxic effects in their own right.

Third, the FIFRA re-registration process is a lengthy and ongoing process with outstanding and missing health and environmental data associated with pesticide reviews. As a result, EPA's assessment process has been routinely criticized as failing to fully assess the short- and long-term impacts of pesticides on human health, particularly on children, and on the environment.

Fourth, under FIFRA, EPA does not track pesticide poisonings, including short-term and long-term adverse effects, as pointed out recently by the Government Accountability Office (GAO).

Finally, EPA presumes, under FIFRA, that if a pesticide is applied according to its label, there will not be any unintentional pesticide exposure to water—therefore, the risk assessment process does not evaluate the impact of terrestrial pesticides on water quality, despite the fact that these pesticides often are detected in waters—presumably through drift or contaminated runoff.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of H.R. 935 also argue that the costs of implementing the Clean Water Act permitting requirements have been excessive. However, I have yet to see one documented case where a state, a mosquito control district, or a pesticide applicator has incurred significant increased costs from complying with the Clean Water Act for pesticide applications.

This administration worked hand-in-hand with these groups to ensure that implementation of the Clean Water Act was consistent with current practices, and was not going to be costly or burdensome. If we are going to have a debate on the merits of this issue, it is incumbent upon the proponents of H.R. 935 to show proof of any perceived burden—but as of yet, no such proof has been provided.

As noted by my colleagues on Monday, there is no substantive reason why this legislation is necessary, other than to limit the scope of Clean Water Act protections over a source of known pollutants that are causing water quality impairment in this nation.

There is no evidence of an emergency. There is no evidence of any significant regulatory burden. And there is no evidence of any substantial increase in compliance costs.

In my view, the proponents have made no argument why this legislation is necessary, other than that the groups who want to restore their regulatory anonymity have asked for it.

We need to ensure that potential sources of water pollution continue to be brought out of the shadows, which would be accomplished by defeating H.R. 935.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 935.