



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on April 29, 2026

Farm Bill Pushes Federal Control Over Pesticide Warnings, Sparks Backlash

As the House prepares to take up the “Farm, Food, and National Security Act of 2026,” or the Farm Bill 2.0, this week, a wide-ranging agricultural bill, a fight over pesticide immunity is becoming a flashpoint testing the strength of the MAHA movement inside President Donald Trump’s coalition.

At issue is a provision that would shield pesticide makers from certain lawsuits tied to labels approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Supporters praise it as regulatory consistency, while critics condemn it as a corporate liability shield.



thinkreaction/iStock/Getty Images Plus

The timing is combustible. The Farm Bill is moving just months after Trump [signed an executive order](#) elevating pesticide production as a matter of national and economic security. Now Congress is weighing whether to lock that approach into law, not only by protecting access to chemicals such as glyphosate, but by limiting how far states and courts can go in warning the public about their risks.

The development also comes as the Supreme Court hears arguments in *Monsanto v. Durnell*. [The case](#) centers on whether federal pesticide labeling law preempts state claims that allowed individuals to sue Monsanto, now owned by Bayer, for failing to warn users that its flagship weedkiller Roundup is linked to cancer.

Roundup’s main active ingredient, glyphosate, has already been linked to cancer in multiple legal disputes and peer-reviewed [studies](#). Juries have [awarded billions in damages](#) against Monsanto over Roundup-related claims, and about 61,000 lawsuits remain active.

The Provisions

The key language [appears](#) in Section 10205, “Uniformity of pesticide labeling requirements.” It establishes a single national standard for pesticide labels, tied directly to federal approval.

The bill states:

Section 24(b) of the Federal Pesticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act ... shall be applied to require uniformity in pesticide labeling nationally, and to prohibit any State, instrumentality or political subdivision thereof, or a court from directly or indirectly imposing or continuing in effect any requirements for, or penalize or hold liable any entity for failing to comply with requirements that would require labeling or packaging that is in addition to or different from the labeling or packaging approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency ... including any requirements relating to warnings on such labeling or packaging....



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on April 29, 2026

In plain terms, the clause does two things at once. It requires one national labeling standard, and it bars states or courts from enforcing any additional or different warning requirements beyond what the EPA has approved.

The section includes some narrow conditions tied to existing violations.

Further, Sec. 10206 extends the same logic to local governments:

A political subdivision of a State shall not impose, or continue in effect, any requirement relating to the sale, distribution, labeling, application, or use of any pesticide ... subject to regulation ... by a State ... or by the Administrator....

And Sec. 10207 defines what counts as lawful use:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the use, application, or discharge of a registered pesticide consistent with its labeling approved under this Act shall be permitted and considered lawful, without further permitting or approval requirements.

Taken together, these sections create a centralized system. The EPA-approved label becomes the controlling standard nationwide. As the manufacturers put it, “the label is the law.” And any use that follows that label is explicitly defined in the bill as lawful.

Ending the State “Patchwork”

Supporters frame the provision as a fix for regulatory fragmentation. In their view, pesticide labels should not vary across states. And who better to set a single, uniform standard than Washington bureaucrats at an unconstitutional agency long known for regulatory capture?

In early March, upon the bill’s passage through the House Agriculture Committee, committee Chairman Glenn Thompson (R-Pa.) [said](#) the bill “restores regulatory certainty in the interstate marketplace” and “brings science-backed management back.”

He also emphasized support across sectors. “This title is widely supported by farmers, ranchers, foresters, sportsmen, and the environmental community,” he claimed.

Some farm groups echoed that urgency. American Farm Bureau Federation President Zippy Duvall [said](#) the legislation is “critical as farmers face headwinds not seen in a generation.”

Industry advocates have focused directly on the risks of state-level variation. The Modern Ag Alliance [warned](#) that “some states have proposed labeling requirements that contradict decades of scientific review and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) determinations.”

It added that “a patchwork of inconsistent state standards would sow marketplace confusion, weaken science-based regulation, and further destabilize already strained farm operations.”

At the same time, not all farmers share that view. Some groups have warned that the same provision could limit accountability and reduce protections tied to pesticide use.

The Farm and Ranch Freedom Alliance [argued](#) the bill would “shield pesticide corporations from accountability,” including in cases where chemicals harm the farmers’ “land, their crops, or their health.” They also argued that the preemption of local regulations would



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on April 29, 2026

[put] corporate factory farm interests ahead of local farmers, animal welfare, public health, and [a] community's ability to decide what kind of agriculture it supports.

Similarly, the American Sustainable Business Network [warned](#) the broader bill "threatens farmers, communities, and pesticide oversight."

The Pushback

The first formal challenge to the provision came in the form of amendments. Representative Thomas Massie (R-Ky.) emerged as one of the most vocal critics, moving to strike the pesticide language from the bill before it reaches final passage.

He posted on X on Tuesday:

If we're Making America Healthy Again, government shouldn't be promoting glyphosate and providing liability immunity for corporations making it.

Following Trump's aforementioned executive decree, Massie and Representative Chellie Pingree (D-Maine) [co-authored](#) the "No Immunity for Glyphosate Act (HR 7601)," aimed at reversing it.

In an April 22 statement, Pingree [framed](#) the effort in direct terms:

If a company's product makes people sick, that company should be held accountable. If states and local communities want to put stronger protections in place, they should have every right to do so.

Massie added:

Americans need to know: our government is under siege by lobbyists for German company Bayer. ... Bayer has spent over \$9 million lobbying for exemption from liability for harm its chemicals, like glyphosate, might cause.

In addition to that lobbying effort, Bayer has extensive ties to the Trump administration, as [reported](#) by the nonprofit U.S. Right to Know.

Co-sponsors of the amendment include Representatives Brian Fitzpatrick (R-Pa.), Jim McGovern (D-Mass.), Eli Crane (R-Ariz.), and Eugene Vindman (D-Va.).

Representatives Anna Paulina Luna of Florida and Nancy Mace of South Carolina also introduced separate measures to strip the provision.

That pressure is already affecting the bill's trajectory. *The Hill* [states](#) that "House GOP leaders are aiming to bring the farm bill across the finish line this week," but face difficulty as "a number of Republicans are vowing to oppose the legislation unless the pesticide provision is removed."

MAHA

Glyphosate, a widely used herbicide, has long been a fault line for the Make America Healthy Again movement. The issue came to a head as the Supreme Court heard the Bayer case on Monday, drawing activists and lawmakers to a ["People vs. Poison" rally](#).



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on April 29, 2026

"I think this is the most unifying issue we've run into," Del Bigtree, a former top political advisor to Robert F. Kennedy Jr., [told NOTUS \(News of the United States\)](#) at the rally. He added:

Talk to any medical freedom person. Odds are they eat organic, they read labels. Hard to imagine what issue is bigger than pesticides, herbicides on our food.

Kennedy, who now serves as the secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS), has been central to that debate. For years, he publicly criticized glyphosate. As an attorney, he [helped secure](#) a landmark 2018 jury verdict awarding \$289 million to a plaintiff who alleged that Monsanto's Roundup caused his cancer. The case became the first major courtroom defeat for the company and reshaped the national conversation around the herbicide.

During his 2024 presidential campaign, Kennedy continued that line of attack. On social media, he [described](#) glyphosate as "one of the likely culprits in America's chronic disease epidemic." "My USDA will ban" its use, he added.

Now, as HHS secretary, he has endorsed the administration's push for legal protections tied to pesticide regulation.

"Pesticides and herbicides are toxic by design, engineered to kill living organisms," Kennedy [posted](#). "Unfortunately, our agricultural system depends heavily on these chemicals."

He argued the administration "inherited" a broken system and suggested the path forward involves change "without destabilizing the food supply."



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.