



Posted by [LydiaScott](#) on 03/06/09 03:36 AM



[Older: [Is this an opportunity to push the Indiana Honest Money act?](#)]

HR 875 <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/F?c111:1:./temp/~c1112RD9bb:e11439:>

This bill is sitting in committee and I am not sure when it is going to hit the floor. One thing I do know is that very few of the Representatives have read it. As usual they will vote on this based on what someone else is saying. Urge your members to read the legislation and ask for opposition to this devastating legislation. Devastating for everyday folks but great for factory farming ops like Monsanto, ADM, Sodexo and Tyson to name a few.

I have no doubt that this legislation was heavily influenced by lobbyists from huge food producers. This legislation is so broad based that technically someone with a little backyard garden could get fined and have their property siezed. It will effect anyone who produces food even if they do not sell but only consume it. It will literally put all independent farmers and food producers out of business due to the huge amounts of money it will take to conform to factory farming methods. If people choose to farm without industry standards such as chemical pesticides and fertilizers they will be subject to a vareity of harassment from this completely new agency that has never before existed. That's right, a whole new government agency is being created just to police food, for our own protection of course.

**DO NOT TAKE MY WORD FOR IT, READ THIS LEGISLATION FOR YOURSELF.** The more people who read this legislation the more insight we are going to get and be able to share. Post your observations and insights below. Urge your members to read this legislation and to oppose the passage of this legislation.

Pay special attention to

- Section 3 which is the definitions portion of the bill-read in it's entirety.
- section 103, 206 and 207- read in it's entirety.

Red flags I found and I am sure there are more.....

- Legally binds state agriculture depts to enforcing federal guidelines effectively taking away the states power to do anything other than being food police for the federal dept.
- Effectively criminalizes organic farming but doesn't actually use the word organic.
- Effects anyone growing food even if they are not selling it but consuming it.
- Effects anyone producing meat of any kind including wild game.
- Legislation is so broad based that every aspect of growing or producing food can be made illegal. There are no specifics which is bizarre considering how long the legislation is.
- Section 103 is almost entirely about the administrative aspect of the legislation. It will allow the appointing of officials from the factory farming corporations and lobbyists and classify them as experts and allow them to determine and interpret the legislation. Who do you think they are going to side with?
- Section 206 defines what will be considered a food production facility and what will be enforced up all food production facilities. The wording is so broad based that a backyard gardener could be fined and more.
- Section 207 requires that the state's agriculture dept act as the food police and enforce the federal requirements. This takes away the states power and is in violation of the 10th amendment.
- There are many more but by the time I got this far in the legislation I was so alarmed that I wanted to bring someone's attention to it. (to the one person who reads my blog)

Didn't Stalin nationalize farming methods that enabled his administration to gain control over the food supply? Didn't Stalin use the food to control the people?

Last word..... Legislate religion and enforce gag orders on ministers on what can and can't be said in the pulpit, instituting regulations forcing people to rely solely on the government, control the money and the food. What is that called? It is on the tip of my tongue.....

I haven't read any of the Senate's version of the bill as I have been poring thru the House's version. Here is the link and I hope some of you can take a look and post your observations and insights below. One thing I am pretty sure of is that very few if any Senator's have actually read the legislation and when it comes up for a vote they will more than likely take someone else's word on how they should vote. The other thing I am pretty sure about is that the legislation was probably written by lobbyists and industry experts.

S 425 <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d111:s425:>

Things you can do

1. Contact your members at 202-224-3121 and ask them to oppose HR 875 and S 425. While you are at it ask them if they personally have read the legislation and what their position is? If they have not read the legislation ask them to read it and politely let them know that just because other representatives are not reading the legislation and voting on it does not mean they can do the same.
2. Get in touch with local farmers and food producers by attending a local farmers market and asking them how business is.
3. Attend a local WAPF meeting, this is a good start to learning about what is going on in farming and local & state initiatives . The website is <http://www.westonaprice.org/localchapters/index.html>
4. Check out the Farmers Legal Defense Fund at <http://www.ftclfd.org/index.html>
5. Find out who sits on your states agriculture and farming committee and contact them with your concerns.
6. Continue to contact your elected officials and let them know your position on legislation and why.
7. Get active at the local and state levels, this is the quickest way to initiate change.

---

Categories: [Health Freedom](#), [Grassroots News](#), [Action Item](#), [US Constitution](#), [Federal Legislation](#), [Current Events](#), [Social Issues](#), [State Legislation](#), [Economy](#), [Congress](#)

Tags:

Showing comments 1—14 of 14

Posted 03/06/09 06:27  
AM

Thanks for the post.



[MidWestLadyFarmer](#)

Winigan, MO

Posted 03/06/09  
08:07 AM



[BBLiberty](#)

Peoria, IL

Yes, thanks for bringing this to our attention. I will be contacting farmers in the Peoria, IL area.

Posted 03/06/09  
08:21 AM



[libertyspirit](#)

Modesto, CA

I also appreciate your post and will be letting others know about this. I will be bringing this up, as well, when I contact my congressman today about a couple of other issues.

Posted  
03/06/09  
08:52 AM



[Freedom](#)

London,  
United  
Kingdom

Thanks for posting this!

digg it

<http://digg.com/politics>

/HR\_875\_The\_Food\_Police\_Criminalizing\_Organic\_Farmin

g

Thanks Lydia,

Posted 03/06/09  
09:03 AM



[Sigy380](#)

Jackson, TN

You can't deny that they have done their homework. As so many people have prepared themselves to be able to grow their own food while awaiting the worst, they have to come up with a plan.

If the worst actually becomes our reality and we have the Real ID, they have to have some way to control our being able to simply feed ourselves.

Conspiracy doesn't have to be a theory!

Posted 03/07/09  
9:56 PM



[thudson](#)

Seattle, WA

I've read the text of this bill several times, and there is nothing restricting backyard gardeners or organic farmers. This bill would affect large agro-business, and insure that their desire for profits would not mean the death of our children.

Please point out what text prohibits backyard gardening. Also, you should divulge any consulting contracts you have with interested parties.

thudson said: "Please point out what text prohibits backyard gardening. Also, you should divulge any consulting contracts you have with interested parties."

The bill does not explicitly prohibit backyard gardening. What it does is include backyard gardens in the definition of Food Production Facilities. Here's the definition (section 3-14)

-----  
 (14) FOOD PRODUCTION FACILITY- The term "food production facility" means any farm, ranch, orchard, vineyard, aquaculture facility, or confined animal-feeding operation.  
 -----

This is a broad definition that could include backyard gardens, a backyard chicken pen with 2 or 3 hens, a backyard bee hive, etc. One might hope that regulations and courts would clarify the law in such a way as to exempt food produced for one's own use. But don't forget U.S. Supreme Court decisions, such as the New Deal era opinion which held that a farmer growing corn to feed his own pigs was engaged in interstate commerce, because growing his own corn meant that he did not purchase as much corn, thus having an effect on the interstate market for corn. Having laws on the books that could conceivably be construed in such a way as to regulate backyard or homestead food production is awfully risky.

In addition to this, the law could very well put small farmers out of business, as it is generally far more burdensome for them to comply with regulations than it is for large companies -- plus small farmers do not have the wherewithal to bribe regulators, whereas large corporations do (I use the term bribe somewhat broadly to include such things as free trips, pretty women, and cases of expensive whiskey).

Posted 03/07/09  
11:28 PM



[altamira](#)  
Lockhart, TX

Posted 03/08/09  
12:38 PM



[Lil Merc](#)

Thank you for directing our attention to this vital information. I will pass this on to everyone that I can.

These people should be charged for even attempting this! This is our right, it is our body. What's next?

San Diego, CA We are so past the need for another Tea Party!

This issue should be larger than anything else currently on the table. Just the fact it is so little publicized is a red flag.

Posted 03/08/09  
2:42 PM



[wilsonpwt](#)

Groveport, OH

HR 875 and Senate Bill 425 under the guise of 'Food Safety' helps the goals of Codex Alimentarius and the World Trade Organization.

Absolute Control of our food and medicine is the ultimate control. As it is already, pharmaceuticals kill 100,000 per year in the United States.

Common Law vs Napoleon Law - HR875 uses Napoleon Law

Posted 03/09/09  
08:02 AM



[karamojong](#)

Waco, TX

Thanks for sharing! Send it to our politicians sure, but I think we need to send it to the media! Local and national! Let's really get it out there! Maybe someone will pay attention.

Posted 03/10/09  
2:46 PM



[Kimberlee](#)

Huntington Beach,  
CA

I sent a hand written letter to our Senator yesterday. I am taking this to all of our local organic growers and grocery stores to get them on board and I'll keep at it until we stop this nonsense.

War in the name of peace, enslavement in the name of liberty. It's been backwards for way too long now and it is the PEOPLE that need to fight for freedom, but not from other countries, from our own government. Funny that as I type this the helicopters are flying over.

Posted 03/10/09  
5:48 PM



[StatusQuoJoe](#)

Phoenix, AZ

Big time! Steve Quayle Story of the Day #2!

Woohoo!

Posted 03/11/09  
09:04 AM



[Chips](#)

Austin, TX

The most immediate necessity is the addition at the end of EXCLUSIONS ((13)(A) of Sec. 3, Definitions), of: ", or nonprofit home or community gardens intended for production of food for participants and their families." (or similar, unambiguous language.)

"Food production facilities" (discussed in a post above) are specifically excluded. However, this in no way denies great ambiguity in general.

The definition of PROCESS is ambiguous; for purposes of the Act, it can be argued that simply growing food could be interpreted as "manufacturing" it, and chopping, slicing, dicing, mincing, cutting, (and otherwise handling), and cooking the food could be construed as "preparation".

One valid definition of FOOD ESTABLISHMENT, as defined by the Act, would be, "a facility owned or operated by a person located in any State that processes food or holds or stores food". While "food production facility", as a term, is defined, "facility" is not; this could be interpreted as meaning your house!

Given the above, anyone's home garden, or a couple of chickens in the back yard, could be construed as a Category 1, 2, 3 or 4 Food Establishment.

Listed as EXCLUSIONS are:

- Food production facilities (farm, ranch, orchard, vineyard, etc.) which can easily be argued are NOT home gardens;
- Nonprofit food establishment in which food is prepared for or served directly to the consumer while this looks like a possible valid exemption for a home garden, it's also ambiguous; it could be interpreted as meaning a soup kitchen or Meals On Wheels facility, but not a home garden.

Posted 03/11/09  
09:52 AM



[Chips](#)

Austin, TX

Hmm. On second thought, the most immediate necessity it to defeat the bill. Barring that, the addition of unambiguous language exempting home gardens is essential.

You must be a member to post comments. [[Become a member](#)]