

The extreme anti-agriculture and animal rights activist group, the Humane Society of the United States, aka the vegan lobby, has been lobbying intensively against my Protect Interstate Commerce Act, also known as the King Amendment. The humane society, and specifically its president and CEO, Wayne Pacelle, falsely claim my amendment will “eviscerate the powers of the states” and is a “threat to every consumer and every animal in American agriculture.”

The truth is my amendment is only a threat to their vegan agenda and trade protectionism. Here are the facts: My bipartisan amendment merely clarifies and reaffirms the long-standing principle that the Constitution reserves the right to regulate interstate commerce to the Congress, not the states. Carefully crafted, it has no effect on any state’s right to regulate production within its own borders. It does not nullify any federal animal welfare laws, but instead puts producers in control of their livestock care. There is only one state law that I know will be impacted by the King amendment

“ California’s 2010 law, AB 1437. The language of my amendment is clear; it restores the Commerce Clause in the Constitution, and clarifies that the states cannot dictate the manufacture and means of production of agriculture products raised in other states. Any state is free to regulate its producers, to even overregulate them if it wishes.

States can overregulate them to the point where they no longer want to produce agriculture products, but no state should have the authority to regulate the other 49 states. The Commerce Clause establishes a free trade zone among the states. It is important to understand clearly the agenda of the humane society. I believe its ultimate goal is to take animal products out of our diet and meat off of

our plate. They want to raise the cost of production so they can reduce the consumption of meat and promote a vegan lifestyle. This is one of the reasons why the passage of my amendment is so critical “ it would ensure

that radical organizations such as the humane society are prohibited from establishing a patchwork of restrictive state laws aimed at suffocating production agriculture out of existence. I am

thankful for the diligence and efforts of Rep. Frank Lucas, R-Okla., throughout his tenure as the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. He is in the unenviable position of working to bring together members from all over the political spectrum in order to pass the bill. The leadership Lucas has shown has been exceptional, and I am thankful for his support of my amendment. The road to completing a farm bill has been long and difficult. Throughout the process, Lucas has been focused on farmers and producers in Oklahoma and across the country who depend on this bill. We owe them five years of predictability in exchange for their generations of commitment. Members of the farm bill conference committee ought to work with the leadership from the House and Senate Agriculture Committees to protect our nation's farmers and producers and get this bill across the finish line. Rep. Steve King is a Republican from Iowa's Fourth Congressional District. Tell us what you think Should the federal farm bill include a restriction on state laws regulating animals meant for interstate sale? [Subscribe to Daily Headlines](#) Sign up! * I understand and agree that registration on or use of this site constitutes agreement to its user agreement and privacy policy.