As the famous radio broadcaster, Kaltenborn, used to say, "Ab! There's good news tonight."

Good, that is, for humanitarians and meat consumers. And for every other decent human being who wishes to spare animals from suffering.

The Brown bill, for which Humane Information Services has been fighting every year since 1973 finally seems to have an excellent chance for passage by the present Congress. We can make sure of this if the humane movement unites behind its excellent bill. For various reasons other humane societies have not really pushed this legislation in the past. It is in order to examine why that is so, and to show why we should all get behind the bill during the present session of Congress to insure its passage.

The Gunter bill, designed to require the use of humane equipment for stunning the animals, to make them unconscious before shackling, has been used by humane societies and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the State Department that the Gunter bill would require something of a foreign plant that is not equally applicable to domestic plants. The reason for this was that under the present federal humane slaughter law, only domestic plants selling meat to the federal government are covered, whereas the Gunter bill would have required all foreign plants exporting meat products to US government agencies.

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

The new Brown bill, e.g., would extend humane requirements to all pack­ ing plants now under federal inspection, or "equal-to" state inspection, subject to giving up because of cost considerations. Just as most greyhound trainers mistakenly believe that the use of live rabbits and cats is necessary to train a racing dog, many packers thought the new methods would put them at a cost disadvantage, until they were required by the law to use them. As soon as some of the plants that wanted to abide by the law tried the humane methods, and found them to be good business, many others fell in line. Probably about 95 percent of plants directly under federal inspection have come into line.

STATE LAWS

Many interstate plants selling business only within a given state and therefore not subject to federal regulation) which fail under state-administered meat inspection methods, however, have not adopted humane methods unless a state humane slaughter law similar to the federal act has been passed by the state legislature.

About half of the states have passed such laws. Vigorous campaigns for state laws in the remainder, conducted by humane societies in the fifteen and sixty, have "petered out" in the seventies, except in a few states, including Mississippi. A bill (H.R. 238) is now before the State legislature. Humanitarians seem to have given up their efforts to pass such laws. These will be unnecessary, however, when the Brown bill passes.

The Brown bill would extend the provisions of the federal law to all of the state plants which are inspected either by USDA inspectors, or by state inspection services "equal-to" USDA inspectors, and therefore, affiliated with the USDA service, which means practically all commercial plants.

INSPECTION GREATLY IMPROVED

The USDA personnel now charged with the task of inspecting the plants, using these methods, have made a valiant effort to do a good job. But there are too many ways in which these efforts may be thwarted. A plant may have a captive-bolt pistol on hand, and use it for stunning cattle (see HUMAN SLAUGHTER, page 2, column 1).

ENFORCEMENT IMPROVED

Under the present act, as previously noted, only meat packing establishments owned by firms which sell meat to federal government agencies, such as the Army and Navy, are affected. Any such packing firm must submit a statement that it is in compliance with the law, which means for all species (cattle, hogs, sheep) in all of its plants. But there is no convenient way for the purchasing agency to check up on that statement. The results of inspections are reported separately for different species. It would require a staff of purchasing agents with a computer to keep track of all these reports and determine, for any firm bidding on a meat contract, whether or not they sell meat products to US government agencies.

The accompanying pictures are evidence of the callous disregard of animal suffering which exists in some foreign countries. The Gunter bill received only average of the 1958 federal act to addition­ al domestic as well as foreign meat pack­ ing plants. But there is no convenient way for the USDA to keep track of all these reports and determine, for any firm bidding on a meat contract, whether or not they sell meat products to US government agencies.
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When the inspector shows up, in between, however, they may prefer to go back to the old inhumane slaughter (not permitted under the 1958 act). Dr. Thomsen has observed such a case. If the electrical method of stunning is used for hogs or sheep, the slaughtermen may be careful to place the device properly if the inspector is present, but get very careless at other times. Unless the electric current passes through the brain from the top of the body, it can be as painful as the former method, still very painful. Modern ships still use primitive, inhumane methods of loading cattle. Here several cases the animal becomes immobile, equally easy to handle.}

Thus, the Brown bill changes the penalties for violation of the act from the present non-enforced provisions applying to meat packers who sell to the federal government, to all plants coming under federal or state USDA-supervised federal meat inspection. Under the Brown bill the inspection of slaughtering methods would be done by the USDA meat inspectors assigned to the plant, where they work daily (see photo). PENALTIES INCREASED

The present federal humane slaughter act has no criminal penalties, and does not identify those who are not in compliance. The reports made by the slaughter association for Humane Legislation, have kept their efforts to seals, whales, eagles, bears, wolverine. Some other societies have noted introduction of the Brown bill in their newsletters and other publications. But very few have given adequate directions about writing letters to Congress and newspapers about it. The reaction of humane societies generally has been passive and ineffective.

No doubt this stems partly from fears that their tax exemption privileges would be endangered by more explicit urgings. These fears now should have been removed by passage of the 1976 amendments to the Tax Code. Othef have been lethargic about the bill from simple inertia. It was too much trouble to become informed about the bill, or they had too many other things of local importance to include in their publications. Another reason was a difference in priorities. Many societies were devoting their efforts to seals, whales, eagles bears, wolverine, and so on, although by any standards related to the amount of suffering involved, the Brown bill would rank at or near the top.

JEWISH OPPORTUNITY

Despite diligent search for opponents of the bill, in the hope that if they are found we might persuade them to change their position, we have come none directly. But we have been told by persons connected with the Congress that Jewish rabbis, and a very prominent Jewish organization, have quietly let it be known that they do oppose the bill. How can this be? The bill would not affect ritual slaughter in any way. It does not redefine the word “humane” as applied to slaughter. Since ritual slaughter is specified only by federal humane slaughter act, and the Brown bill would only extend the coverage and greatly improve the enforcement of that act, it would not affect ritual slaughter in any way. Why, then, do some Jewish interests oppose it?

The answer is: inertia, conflicting priorities, slaughter, intemperance, and policies of the House Agriculture Committee.

CONFLICTING PRIORITIES

Our sister society, the National Association for Humanitarians, has kept track of the mail received by Congress about the Brown bill. Following publication of NAHL’s Humane Legislation Digest a year ago, the House Agriculture Committee reviewed the following priorities:
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Vegetarianism and Humanitarianism

FROM A VEGETARIAN

"Please stop sending Reply to Humanitar­rians. I've been a vegetarian for so long now that it seems senseless to fight for human slaughter...Why have such groups sprung up recently to support a publication that is fighting for different things than I believe in."

Mary Jane Need, Westport, Connecticut.

REPLY:

We continue to read vegetarian viewpoints, and wish you were open-minded enough to continue reading ours. If you had any common sense at all, you would join us again and let us know why you think we should have fought for in 1977. humble animals make everybody an vegetarian. The old "all or nothing" belief is hard to eradicate (see article this issue).

About twelve o'clock one night several years ago Doc wrote me back by telephone from New York City. The caller had just read an article in our Report to Hu­manitarians about human slaughter. Why don't you have the courage to come out against the eating of any meat? Are you a vegetarian, he demanded.

"That depends on how you define 'veg­etarian,'" Doc replied.

KINDS OF VEGETARIANS

There are many different varieties of vegetarians. Probably less than ten per­cent of them are "vegans," who will eat or use any product of animal origin, including meat, poultry, fish, eggs, milk, butter, cheese, wool, or leather.

The remainder of the vegetarians are divided into various groups, such as the lacto-progressive vegetarians, who eat all dairy products, but no animal flesh. In so doing, of course, they contribute to the use of discarded laying hens for meat and eggs, and to the killing of cows, bulls, and bulls also eventually wind up at the slaughterhouse and on the tables of meat eaters.

Likewise, vegetarians who rationalize the eating of gelatin because it is only a by-product of the making of leather, or the use of wool or leather for the same reason, overlook the fact that all of these products have some value in the natural life of the live animal. This value is what the farmer takes into account when deciding whether or not to produce the animal. And the shearing of sheep and goats and the growing of more wool then needed for their own protection leads to the death of many thousands from cold weakness, weakness of bones, of muscles, and finally, of pleasure riding eventually results in their death and use for food. And simply keeping a dog as a companion results in the production of food which is at least partly of animal origin.

There is no logical reason, therefore, based on the principle of not taking an animal's life, for approving the use of some products of animal origin and not others. The same is true for the vegetable based vegetarian, who hands down. But there are reasons, other than this "principle," for becoming a veg­etarian.

WHY PEOPLE ARE VEGETARIANS

People are motivated to be vegetarians by various considerations which also in­fluence how they define the term "vegetarian." Some have religious or ethical convictions which prohibit taking the life of an ani­mal or eating flesh.

Others fear for the millions of under­nourished people in the world for whom much more and cheaper food could be made available through the omission (or "omnivore") of eating both animal and plant food. We are, they say, born to be vege­tarian animals. Our teeth and jaws are not designed for slicing flesh. We per­spire through our skin, whereas carnivores do so through their tongues. The carn­i­vores hunt for food at night, whereas veget­arian animals do so in daylight.

But vegetarians carefully avoid applying human attributes to the third cate­gory of "carnivores." Most herb­i­vores have multiple chambers for food diges­tion, and are able to assimilate food material primarily indigestible to humans. True, anthropoid apes live on nuts, fruits, green shoots, edible leaves and seeds, but this is far from being the kind of diet envisioned by the vegetarians.

These anatomical differences seem to be a dangerous reason to eat meat, as well as being hard-to-digest or tasteless vegetable mater­i­als, makes up for his lack of physical features designed to aid the eating of raw meat, on whole animals or on the production of food animals.

Yet the vegetarians have excellent rea­sons for believing their diet to be more healthful than that of meat eaters. Meat

Unwillingness to kill animals, due to re­ligious scruples, may result in much un­sustained suffering, as these "sacred cows" come to India.

(Photograph from St. Petersburg Times)

As high in saturated fats and cholesterol, believed to be causes of heart disease. Apparently people who eat a diet high in animal fats have a higher incidence of coronary heart disease than those who do not.

Vegetarians also make a case for possi­ble cancer-causing properties of meat. Studies have shown a strong correlation between the incidence of colon cancer and meat consumption.

Vegetarians also claim that meat has a far greater amount of harmful bacteria than vegetable foods. Salmonella infec­tion is especially likely to result from bacterial contamination of meat. Accord­ing to Dr. James Goddard, writing on "Nu­trition Today," meat chosen at random in retail markets has shown a high incidence of contamination. Others say that proper cooking can kill these bacteria.

It is pointed out, also, that a carniv­orous diet creates more waste for the kid­neys of meat eaters. Kidney function tests and urine analyses show that meat eaters re­quire of their kidneys three times the amount of work in the elimination of uratrogenous wastes than is demanded of the kidneys of flesh abstainers. There is a high incidence of kidney disease.

Finally, the fatty tissues of meat are said to act as biological magnifiers, adding to the chemical content of the hu­man body. People who survived the del­ithotrophic, preservatives and antibiotics.

One of the best, if somewhat biased, presentations we have seen of these health considerations arising from the eating of meat is to be found in Facts of Vegetari­anism, a tabloid publication of the North American Vegetarian Society, 501 Old Hord­ing Highway, Malaga, New Jersey 08328, which sells for ten cents per copy. In­terested persons may wish to send for it.

Another publication which will be found useful by those interested in vegetarianism is Eating for Life, Not About Vge­...
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DIE T PROBLEMS OF VEGETARIANS

What we have found very useful is the more objective and scholarly approach taken by the magazine, 'Vegetarian Nutrition and Health,' which may be ordered in a dietetic vegetarian, and which must be provided if the diet is not to prove harmful. For this reason the vegetarian would be well-advised not to depend on statements by the sales people of the local market, who may be plumbers or used-car salesmen turned physiologists and nutritionists by reading the advertising and promotional literature of those cat's whiskers.

For this purpose we have found very useful the more objective and scholarly articles in the magazine, 'Vegetarian Nutrition and Health.' It has an issue of December, 1971, Vol. 23, No. 9), especially the article "How to be a Healthy Vegetarian" (page 154).

We recommend that any vegetarian or would-be vegetarian study the issue from the nearest library and read the article carefully. It may not be the nutritionists' last word on the subject, but it does contain a wealth of valuable information, particularly on the role of amino acids in human nutrition. We believe that the actual use of these elements, found so abundantly in animal products, will be included in it. The article entitled "Vegetarians Can Get Complete Protein Nourishment," in the March, 1973, issue of PreVision, contains similar information. We have not as yet come across a reference to this article. We also recommend that readers of these articles obtain and study the literature and correspondence works cited. Health is too important to triffl e with.

Here is a puzzle: Do you know that corn has a higher amino acid content, per gram of nitrogen, than wheat, and that sweet potatoes have a relatively high content of the same amino acid?

Eggs provide a biologically complete protein. By knowing the distribution of the nitrogen, we can plan the use of other foods to collectively give you approximately the same basic proteins. Likewise, we can plan an adequate supply of each amino acid. For example, corn, sweet potatoes, and some legumes, both alone and in combination, are needed to be starch-rich foods, collectively provide a good amino acid balance. Such information contained in the article cited is collected from all the people who read or who write in the vegetarian literature, who publish several works on the subject, and who are rather critical of the "do-gooder" and "nutty" philosophy, not himself. The vegetarian for health reasons cares more for the animal's health, but he also has at least some evangelical concern for the future of the country. He earnestly tries to convince the health benefits of a vegetarian diet.

Probably in the worst case there is a certain element, found in all "do-gooders" including humanitarians, of ego fulfillment. Mr. J. K. Fulfillment is not going to appear "holier than thou," or to defend themselves against implications that they are peculiar. The genuine vegetarian may be following the precept that the best defense is an offense. That, as we have acknowledged, applies to humanitarians as well as vegetarians. The most prominent concerners in society generally unappreciative of our efforts, if we recognize our motives, including those that may not be too flattering.

It appears to us, as humanitarians, that the most logical reason for proselytism by vegetarians is to be found in the fourth motivation, "humaneness." The essential condition of humaneness is to be concerned not only for the other sentient being, including animals. It is the wish to avoid imposing physical or psychological suffering on either people or animals.

THE ONLY WAY VEGETARIANISM CAN REDUCE ANIMAL SUFFERING

The only way vegetarianism can contribute to a reduction in the amount of suffering of animals by is by reducing the demand for and of meat products. This is all the saving of some specific animals' lives. If, for example, you should win over to vegetarianism a group of people who during a time in which you consumed the equivalent of five animals, you have not actually saved five animals from death or cruelty, but only persuaded or been able to eat the animals and consume their by-products, persuaded to do so by lower demand for and prices of these products. It is much less, for example, than the actual reduction of total meat consumption. This is to be retired from service, not a single subway employee fired. The only result would be a slight reduction in the subway's revenue and a correspondingly slight reduction in the system's annual receipts and expenses. It is not a cult. A vegetarian newspaper refers to the way in which the reduction in meat eating and by-product usage can be translated into a reduction in suffering.

A good analogy is the New York subway. If 20 daily riders get mad at the subway and quit riding it, not a single car would be fired from service, nor would a single subway employee fired. The only result would be a slight reduction in the subway's revenue and a correspondingly slight reduction in the system's annual receipts and expenses. It is not a cult. A vegetarian newspaper refers to the way in which the reduction in meat eating and by-product usage can be translated into a reduction in suffering.

Exactly the same principle applies to furs. People or organizations opposed to trapping think that every person persuaded to give up wearing furs would be a significant reduction in the number of furs, at a price. But to achieve it, the number of animals whose skins would be required to make that coat. It is much less, for example, than the actual reduction of total meat consumption. This is to be retired from service, not a single subway employee fired. The only result would be a slight reduction in the subway's revenue and a correspondingly slight reduction in the system's annual receipts and expenses. It is not a cult. A vegetarian newspaper refers to the way in which the reduction in meat eating and by-product usage can be translated into a reduction in suffering.

IS VEGETARIANISM NOW EFFECTIVE IN PROMOTING HUMANITY?

After many decades of promotion of vegetarianism, has the number of people converted to the faith become sufficient to actually affect the demand for and prices of animal products, and hence the production of animals for food and other products? According to Nathaniel Altman, in his book previously cited, "It is estimated that the total number of vegetarians in the United States is about 3 million people." But undoubtedly the number has grown substantially since 1968.
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USE OF LIVE RABBITS IN GREYHOUND TRAINING

Greyhound racing is very popular in Florida. It provides a "respectable" way to gamble, and the excitement which goes along with any kind of gambling and racing. A large percentage of the dogs used in breeding and training are found in Florida. During the tourist season the dog tracks offer an important attraction to supplement the beaches, Disney World, Sea World, Busch Gardens, nightlife, and the host of sleazy transactions that go on along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico and the North.

This gives the tracks an immeasurable position of favor with the hotels, motels, restaurants, chambers of commerce, advertising media, and other interests affected by the tourist trade. And the State itself derives millions of dollars annually from admission and betting taxes. Only the small towns of the Panhandle escape.

Our members who write to suggest that we "do something" to stop greyhound racing in Florida and other parts of the United States, maintain that the tremendous influence of the business interests supporting the tracks, plus the moral vacuum resulting from participation in this form of entertainment, makes such efforts futile. Among other considerations, the tracks are said to have one of the most efficient law enforcement agencies in the State.

There is no more chance of eliminating this political behemoth than of closing antitrust laws. The defendant could create our scarce resources by jousting with such formidable opposition, no matter how popular this is at the moment. However, we are aware of the desire to chase the hounds, and we do not seek to stop them from breeding and racing; but the use of live animals in the training of dogs is objectionable, without a doubt. It is cruel to use live virus and cats to train greyhounds, and it is cruel to use the dogs to chase them. This does not mean that a dog cannot be taught to run for a living, but the use of live bait in training greyhounds is unnecessary. A device marketed under the trade name, "Jack-A-Lure," is claimed to do as good a job as the use of live bait.

In 1973, when a state attorney in Ocala prosecuted a local trainer for using live rabbits in training greyhounds, Humane Information Services furnished a considerable amount of information about the above for use in the case. However, the trainer was prosecuted for maintaining a "public nuisance," because the prosecution thought it offered a better chance of conviction than would a case based on violation of the anti-cruelty laws. The trainer was found guilty, but the decision was later reversed by the appeals court, on the grounds that a rabbit is a rodent, not an "animal." This was an inspiration, contrary to the attorney general, and a very unambiguous definition of the word "animal" in the Florida statutes.

We have also furnished information along these lines to the Florida attorney general, who is considering whether the tracks in Florida are violating the anti-cruelty laws. This investigator wrote of his intention to stop the use of live bait in training young greyhounds who are prosecution of a trainer in a lower court in Pinellas County, Florida, and introduction of another bill in the Florida legislature to ban such training. The complaint was filed on the ground that the use of live rabbits and cats is cruel. The law states that the use of live animals is illegal, and the judge found the defendant guilty, but the decision was reversed by the appeals court, on the grounds that a rabbit is a rodent, not an "animal." This was an inspiration, contrary to the attorney general, and a very unambiguous definition of the word "animal" in the Florida statutes.
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The principal objection to greyhound racing is the destruction of the countless number of dogs found unsuited to racing, and the training of young racing dogs for the use of live rabbits and cats to instill in them the desire to chase the fake rabbit used as a lure during the actual race. The kennel owners stoutly claim that the discarded dogs are destroyed by veterinary injection of sodium pentothal, as in laboratories operated by the best humane societies. We have suspected that less humane procedures are used in some cases. We have heard of various injections of muscimol chloride. But it is exceedingly difficult to obtain concrete evidence of such practices, and concrete evidence of rumors circulated by disgruntled former employees, etc., is not very useful.

The use of live bait in training young greyhounds is another matter. The trainers and kennel owners do not deny that they engage in these practices, which are followed in all states where racing is conducted. They claim there is no other way to instill in the dogs the needed speed. The use of live bait for training dogs used in actual racing, as a means of whet ting their appetites and making them run harder during the race, is prohibited by rule of the State racing commission, as in some other states. But there are no rules that prohibit the training of tracks or kennels where the young dogs are schooled.

Humane Information Services has some members in Australia who have been very helpful to us in various ways, as in connection with slaughtering methods used in that country. They have furnished us with copies of laws and case information relating to the training of greyhounds in Australia, where the tracks are very popular and the dogs appear to run just as eagerly as here. Training is conducted without the use of live rabbits and cats, except in a small state in southern Australia where the industry is not important.

There are some dog trainers in this country who are convinced that the use of live bait is unnecessary. A device marketed under the trade name, "Jack-A-Lure," is claimed to do as good a job as the use of live bait.
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Vegetarianism, by proselytizing people into giving up meat, helps those who choose to do so. But they do not necessarily in an important way contribute to the avoidance of animal suffering.

This fourth motivation behind vegetarianism calls for adopting and advocating a vegetarian movement and (2) placing major emphasis on the central nervous systems than mammals, and much less effect upon meat consumption.

The foregoing statement may be rejected (4) placing major emphasis on the central nervous systems than mammals, and much less effect upon meat consumption.
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This is the way sheep, goats and calves are killed in Mexico and some other countries. The animal is held against the legs of the slaughterer, who grasps the muzzle of the animal with his left hand and cuts the throat with the knife in his right hand. (From Peggy Monning Porteau, Asociacion De Lucha Para Evitar La Crueldad Con Los Animales, A. C., Mexico.) We are using these color photographs despite the fact that they will not show up as well as in black and white, because so far we have not been able to obtain similar ones from New Zealand or Australia, where similar methods are said to be used. The United States imports negligible quantities of meat involved, as evidence that he is "doing something." Thousands of bills are introduced in each session without the slightest prospect of passage. They are referred to a committee or subcommittee, where, if the chair of the committee, or there is interest in the object of the bill. In fact, a majority of the chairman's constituents may be against cattle. And when one has been around long enough to become chairman of a committee, he probably has become so well known in his home district, that he has done small favors for so many people, that nobody seriously challenges him at election time. He is not likely to please the congress, so long as he maintains a stance on major issues that is in line with his constituency. One of the things he has to keep in mind, however, is the necessity for having a sufficient campaign fund every election year to pay for expenses, advertising and roadside signs which continue to keep his name and picture before the electorate. Thence the effort to be hull and reasonable for him to listen respectfully to what his campaign contributors say.

Under these circumstances it is a wonder that so much legislation which is not of interest to large groups or campaign contributors does get passed. Actually, Congress has many more conscientious legislators than is commonly believed, if only because presidents sometimes may be due to ambitions of the member for advancement to the Senate or high state office, which requires satisfying a broader constituency. But in most cases it is because the Congressman is conscientious and takes his duties seriously.

**BILL RELATING TO DOMESTIC ANIMALS**

Bills relating to domestic animals are referred to the House Committee on Agriculture, and its Subcommittee on Livestock and Grazing. That is where so much of the proposed humane legislation ends, because it deals with domestic animals.

Humanitarians are fortunate that the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. Thomas S. Foley, of Washington, and of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grazing, Mr. Walter S. Poage, of Texas, have shown themselves to be conscientious and quite sympathetic to humane legislation. Mr. Foley's wife, who is also his legislator, is active in the area of animal welfare. Mr. Foley personally acted as floor manager for the bill carrying the 1976 amendments of the Animal Welfare Act and succeeded against considerable opposition in getting it passed. This bill was first considered by Mr. Poage's Subcommittee, and he is always ready to patiently meet conflicting viewpoints on these proposals.

Mr. Poage comes from a section of Texas given to sheep ranching, in which he also is personally engaged, we understand. Both Poage and constant constituents are considerably provoked by the efforts of humanitarians and environmentalists to ban the poisoning of predators. Whether or not a committee, he probably has become so well known in his home district, that he has done small favors for so many people, that nobody seriously challenges him at election time. He is not likely to please the congress, so long as he maintains a stance on major issues that is in line with his constituency. One of the things he has to keep in mind, however, is the necessity for having a sufficient campaign fund every election year to pay for expenses, advertising and roadside signs which continue to keep his name and picture before the electorate. Thence the effort to be hull and reasonable for him to listen respectfully to what his campaign contributors say.

Under these circumstances it is a wonder that so much legislation which is not of interest to large groups or campaign contributors does get passed. Actually, Congress has many more conscientious legislators than is commonly believed, if only because presidents sometimes may be due to ambitions of the member for advancement to the Senate or high state office, which requires satisfying a broader constituency. But in most cases it is because the Congressman is conscientious and takes his duties seriously.
HUMANE SLAUGHTER — FROM PAGE 7 — very important and active legislative body. Its purview consists of the problems of agricultural producers and marketing establishments responsible for feeding this country and many other parts of the world. There can be no denying that a limited amount of time to humane legislation.

In recognition of this situation, the Committee and Subcommittee chairmen members appear to have adopted an informal policy of considering seriously only one proposal generating more interest than the Brown bill. (Photograph from the Johnson Library.)

Meat inspectors of the USDA work daily in federally-inspected plants, checking for disease or other conditions which would make the meat unfit for human use. These inspectors would be used to enforce the humane slaughter requirements under the Brown bil1. (Photograph from The National Provisioner.)

Now we are in a new session of Congress, and the Committee and Subcommittee chairmen and members will have to choose what principal piece of humane legislation will receive concentrated attention in 1977. We devoutly hope it will be the Brown bill. And we have received various indications that it likely will be, unless some other proposal generating more interest among people writing to the Committee and Subcommittee and other members of Congress should displace it.

That is where you, the readers of this Report to Humanitarians come in.

Obviously, we would not have reached this favorable stage in Congressional consideration of the bill had it not been for the large number of letters generated by our sister societies, the National Association for Humane Legislation, a year ago.

We have received quite a few letters from active members who have written, and who urged others to do so, and who were greatly disappointed and depressed when no action by Congress followed. We must not be too impatient and expect too much. Getting legislation is a step-by-step process, which must be carried out consist­ently for each phase. We are now at the most critical phase.

A lot will depend on you when the fate of this bill is decided this year. Now is the time, for all good humanitarians and consumers to come to the aid of these poor animals who suffer so that you may have meat on your tables. If you do your part, the Congress will do its part.

WHAT OUR MEMBERS SHOULD DO

(1) Write a letter to the Congressman from your own district, if you have not already done so in response to the suggestion in our last Report. Ask him to work and vote for the Brown bill for humane slaughter, H.R. 1464. Address: Honorable [name] , House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515.

(2) Write to Mr. and Mrs. R. Poe, Chairman, Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515. Ask him to hold hearings on the Brown bill for humane slaughter, H.R. 1464, and to report it out favorably as soon as possible.

(3) Write to Mr. Thomas S. Foley, Chairman, House Agriculture Committee, House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515. Ask him to give this single important bill a big job in pushing through the Brown bill for humane slaughter, H.R. 1464, as he did last year for the Animal Welfare Act amendments.

(4) Write to each member of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, asking for support of the Brown bill for humane slaughter, H.R. 1464. You can address each one at: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. Ask them to come to the Committee's request, in addition to Mr. Poe's, ask them to come to the Brown bill.

(5) Write to each of the two US Senators from your state; and to Humane Information Services. Include in your letters phase I, phase II, and all the other phases, including the Amendments.

(6) Write letters to the editors of your locally-circulated newspapers, explaining briefly your reasons for this legislation, and urging readers to write to their Congressmen and two Senators urging passage of the Brown bill for humane slaughter, H.R. 1464.

(7) Persuade your local humane society to pass a resolution endorsing the Brown bill for humane slaughter, H.R. 1464, and to send copies of it to the Congressman from your district; to Mr. Poe, Chairman, Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, to Congressman George E. Brown, Jr., and to the two US Senators from your state; and to Humane Information Services.

(8) If you are a member of any national humane organization in addition to Humane Information Services, write them and ask them to actively support the Brown bill H.R. 1464.

(9) Try to persuade your labor unions, churches, civic auxiliaries and organizations to write letters in support of the Brown bill H.R. 1464.

(10) Send an extra contribution to Humane Information Services to help in obtaining humane slaughter of food animals. Write the letters in a simple, courteous and specific. The Congressman you are addressing has heard all the arguments in favor of the bill, about how we should help the poor, dear animals to avoid suffering, etc. The registered lobbyist of our sister society, the National Association for Humane Legislation, a year ago, has visited the Congressmen's offices and left literature. Do not send a copy of this Report or any other. Just ask him politely to do what you want -- support the Brown bill for humane slaughter, H.R. 1464.

Don't confuse the issues by referring also to other legislation. Stick to the Brown bill for humane slaughter, H.R. 1464.

Friends and fellow animal lovers, you will be kept informed of the latest developments as they occur. We wish you all the best in this effort in behalf of humane slaughter.