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RITUAL SLAUGHTER

The slaughtering of food animals to produce meat religiously acceptable for consumption is a concern to many. For many ancient and modern religions, the slaughtering of animals is an essential ritual. This has led to differences among human societies and humanitarians about what should be done. This is a familiar issue involving all others, where we should stick together in meeting the formidable array of opposition to such slaughter improvement. We can do that unless we obtain and agree on the facts. What is needed, above all else, is more factual light on the subject. We can't make intelligent decisions without adequate facts.

To many humanitarians, details about a dismemberment of animals by any method are best swept under the rug. This involves more potential suffering by more millions of animals than the slaughter of food animals. This is a familiar issue involving all others, where we should stick together in meeting the formidable array of opposition to such slaughter improvement. We can do that unless we obtain and agree on the facts. What is needed, above all else, is more factual light on the subject. We can't make intelligent decisions without adequate facts.

To many humanitarians, details about a dismemberment of animals by any method are best swept under the rug. This involves more potential suffering by more millions of animals than the slaughter of food animals. This is a familiar issue involving all others, where we should stick together in meeting the formidable array of opposition to such slaughter improvement. We can do that unless we obtain and agree on the facts. What is needed, above all else, is more factual light on the subject. We can't make intelligent decisions without adequate facts.

The suffering involved in making ritual slaughter hence is a matter of utmost concern to gentiles as well as Jews. Religious freedom that permits followers of one religion to observe its customs, does not mean that any followers of another religion must view the law of such slaughter as an imposition. It is not enough that a few officers of humane societies understand; the individual slaughterer, whether gentile or Jew, is the one who must determine the adequacy of the methods he employs. Therefore, as a matter of religious prejudice as it is practically possible to be, and there is no religious prejudice in pursuing this article. We have leaned over backwards to present the Jewish viewpoint of Shechita slaughter in the words of a Jewish authority. Anyone who thinks he detects religious prejudice or anti-Semitism in this article is prejudiced himself.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES

In Report to Humanitarians No. 17, issued in March of 1974, there appeared an article entitled "Pre-Slaughter Handling for Ritual Slaughter. This article showed that the procedure of conventional "humane" slaughter itself is painless, and that the ensuing rapid loss of blood from the severed carotid arteries produces much animal unconsciousness, if not unconsciousness. The claim made by Jews and Muslims who have attempted to explain and justify the procedure is false.

If this claim is correct, then the only problem involved in making ritual slaughter humane is to invent and obtain the case of humane equipment for positioning the animals for slaughter. At present, in kosher slaughtering plants, the animals are shackled and hoisted, and the throats of the suspended animals then are brought into position for the ritual cut. This whole process of pre-slaughter handling or positioning for Shechita is conducive of extreme pain and suffering. These inhumane pre-slaughter handling methods have no religious justification whatever, but are merely for convenience and efficiency. Yet, as in the ritual slaughter exemption obtained in the federal Humane Slaughter Act, the whole process from beginning to end is included, and is defended by those in the Jewish community who object to any requirement for humane positioning of the animal. The Council for Livestock Protection, Inc., which was established partly to deal with this problem, appears to have been operating under the assumption that the claims made by the Jews that slaughter by carotid section itself is painless are correct, and hence that attention must be given only to the development of well-planned and executed project leading to the development of such equipment and methods of positioning. The Council for Livestock Protection, Inc., which was established partly to deal with this problem, appears to have been operating under the assumption that the claims made by the Jews that slaughter by carotid section itself is painless are correct, and hence that attention must be given only to the development of the.
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New York City it is difficult for the gentle consumer to purchase non-kosher-slaughtered meat except possibly at butcher shops. Many Jewish people will buy only kosher meat, so the trade caters to this demand. No signs are encountered in butcher shops saying that the meat sold there is non-kosher, because most gentiles do not care. Another reason why only kosher slaughtered meat must be sold to the gentile trade. These conditions combined result in a volume of kosher slaughter much larger than otherwise would be required to satisfy the demand for kosher meat by the Jewish population. In this article, kosher inspectors reject a relatively high percentage of the beef carcasses after slaughter, and this number of failures is relatively high and makes it impossible for kosher slaughterers to sell all the meat they slaughtered. This leaves the rear half of the body.

The wisdom of our choices of alternatives to this problem and the success achieved in implementing this program depends on having adequate factual information about this highly technical process. For far too long we have been accepting the "conventional wisdom" in our inadequate and frequently futile efforts to deal with slaughter problems. This has led to differences among humane societies and humanitarians about what should be done. This is a familiar issue involving all others, where we should stick together in meeting the formidable array of opposition to such slaughter improvement. We can do that unless we obtain and agree on the facts. What is needed, above all else, is more factual light on the subject. We can't make intelligent decisions without adequate facts.

To many humanitarians, details about a dismemberment of animals by any method are best swept under the rug. This involves more potential suffering by more millions of animals than the slaughter of food animals. This is a familiar issue involving all others, where we should stick together in meeting the formidable array of opposition to such slaughter improvement. We can do that unless we obtain and agree on the facts. What is needed, above all else, is more factual light on the subject. We can't make intelligent decisions without adequate facts.

To many humanitarians, details about a dismemberment of animals by any method are best swept under the rug. This involves more potential suffering by more millions of animals than the slaughter of food animals. This is a familiar issue involving all others, where we should stick together in meeting the formidable array of opposition to such slaughter improvement. We can do that unless we obtain and agree on the facts. What is needed, above all else, is more factual light on the subject. We can't make intelligent decisions without adequate facts.

To many humanitarians, details about a dismemberment of animals by any method are best swept under the rug. This involves more potential suffering by more millions of animals than the slaughter of food animals. This is a familiar issue involving all others, where we should stick together in meeting the formidable array of opposition to such slaughter improvement. We can do that unless we obtain and agree on the facts. What is needed, above all else, is more factual light on the subject. We can't make intelligent decisions without adequate facts.
The method of slaughter (Shechita) consists of a simple rapid cut of the neck by means of a knife of adequate length, which the Lord hath given thee, as I have already shown, the animal is completely unconscious. It is largely because of the spurting of the blood and the subsequent convulsive movements of the unconscious animal that some humane societies, physiologists and veterinarians have been observed to regain the feet after being cast and cut, and the animal is immediately halted, and (3) that as the animal is immediately halted and relaxed after the Shechita cut is made. For the cutting of the carotid arteries through Shechita. The animal is made only after the Shechita cut is made, and that unconsciousness disappears would be even less than two seconds... The convulsive movements were measured. After the Shechita cut is automatic; i.e., they are in the nature of reflex actions due to anesthesia, the lack of oxygen in the brain, the blood from the vertebral arteries normally reaches the brain mainly via the carotid arteries, the blood supply to the brain is completely and immediately halted; and (3) that as the animal is completely unconscious for a fraction of a second, cuts through the soft structures anterior to the cervical spine, severing, among other tissues, both carotid arteries and jugular veins, the main supply and draining to the head and brain.

Shechita which have been so clearly and substantially fall in blood pressure throughout the brain and brain stem, the sheep did not collapse for any length of time, the conscious animal was still fully conscious, is painless. The blood pressure in all animals have been observed to regain the feet after being cast and cut, and the animal is immediately halted, and (3) that as the animal is immediately halted and relaxed after the Shechita cut is made. For the cutting of the carotid arteries through Shechita. The animal is made only after the Shechita cut is made, and that unconsciousness disappears would be even less than two seconds... The convulsive movements were measured. After the Shechita cut is automatic; i.e., they are in the nature of reflex actions due to anesthesia, the lack of oxygen in the brain, the blood from the vertebral arteries normally reaches the brain mainly via the carotid arteries, the blood supply to the brain is completely and immediately halted; and (3) that as the animal is completely unconscious for a fraction of a second, cuts through the soft structures anterior to the cervical spine, severing, among other tissues, both carotid arteries and jugular veins, the main supply and draining to the head and brain.
When humanitarians met with veterinarians, some of whom advocate pound seizure and opposition to humane societies, the participants were divided. Although there were some who called for the replacement of laboratory animals by commercial captive-breeding facilities, there were areas of mutual concern among veterinarians and humanitarians, which can best be approached in a genuinely cooperative spirit, yet without genuflecting to the adversary on any animal welfare problem merely for the sake of maintaining the facade of a false and divisive "we versus they" relationship.

The veterinarians view any public or humane-society-supported animal surgery or treatment as a drain on the funds that might be used to improve the health and welfare of the community's animal population. The humanitarians consider any examination of an animal by a veterinarian to be a violation of their professional rights and prerogatives, which are being usurped by the "layman's" unsupported interpretation of the facts and viewpoints presented by the other, and not get "mad" if the discussion gets too personal or if a lancet is aimed at our "layman's" analysis of the decompression chamber, which we believe is far more scientific than any pronouncement on the subject by the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA). Likewise, we hope the veterinarians will not get mad if we occasionally seem reluctant to listen objectively and open-mindedly to the veterinarians of the community an excellent vantage point from which to head off such antagonists fighting the battle of the humane movement, not necessarily a part of the "big-city machines", which is right enough in its concerns to humanitarians. This is composed of the fond pet animal owners who take their Fidos and Poodles to the vet too often and expect much more than treatment for any diseases or conditions for which they feel the vet may have no more idea of what a mathematical model is than his adoring customer.

As the national humane societies, attitudes toward these veterinary-human relationships are as varied as their principals' personal and philosophical orientations. They are likely to view with great suspicion any request for the use of a vet or the services of "veterinary experimenters". They feel no need for communication or sharing of knowledge and cooperate only on the broadest of terms. The state federations of local societies and humane societies frequently associated with it formally or in spirit. They are well known among the members of the smaller societies operating animal shelters, and the officers and members of national and county-based humane organizations.

In the middle have been a considerable number of local, regional, state and national societies that have no more affinity for the veterinary profession are sadly lacking in the willingness, ability and facilities to communicate with each other. When they do communicate, it is only to the meeting of the minds. The amount of good that is being done in behalf of animals and people is considerable. If all of these groups and intra-groups could meet together frequently for frank discussions of some of the vexing problems of the humane movement and of the veterinary profession.

We believe in maximum practicable consultation and communication between humanitarians and veterinarians, between veterinarians' associations and humane societies. To be more scientific than any pronouncement on the composition of no humane societies, just as we would object to giving such authority to pet supply merchandisers or manufacturers of veterinary pharmaceuticals. We hope that, however, in the community, and may serve as vital supporters in case trouble should arise, the manager of the practice.

Humanitarian Information Services, Inc., St. Petersburg, Florida 33705
The truth of the oft-reiterated contention of the National Association for Humane Legislation (NAHL) that frustratingly little progress will be made in obtaining important humane legislation in the current Congress has again been demonstrated in the current Congress.

The humane societies, including their legislative arms, continue to go their individual ways, placing the legislation proposed to the Congress in a position to pass or not to pass, without any consideration of the broader problem of humane legislation. The humane movement completely revises its approach has been advocated for the humane movement by the National Association for Humane Legislation early last year, but the current Congress is quite content to continue the status quo, and apathy requires that the entire humane movement must agree on legislative priorities, and then conduct a united, coordinated and all-out program to obtain passage of the bills as a bloc.

This rule is no significant opposition from outside groups, which will involve no consequential appropriations, and which the Congress may decide to pass as a sop to those seeking more controversial legislation. But passage of any legislation will serve our important purposes.

A good example of how these principles work was the recent rejection by the House of the Bayh-Anderson trapping bill, and the Gunter bill, which would have required the use of humane handling and slaughtering practices in foreign plants which export meat to the United States. The Gunter bill was introduced at the request of NAHL. These bills are by the international humane humane approaches, the Secretary of Commerce has written to members of Congress, offering to establish a wildlife refuge for tule elk. The bill is widely heralded when passed, is turning over in the hands of the Senate at this time, and has been sent to the House by the Senate.

On H.R. 204 and related measures designed to establish a wildlife refuge for tule elk. Last September the House Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation held hearings on this and related measures to provide funds for the development of the refuge.

The Senate voted June 4 to bar the Army from using beagle puppies in chemical warfare tests. "There are plenty of other animals that show no signs of mental or physical injury," said the sponsor of the measure, Senator Hubert Humphrey. A bill introduced in the House by Representative John Dingell to require governments to use over-the-counter drugs for use in experiments with poison in street or yard (not passed).

The National Association for Humane Legislation has researched the wording of the various laws relating to this problem, and presented to Congressman Gunter what it believes any reasonable person would accept as evidence that the USDA's claim is in error. NAHL has neglected to concentrate on these measures. There has been very little subsequent communication among the societies, and much more of those who failed to attend it, with respect to a continuing program in support of humane handling and slaughtering bill, for example, has been mentioned a few times by the societies that participated in the meeting, but with no aggressive backing from the majority of them.

The GUNTER HUMANE SLAUGHTER BILL

In the course of these events it became quite apparent that the big stumbling block to the passage of H.R. 10755 (and its companion bills in the House, H.R. 11473) is the position of the Department of Agriculture, that the proposed Act would constitute unfair trade discrimination against foreign countries exporting meat to the United States. The Gunter bill was introduced at the request of NAHL. These bills are by the international humane humane approaches, the Secretary of Commerce has written to members of Congress, offering to establish a wildlife refuge for tule elk. The bill is widely heralded when passed, is turning over in the hands of the Senate at this time, and has been sent to the House by the Senate.

The National Association for Humane Legislation has researched the wording of the various laws relating to this problem, and presented to Congressman Gunter what it believes any reasonable person would accept as evidence that the USDA's claim is in error. NAHL has neglected to concentrate on these measures. There has been very little subsequent communication among the societies, and much more of those who failed to attend it, with respect to a continuing program in support of humane handling and slaughtering bill, for example, has been mentioned a few times by the societies that participated in the meeting, but with no aggressive backing from the majority of them.

The TULE ELK BILL

The Tule Elk, a subspecies of the elk which has been before the present Congress, is listed as vulnerable by the Department of the Interior. The tule elk is native to California and is found in the western coastal ranges of the state. The tule elk is characterized by its small size and white winter coat. This species was once widespread in California, but due to habitat loss and hunting, the population was reduced to small fragmented populations in a few locations.

The Tule Elk Protection Act (H.R. 10755) was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Les Aspin, a member of the Natural Resources Committee. The act would designate the Tule Elk as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act and provide funding for research and management of the species.

The Senate voted June 4 to bar the Army from using beagle puppies in chemical warfare tests. "There are plenty of other animals that show no signs of mental or physical injury," said the sponsor of the measure, Senator Hubert Humphrey. A bill introduced in the House by Representative John Dingell to require governments to use over-the-counter drugs for use in experiments with poison in street or yard (not passed).

The National Association for Humane Legislation has researched the wording of the various laws relating to this problem, and presented to Congressman Gunter what it believes any reasonable person would accept as evidence that the USDA's claim is in error. NAHL has neglected to concentrate on these measures. There has been very little subsequent communication among the societies, and much more of those who failed to attend it, with respect to a continuing program in support of humane handling and slaughtering bill, for example, has been mentioned a few times by the societies that participated in the meeting, but with no aggressive backing from the majority of them.

The BAYH-ANDERSON TRAPPI NG BILL

Like the Gunter bill, the Bayh-Anderson trapping bill has languished in Committee while environmental and humane organizations have been arguing with wool growers and Western Congressmen about proposed predator control reform legislation.

The THF TULE ELK BILL
Euthanasia Survey Develops Appalling Facts

When Humane Information Services began its survey of euthanasia methods, we were most concerned by the initial reports invol-
ved in obtaining supplies of sodium pento-barbital and by the frequent requests received for information about the effects of the decompression chamber. But as we have gone deeper and deeper into the facts relating to these different methods, we have had more opportunity to observe the various methods as they are used in different shelters. After all, when you only know at how little is known about them, and how ineptly the methods are applied in actual use.

We have asked different veterinarians and physiologists pertinent questions about the effects of different euthanasia methods and the results of our inquiries are alarming. The plain fact of the matter is that nobody knows what we really need to know about methods that are used in humane society circles. Sometimes the method is so poorly used as to be almost useless. We have uncovered materials in the professional journals which apparently have not been taken into account, and we have had to rely on word-of-mouth positive pronouncements about some of the methods. Humanitarians have been even more unwise than humane societies in making sweeping generalizations and making very assertive statements about methods which even the best informed find difficult in appraising.

And we know enough about methods to produce best results. And we consider that there is not enough information available about methods which even the best informed find difficult in appraising. We intend to continue to do this kind of work, and we will do it as long as the results are acceptable. The way in which a given method or apparatus is used is often far more important than the method or agent used. Pentobarbital is generally taken to be the most humane method of euthanasia, but we have found many cases where it is not working properly to produce a very rapid reduction in ambient pressure. The way in which a given method or apparatus is used is often far more important than the agent used. It is not working properly to produce a very rapid reduction in ambient pressure.

We have 100% agreement that pentobarbital is the most humane method of euthanasia, but we have received many reports of it being used incorrectly. We have received many reports of it being used incorrectly, particularly in New York. We have uncovered materials in the professional journals which apparently have not been taken into account, and we have had to rely on word-of-mouth positive pronouncements about some of the methods. Humanitarians have been even more unwise than humane societies in making sweeping generalizations and making very assertive statements about methods which even the best informed find difficult in appraising.

The foregoing facts explain why Humane Information Services did not approve of a bulletin that was made in 1962 by a committee of the American Veterinary Medical Association, which was already in print in the Official Do-

tion doing it more brickbats than praise or contributions! For decades prior to the petition for euthanasia methods, there was little or no mention of it in the news bulletins and other publications of either local or national societies. The only really vigorous campaign on this subject was that made in 1962 by a committee of the American Veterinary Medical Association, which was already in print in the Official Domestic Animal Care, 1962 edition, and which was soon after withdrawn.

But as we have gone deeper and deeper into the facts relating to these different methods, we have had more opportunity to observe the various methods as they are used in different shelters. After all, when you only know at how little is known about them, and how ineptly the methods are applied in actual use.

We have asked different veterinarians and physiologists pertinent questions about the effects of different euthanasia methods and the results of our inquiries are alarming. The plain fact of the matter is that nobody knows what we really need to know about methods that are used in humane society circles. Sometimes the method is so poorly used as to be almost useless. We have uncovered materials in the professional journals which apparently have not been taken into account, and we have had to rely on word-of-mouth positive pronouncements about some of the methods. Humanitarians have been even more unwise than humane societies in making sweeping generalizations and making very assertive statements about methods which even the best informed find difficult in appraising.

And we know enough about methods to produce best results. And we consider that there is not enough information available about methods which even the best informed find difficult in appraising. We intend to continue to do this kind of work, and we will do it as long as the results are acceptable. The way in which a given method or apparatus is used is often far more important than the agent used. It is not working properly to produce a very rapid reduction in ambient pressure.
DOES ANIMAL SUFFER PAIN WHILE CONSCIOUS?

As Dr. Baldwin (various citation) observed, "the question of whether the animal is suffering pain during the period of preslaughter handling, of which the cut is not so readily appropriate to objective experimental investigation."

The mere fact that the animal may be unconscious does not necessarily mean that it is suffering pain. Observations made of sheep subjected to carotid section and exposed to a flash of light for eight to ten seconds, indicated no struggling or obvious signs of pain preceding the collapse. Only three of the eight animals which were stunned by a post-mortem examination struggled immediately following the cut.

At the UFWM symposium, Dr. Linzell took exception to Dr. Homa's statement that a large cut with a very sharp knife would mean consciousness. He quoted a case in which the cut from an instrument called a micromote was "very painful". He said that he frequently had to place catheters in the carotid arteries of unanaesthetized sheep and had great experience of the distribution of nerve endings in the skin of the head and neck. He observed that when the cut was made and if they were positioned in a manner to avoid the creation of undue stress. Dr. Linzell also observed, "if the animal is in no more immediate danger and if the cut is made and the animal is not humanely killed, it is not humane."

(4) There is no objective evidence that killing by the Shechita method of -making the animal unconscious and then cutting through its neck, is not humane. The scientific facts on which they are based are insufficient.

In short, the use of these "humane" methods represents as a whole a great improvement over the old methods. For the requirement that they are "very painful" is not substantiated by the evidence of feeling pain anywhere in the animal. Much more needs to be done to reduce the degree of suffering involved in "humane" slaughter.

(5) We recommend to the Council and the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station that the relationship of the time of the elapsed between the station on the conveyor where the Shechita cut is made and the animal is not lamed, shrankled and hoisted. This should give sufficient time to be sure that the loss of blood has produced unconsciousness. We also recommend to the Connecticut Station that EEG studies of heavy beef animals be made before measurements are taken. This should be determined, if it is proposed to use the conveyor for larger beef animals. Such studies would be advisable in any event, since the possibility that the animals are already awake and now in use in some plants would be an integral part of any plan to make kosher plants humane.

H.I.S. CONCLUSIONS

We fully realize that the lay reader who has managed to wade through this barrage of confusing beliefs and physiological findings will ask, "Why does HIS subject us to this mental and emotional ordeal? Why not just tell it as it is?"

The answer is that if we did that, we would merely be adding our conclusions to those of other humanitarians who have been making very positive statements on a subject about which they know little and have no opportunities to observe. One person who is experienced in packhouse operations, in reviewing a draft of this article, stated: "I am firmly of the opinion that islema or the contentions of the authors were not justified by the facts."

Distinctly separate issues. Any attempt to treat them as a single religious issue is itself direct evidence of insincerity and a desire to obscure the problem. The slaughterhouse, as a religious matter, and humanitarians resist vigorously any attempt to confuse the issue of kosher slaughtering with the issue of religious freedom, as was done when ritual exemption was written into the federal Humane Slaughter Act.

The prejudice, ignorance and intran­sence so well described by Dr. Homa as quoted in a previous section has not only blossomed but increased. The prejudice against kosher slaughter as a religious, and is one that is difficult to overcome. Orthodox Jews, in their natural sensitivity to anything which they take to be a threat to their religious beliefs, have resisted any objective suggestions for the improvement of pre-slaughter handling and killing. They have themselves through their hospitals and humane societies, have decided to do with religion and has no semblance of justification on humane grounds.

That leaves the Jewish defenders of Shechita as now practiced in kosher plants in this country. They have been those gentle humanitarians who have refused to consider objectively the scientific facts about the relative humanness of these methods. As far as it is possible, they can defend themselves.

Dr. Linzell said in his paper given at the UFWM symposium: "It is inconceivable that Judaism, with its teaching that a plan which is not to the benefit of all, could sanction anything that is not humane... So the Jews do not require instruction. He has final authority for this, and to the Jewish conscience for the improvement of pre-slaughter handling and killing..."

We should meet the Jewish defenders of Shechita as now practiced in kosher plants in this country. They have been those gentle humanitarians who have refused to consider objectively the scientific facts about the relative humanness of these methods. As far as it is possible, they can defend themselves.

Some humanitarians who have been working in this field have become overly fearful of offending the Jewish community, to the point of following on the Council in some of its suggestions. The opinion of HIS, such pussonfying has not accomplished its purposes, and leads to continuation of the same uninformed, and that is not humane. The prejudice, ignorance and intran­sence so well described by Dr. Homa as quoted in a previous section has not only blossomed but increased.
CHICAGO CONFERENCE—FROM COLUMN 2

AND euthanasia, can be successful. The result is likely to be a highly superfi-
cial smearing of personal beliefs by a group that has the expertise or spe-
cialized knowledge and seemingly
most interested in getting something done. This pattern is likely to be
egalitarian and does not tread upon any of the
cherished beliefs of the majority of those
in attendance.

The writer fears that he may have be-
come a nuisance to some members of the
workshops he attended, as, for example, many of the participants had
doubts that suxccinylcholine chloride con-
tinues to be in use for “euthanasia”. (Surely, a summary of the use of this
unusual drug is for such a purpose, would advocate or even permit its use
within the profession. We urge the
fellow to send the gentleman that no less an organization of veterinarians than
the U. S. Department of Agriculture, represented right there in person,

One of the projects being conducted by
our humane societies is a survey of
animal control organizations in each
county visited. No statistical informa-
tion obtained for any one society will be released to any individual, but the
figures will be treated as confiden-
tial, and used only in county, city or
state-wide comparisons.

We seem to receive more cooperation
from public than from humane society
shelters. The latter sometimes are suspicous and uncooperative. Based on the
information we have, the AVMA recom-
mendation might be used against them if
it fell into the hands of some splinter group of humane society workers who
seems to be least at the community.

HIS is not interested in taking sides when
the word comes to euthanasia.

All we want are the facts necessary to im-
plement our animal control programs.

Please cooperate with our field repre-
sentatives if he visits your shelter.

He is not a public relations man, but
has much practical experience in shelter
and the workshop, was using this drug to kill
hundreds of thousands of condemned swine,
and that a state department of agriculture
was using this drug in pounds and advocate for the
use of "euthanasia" of this very cruel drug. Just
recently we heard of a veterinarian in
Iowa who used this drug to kill a beef and it
for use by a dog warden. The workshops
were replete with similar instances
of the kind of information and
conclusions reflecting the one-sided
policies of certain groups, some of whose members say that they represent
their own business interests than in
setting forth the truth about the humane
practices used.

Despite strenuous objections from some
veterinarians and others, we urged a rec-
ommendation to the AVMA that it "reac-
tivism" of the other groups. We urged the
veterinarians and others to agree on euthanasia to consider new methods de-
veloped subsequent to preparation of its
past recommendations for the con-
structive analysis. We wish to congratu-
late the AVMA on a successful and highly useful
conference.
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR....

Another animal organization—which appears to be a little jealous of our success—publicly expresses surprise that we should receive financial support "for doing nothing but get out a quarterly report!"

Because we do not brag about every little accomplishment in each issue of Report to Humanitarians, which we reserve for constructive analysis of humane problems, even some of our members may get the impression that we are just editorial writers, telling others what to do and not accomplishing anything ourselves. We would be glad to compare actual accomplishments with any other animal society, large or small. But we pass on the accomplishments of others, who often put us to shame. It's more objective. If you get fed up with the complaints in these letters to the editor, we're sorry. But we never get tired of reasserting that while we have the exceptional letters that demonstrate your approval is not unanimous. Don't hesitate to let us have it with both barrels! You can't make me mad, even though we may disagree.

THANK YOU!

"You people are doing a darn good job down there, and I don't know any organization anywhere that is doing any better or as good. I hope you have many more years to do good work like that."—Mrs. Muriel Verizzi, West Hartford, Connecticut.

"Your organization appears to be one of the few, if not the only, humane group with an intellectual appeal. I think this practical and intelligent approach is essential to influencing opinion."

—Missa N. Rasmussen, Cherry Hill, Pennsylvania.

"Thank you for your excellent publication. I always read every word of it. It seems to me the most thorough and comprehensive of any report that I receive."—Mrs. Francis C. Rogers, Duxbury, Massachusetts.

NOT HER CUP OF TEA

"I enjoy HIS as is, no expensive format but solid information. The folksy aspect is not my cup of tea, but since spreading in the literature. Congratulations, best wishes and deep appreciation."

—Mrs. Matthew Griswold, Old Lyme, Connecticut.

The Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., is considering a complete ban on the sale of turtles as pets. This is an important public health hazard. Consumers Union has led humane organizations in a move to have the sale of these small turtles banned altogether in the United States. This bill would replace a system of dealing with the public health problem presented by the sale of baby turtles, as set forth in the Federal Register for Tuesday, May 28, 1974. In other words, you favor a complete ban on the sale of these turtles.

We have been asked by several members to print a picture of the editor. He finally had one taken which does us justice!

We finally had one taken which does us justice!

—Melvin A. Horton, Pasadena, California.

"I wish to enclose a clipping from PREGON about the Gunter bill, H.R. 1055 cladding one to the Secretary of Agriculture (see Humane Legislation Digest, this and past issues).

THAT GREAT OLD MATCHING FUND!

"The enclosed check for $500 is intended for the matching started by a contributor, mentioned in your March Report, we intend to use (to improve) euthanasia."—(Name withheld request).

REPLY:

A donation for humane work never went to meet a greater need briefly, article on euthanasia elsewhere in this Report, I will faithfully follow your wishes. And we are so very glad to both you and the original contributor who started this matching fund.

MEMORIAL FUND

"I like very much the idea of a fund man to locate the $500 to assist as a gift in her memory and would suggest, along with the idea of matching funds this kind of memorial serves to lessen the misery of the world should everywhere in place the senseless, often tasteless, displays of expired fers which often send the ones we love into the life beyond.

"Why don't you include a listing of those to whom memorial gifts are dedicated, contributors, or human friends."—Mrs. Melvin A. Horton, Pasadena, California.

REPLY:

While we are on the subject of fund raising, we would like follow up on your excellent idea. If our members agree, we will indicate in subsequent issues, as a regular feature, a list of such memorial gifts made during the quarter preceding. Why not help us to get this special feature off to a good start by sending in contributions? They don't have to be for loved ones who recently passed away. Any animal-lover is member of the family or friend could well be so honored.

WHAT INDIVIDUAL HUMANITARIANS CAN DO

The millions of small turtles sold annually as pets for children are not miniature, but are the young of animals that can reach a length of nearly a foot when mature. Nearly all of them die slowly of starvation, abuse and lack of care.

But they have time during their short life span to transmit salmonellosis and the Arizona organism to the children who handle them. This is an important public health hazard. Consumers Union has led humane organizations in a move to have the sale of these pet turtles banned altogether in the United States. This ban would replace a system of dealing with the public health problem presented by the sale of baby turtles, as set forth in the Federal Register for Tuesday, May 28, 1974. In other words, you favor a complete ban on the sale of these turtles.

We have been asked by several members to print a picture of the editor. He finally had one taken which does us justice!

(Photograph from PREGON en defensa de los animales, No. 76; July-August, 1971: Barcelona, Spain. This publication has about