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tion there are evidenced feelings of ambiguity, as well as ambivalence toward the natural order and the role of human kind in it. Some have found in the scriptural material the impetus for great acts of kindness, others the justification for unspeakable cruelty. This might have been expected, considering the ways biblical materials have been used in other controversies throughout history. In truth, the bible represents an open tradition: it is not a program of church or synagogue; not a project for nature; but merely the state of its technology as it is shown to be an outgrowth of the eighteenth and nineteenth century mechanisms, and the elevation of technology above the ideal of service to humankind, such that technology assumes the role of a controlling force, all in the interest of a widespread materialism of a private and egotistical nature.

The desacralization of the world is not a program of church or synagogue; quite the contrary. Cold and mechanistic views have come from the laboratory, not the pulpit. The proper answer to this quandary is not a lot of mythical and mystical nonsense, but a humane reassessment done in reverence and humility, acknowledging the wondrous interdependence we can exercise in regard to our environment.

No Need to Be Boxed in: Group Pens and Grain for Veal Calves

Michael S. Mosner

Background

My family has been in the wholesale veal business for 30 years. The basis of this business has been various breeds of female beef calves that are slaughtered at less than 500 lb. These calves are allowed to suck from cows and graze until they are ready for market. Beef calves, however, tend to vary in quality and quantity depending on the time of the year that they are purchased and raised. Generally, calves become scarce in the spring, when feeders are buying calves to put on pasture. Then, in the summer and

fall, large numbers of calves usually be-
come available, thereby depressing prices.
As the winter comes on, calves become scarcer
and consequently more expensive.
In the early 70's, there was a chronic
shortage of calves. However, feed was
cheap (interest rates were, too), and
feedlot operators were snapping up
everything that moved for beef. As a re-
suit, my father, David Mosner, had some
difficulty procuring calves for veal pro-
duction. At that time, Dr. Gardner of
Brigham Young University was experi-
menting with the use of a grain diet for
calves raised for veal. He concluded that
there was no difference in taste or ten-
dency between grain-fed and milk-fed veal.
After learning about Gardner's work,
my father suggested that I do some work
on grain-fed calves while I was at-
tending Cornell University. Dr. R.C.
Warner of Cornell agreed to sponsor and
supervise me in an independent research
project on the economical feasibility of
grain-supplemented rations for veal calves.
I concluded from these initial studies
that grain-fed veal could be raised
economically. The only remaining hitch
was to find a means to end up with a calf
and milk-fed calves. The production
costs entailed in raising prime veal are
particularly high, and feedlot opera-
tors stopped looking for calves.
At present, there are three types of
veal. These include the beef-type calves
discussed above, baby "boob" calves,
which are slaughtered immediately after
birth, and milk-fed calves. The production
values in raising prime veal fluctuated by
as much as 86 cents per lb; there was no
market stability. In the seventies, I be-
gan to raise only grain-fed calves, in order
to circumvent the constraints of the tradi-
tional marketing channels.
Current Operation
At present, there are three types of
veal. These include the beef-type calves
(discussed above), "boob" calves,
which are slaughtered immediately after
birth, and milk-fed calves. The production
costs entailed in raising prime veal are
particularly high, and feedlot opera-
tors stopped looking for calves. However, feed
was to find a means to end up with a calf
of feeding grain to calves for veal pro-
duction was greatly diminished.
After 3 weeks, the calves are
offered hay and a commercial calf
starter. After 3 weeks, the calves are
given an initial check for general health
and an injection of vitamins. The calves
are finished at 450-500 lb, live
weight, and this increase in weight re-
duces the incidence of anemia. In addition, grain-
fed veal appears to be a viable
option for making consistently high-quality
veal available to consumers at a rea-
sonable price. Also, the calves would be
bleeded because of the favorable meat
yields attainable from grain-fed veal.
In our operation, calves are raised
in group pens rather than in individual
stalls. This allows the calves room to
move around and to "socialize." This
practic makes teeth the stress
on the calves in crate systems. Fur-
thear, because there is some iron content
in the grain, the calves do not become as
anemic as milk-fed calves. Anemia is a
well-recognized stressor to calves, and a
reduction in stress means that disease is
less likely to develop. In addition, grain-
fed veal provides better nutrition to the
consumer, because of the additional iron
in the meat. This decrease in anemia is
accomplished while the low levels of fat
and cholesterol for which veal is noted
are retained. In essence, grain-fed veal
constitutes a highly desirable commodi-
ty, since it can be produced inexpensive-
ly, is of high-quality product, and is affor-
dable to the average consumer.
We are currently operating in a con-
verted free-stall dairy barn. We have
capacity for about 600 calves. (However,
additional stock can also be penned out-
doors.) We buy calves that have an init-
ial weight between 150 and 175 lb for
grain-fattening. However, sometimes eco-
nomics may dictate that we buy baby
 calves—in this case, milk replacer is of-
ered until weaning, which occurs at 6
weeks of age. Calves are housed inside
the barn and sorted into pens in groups of
20. Each pen is 12 by 32 feet, thereby
allowing each calf about 20 square feet.
Calves are finished at 450-500 lb, live
weight, and this increase in weight re-
duress of consumers.

Grain-fed operation is that there are
usually a wide variety of grain suppliers
to choose from, in contrast to the small
number of milk replacer sources.
My finished calves have been graded
as choice veal and are distinguished by a
light pink hue and excellent conforma-
tion. The major problem we have faced
so far arises from the myth perpetuated
by some feed companies—that veal must
be white to be of premium quality. Con-
sumers have been repeatedly told that
"If it's not white, it's not veal." I believe
that this is an obvious fallacy that must
be countered by effective educational
efforts.

The Future of the Veal Industry
Over the last decade, the per capita
consumption of veal has steadily declin-
ed. Perhaps the most important reason
for this decline has been the high price
of veal; the resulting substitution of oth-
er meats. Consumers are now buying
more of the reasonably priced products,
such as poultry and pork. Chicken, tur-
key, and pork cuts are currently being
featured in many supermarkets and res-

taurants. Not only are these meats less
efficient than veal, but they taste good,
also. In my opinion, unless the veal grow-
er can find ways to cut the costs entailed
in production, he will simply price him-
self out of business. I believe that grain-
fed veal is the best economic alternative
to all other types of veal, for many rea-
sons. Grain-fed calves offer the consis-
tent high quality that the beef breeds do

fall, large numbers of calves usually become available, thereby depressing prices. Again, in the winter, calves become scarcer and consequently more expensive.

In the early 70’s, there was a chronic shortage of calves. However, feed was cheap (interest rates were, too), and feedlot operators were snatching up everything that moved for beef. As a result, my father, David Mosner, had some difficulty procuring calves for veal production. At that time, Dr. Gardner of Brigham Young University was experimenting with the use of a grain diet for calves raised for veal. He concluded that there was no difference in taste or tenderness between grain-fed and milk-fed calves. After learning about Gardner’s work, my father suggested that I do some work on grain-fed calves while I was at Cornell University. Dr. R.G. Warner of Cornell agreed to sponsor and supervise me in an independent research project on the economical feasibility of grain-supplemented rations for veal calves.

I concluded from these initial studies that grain-fed veal could be raised economically. The only remaining hitch was to find a means to end up with a calf of feeding grain to calves for veal production stopped looking for calves. This slack in demand caused a decrease in the price of calves, and the necessity of feeding grain to calves for veal production was greatly diminished.

Upon graduation from Cornell, I started raising milk-fed calves. Throughout the first 3 years, as a prime veal feeder, I continually experimented with different grain rations for calves. During most of 1980 and 1981, the price for finished milk-fed calves was quite low. Many growers were forced out of business.

Why, then, did I continue to experiment and to produce grain-fed calves? The consumer, because of the additional iron in the meat. This decrease in anemia is accomplished while the low levels of fat and cholesterol for which veal is noted are retained. In essence, grain-fed veal constitutes a highly desirable commodity, since it can be produced inexpensive, is a high-quality product, and is affordable to the average consumer.

We are currently operating in a converted free-stall dairy barn. We have capacity for about 600 calves. (However, additional stock can also be penned outdoors.) We buy calves that have an initial weight between 150 and 175 lb for grain-fattening. However, sometimes economics may dictate that we buy baby calves—in this case, milk replacer is offered until weaning, which occurs at 6 weeks of age. Calves are housed inside the barn and sorted into pens in groups of 20. Each pen is 12 by 32 feet, thereby allowing each calf about 20 square feet. Calves are finished at 450-500 lb. Live weight, and this increase in weight requires about 4 to 5 months. Straw and hay are used as bedding. When older calves first come into the barn, they are given an initial check for general health and an injection of vitamins. The calves are offered hay and a commercial calf starter. After 3 weeks, the calves are switched to the finishing ration, which consists basically of corn, with a protein supplement and essential vitamins and minerals. Baby calves, after weaning, are switched from milk to calf starter and ad lib water; after they have consumed about 100 lb of starter, they are switched to the finishing ration.

In the beginning, we used baby Holstein steins in our operation. However, we have found that it is also economic to use other types of veal, for many reasons.

The Future of the Veal Industry

Over the last decade, the per capita consumption of veal has steadily declined. Perhaps the most important reason for this decline has been the high price of veal and the resulting substitution of other meats. Consumers are now buying more of the reasonably priced products, such as poultry and pork. Chicken, turkey, and pork cutlets are currently being featured in many supermarkets and restaurants. Not only are these meats less expensive than veal, but they taste good, too. In my opinion, unless the veal grower can find ways to cut the costs entailed in production, he will simply price himself out of business. I believe that grain- fed veal is the best economic alternative to all other types of veal, for many reasons. Grain-fed calves offer a consistent high quality that the beef breeds do not.
not, the meat-to-bone yields that bob calves lack, and the relatively low price makes the product a nutritional and affordable choice for the consumer.

---

**Reporting Requirements Under the Animal Welfare Act: Their Inadequacies and the Public's Right to Know**

M. Solomon and P.C. Lovenheim

**Introduction**

The Animal Welfare Act is the only federal statute designed to protect animals used in laboratory research. Under this law, research facilities are required to register with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and to meet minimum standards of housing, care, and treatment for most warm-blooded animals. The Act is administered by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), an agency of the USDA. The Animal Welfare Act established by law

The human ethic that animals should be accorded the basic creature comforts of adequate housing, ample food and water, reasonable handling, decent sanitation, sufficient ventilation, shelter from extremes of weather and temperature, and adequate veterinary care, including the appropriate use of pain-killing drugs, is, emphasis added]

The petitioner considers all provisions of the Animal Welfare Act important, but none more so than those that concern animals used in painful experimentation. The number of animals used in such procedures is great, and has increased over the years from 65,501 in 1974 to 122,650 in 1980, according to APHIS (1975, 1981) reports. (These figures are cited for comparative purposes only since their reliability is questionable.) Since 1970, congress has required research facilities to show that during actual research and experimentation, pain-relieving drugs are used "appropriately" and in accordance with "professionally acceptable standards." The chief reasons for this failing are (1) regulations and guidelines do not define "pain" or "distress," (2) regulations and guidelines do not adequately define "routine procedures," and (3) regulations and guidelines do not require meaningful explanations for the withholding of pain-relieving drugs in procedures acknowledged to cause pain.

Under current regulations, research facilities must file an Annual Report with APHIS showing the number of types of animals used in "actual research, testing, or experimentation," and indicating which tests involved "accompanying pain or distress to the animals." In instances when animals were used in painful procedures but were given no pain-relieving drugs, the Annual Report must include "a brief statement explaining the reasons for the same" (9 CFR 2.28(a) (2)(d)).

The Reporting System, functioning properly, should provide APHIS with information sufficient to demonstrate that researchers are using pain-relieving drugs "appropriately" and in accordance with "professionally acceptable standards." This was congress' intent and the System is, in fact, the only means by which APHIS can obtain such information on a regular and cost-effective basis. Effective administration of the Reporting System, therefore, is crucial to enforcement of this most important provision of the Animal Welfare Act. We therefore undertook an analysis of the reports from 1,211 facilities for FY 1979.

We conclude from the analysis that the Reporting System, as presently administered, fails to achieve its primary statutory objective: it does not provide APHIS with information sufficient to demonstrate that researchers have used pain-relieving drugs "appropriately" and in accordance with "professionally acceptable standards." The chief reasons for this failing are (1) regulations and guidelines do not define "pain" or "distress," (2) regulations and guidelines do not adequately define "routine procedures," and (3) regulations and guidelines do not require meaningful explanations for the withholding of pain-relieving drugs in procedures acknowledged to cause pain.

The Reporting System, as presently administered, fails to achieve its secondary, but nonetheless important—objective: it does not generate reliable and meaningful information to the public about the use of animals in research. When congress passed the Animal Welfare Act amendments in 1970, it declared that animals used in research "deserve the care and protection of a strong and enlightened public" (H. Rep. No. 91-1651, 91st Cong., reprinted in, (1970) U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 5103, 5104—emphasis added). The analysis also revealed serious transcription errors, involving tens of thousands of animals, by APHIS staff.

**Statement of the Problem**

Current regulations and guidelines do not define "pain" or "distress." Without such definitions, researchers appear to apply conflicting standards, in interpreting these terms.

Current regulations require research facilities to report annually to APHIS on the use of animals in "actual research, testing, or experimentation," and to indicate which tests involved "accompanying pain or distress to the animals" (9 CFR 2.28(a)). APHIS supplies researchers with a specific form for submitting the Annual Report ("Annual Report of Research Facility"). VS Form 18-23) and has also issued instructions for completing the Report form ("Instructions for Submitting the Research Facility Annual Re-