Animals are kept intensively to produce meat, milk and eggs. Intensive farming has made food cheaper, but is it kind to animals? Should hens live in cages? Should pigs live in stalls? Should calves live in crates?

This booklet describes the history of political campaigns for the welfare of farm animals. It shows how animal welfare groups have campaigned locally, nationally, in Europe and internationally to improve the welfare of farm animals. It describes how systems such as the battery cage, the sow stall and the veal crate are now being banned in Europe as a result of these campaigns. There is also discussion of current campaigns concerning live animal exports and the reform of World Trade Organisation rules.

Most important of all is a list of the websites of organisations offering a range of viewpoints on these issues. We hope these will help you to form your own view of how we can develop methods of producing foods that people want to eat in ways which are fair to farmers, kind to animals and good for the environment.

**THE VEAL CRATE**

This calf is in a veal crate. He is kept on his own, unable to turn around, for most of his life. This system was banned in Britain in 1990, and will be illegal throughout the European Union in 2007.

Read on to find more examples of campaigns for farm animal welfare. Decide for yourself how you think we should keep farm animals. What responsibility do we all have as consumers for the ways in which farm animals are kept?
Many farm animals are kept intensively. Intensive farming has developed in response to pressure to produce food ever more cheaply. Hens have been placed in battery cages, pregnant pigs in sow stalls, and meat chickens, ducks and turkeys have been crowded into sheds. Chickens have been selectively bred to grow faster, hens to lay more eggs, sows to produce more piglets and cows to produce more milk. The result is cheaper food, but often at a cost to the animals. Is this right?

Look at the examples on these pages and decide how far you agree or disagree with the systems described.

**DISCUSSION ACTIVITY**
Discuss in your group how far you agree or disagree with these farming methods.

---

**Producing chicken indoors**
The picture shows a crowded chicken shed. Chicken meat is cheap because of intensive farming. Is it fair on the animals?

**Rearing pregnant pigs in sow stalls**
At present, most European sows kept indoors spend their pregnancies in sow stalls. The purpose is to make pigs easier to manage. This system is illegal in the UK. It will be phased out throughout the European Union by 2013. The sows cannot turn round. They are caged for months without a break. Is this cruel?

**Producing battery eggs**
Battery eggs are the cheapest to produce. Does this justify crowding the animals into small cages?

---

**Keeping animals in cages or small pens**
Animals kept in small cages use less energy in exercising so they need less food to grow. Their meat, milk or eggs can be cheaper. Exercise is good for an animal’s health. It also makes life more enjoyable. Is it cruel to prevent an animal from behaving naturally?
Selectively breeding chickens to grow faster

If chickens grow faster, the farm can produce more chickens per year and keep costs down.

Yet growing too fast can cause suffering to the chickens. Sometimes their legs cannot support their body weight and many go lame.

Selectively breeding cows to produce more milk

Cows are selectively bred to produce very large quantities of milk. This helps to keep milk cheap.

The cow’s udder may contain over 20 litres of milk at a time. Supporting this weight can make the cow lame. Producing so much milk can cause painful infections in the cow’s udder.

Eating farmed salmon

Salmon are reared in cages in lochs or by the coast. Intensive farming has made salmon cheap to buy.

Salmon swim backwards and forwards in their cages; naturally they would swim hundreds of miles out to sea. Fish faeces, and the chemicals used to prevent disease, pollute the marine environment.

Debeaking hens

Hens kept in crowded conditions often attack and sometimes kill each other. Cutting off the tip of the beak can discourage this.

Debeaking is stressful. It works by making it painful for hens to peck, but pecking is an important activity for hens. One kinder, but more expensive, way of reducing their aggression would be to give them more space.

At the time of writing (June 2002), the UK Parliament is about to debate regulations which will ban routine debeaking from 2011.
Compassion in World Farming (CIWF) started to campaign against the sow stall in the late 1960s. CIWF’s founder, Peter Roberts, argued:

Factory farm animals are deprived of everything that makes life worth living

CIWF printed leaflets and scientific reports arguing for a ban on the sow stall. It organised demonstrations and media stunts, collected nearly a million petition signatures, launched a video called Screaming for Change, conducted letter-writing campaigns and lobbied ministers and MPs. At election time, candidates were asked to support a range of measures to improve the welfare of farm animals.

In response to such pressure, the government set up the Farm Animal Welfare Council (FAWC) in 1979 to advise about welfare standards in UK farming. In 1988 FAWC produced a report recommending that the sow stall should be phased out. The government later announced that it had accepted these recommendations.

In 1990 the MP Sir Richard Body came second in the ballot for Private Members’ Bills in the House of Commons. CIWF urged him to present a Bill against the sow stall. He brought forward a Bill (called the Pig Husbandry Bill) which would ban stall and tether systems over a five-year period. The Bill was supported by MPs from all parties and passed its second reading by 118 votes.

The Bill was withdrawn after the government promised to bring in its own regulations. Sow stalls were to be banned, but over a longer eight-year period (see “key dates” opposite). The campaign continued in Europe. In 2001 the EU Council of Ministers decided to ban the sow stall, except for the first four weeks of pregnancy.

RESEARCH ACTIVITY

You can look up debates in the House of Commons as far back as 1988. Log on to the website www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm/cmhansard.htm and search for debates for a particular date. The second reading of the Pig Husbandry Bill was 25 Jan 1991.
Key dates of campaign against the sow stall

1967  CIWF formed by dairy farmer Peter Roberts to campaign against factory farming systems such as the sow stall.
1979  Government sets up Farm Animal Welfare Council (FAWC) to advise on farm animal welfare issues.
1988  FAWC publishes report recommending a phase-out of stall and tether systems for keeping sows.
1989  Government announces that it accepts the recommendations of FAWC’s report.
1990  Sir Richard Body MP presents Private Member’s Bill to Parliament to phase out sow stalls (and tether systems) over a five-year period.
1991  Bill fails, but government presents its own Bill to phase out sow stalls and tether systems over an eight-year period. Campaigns against the sow stall continue in the European Union.
1999  Sow stalls and tether systems illegal throughout UK.
2001  EU Council of Ministers decides that sow stalls will be banned in 2013, but announces that the ban will not apply for the first four weeks of each pregnancy.

The value of scientific research in campaigning

Scientific research can be crucial in persuading politicians to act. Just before the debate on the sow stall, several scientific studies suggested that the sow stall was cruel. Campaigners publicised this research.

During the debate in Parliament on the banning of the sow stall, the government’s junior agriculture minister David Maclean supported the Bill, quoting from the scientific evidence as follows:

“Pigs in stalls showed increased amounts of stereotyped behaviour such as licking and biting of the stalls and a higher incidence of aggressive actions. Physiological measurements taken from the pigs indicated that they were showing a chronic stress response as a result of confinement. Sows subjected to this stress were considered by one author to be suffering from clinical neurosis … Increased incidence of urinary infection and lameness in closely confined pigs has also been recorded.”

Later, when the government brought in its own legislation to ban the sow stall, it used the evidence provided by science to justify its action. Many people think it should be obvious that the sow stall is cruel, but it helps to have scientific evidence to back up campaigns!

RESEARCH ACTIVITY

Research other campaigns for pig welfare. These include farrowing crates, fattening pigs, tail docking, provision of straw etc
**The Ban on the Battery Cage - An Example of a European Campaign**

**Hens like to**
- stretch their wings
- peck around for seeds and worms
- bathe in dust to remove grease from their feathers
- lay their eggs in a nest (a powerful maternal behaviour)
- and perch at night
- but they can’t in a small cage

**The battery cage**

Most laying hens live in battery cages. It is the cheapest way of producing eggs, but is it kind to hens?

In a battery system, hens get less space than this A4 page. Four or five are crammed into a small cage without the space to stretch their wings. Lack of exercise is bad for their health. They are unable to perch at night, peck the ground, bathe in dust to clean themselves or lay their eggs in a nest. All of these are important to hens.

**Campaigns against the battery cage**

The campaigns started with a book called *Animal Machines*. The author, Ruth Harrison, wrote about what she saw as the cruelty of systems like the battery cage and veal crate. She believed animals were being treated as machines, not as sensitive living beings. The book caused a storm. The government set up the Brambell Commission to report into intensive animal farming. In 1967, ex-dairy farmer Peter Roberts set up Compassion in World Farming (CIWF) to campaign against factory farming methods.

Change takes time. Over the next two decades the battery system continued to spread, but the issue was on the map. Years of demonstrations, media stunts, petition signings, letter and postcard campaigns continued to bring the battery cage issue to public attention.

**Campaigns go to Europe**

By the late 1990s, factory farming was a major issue throughout most of the European Union, especially in the North. CIWF formed an alliance with welfare groups throughout Europe called the European Coalition for Farm Animals (*ECFA*). The RSPCA formed a similar alliance called *Eurogroup for Animal Welfare.*
The European Commission was persuaded to produce a report. In 1998 it proposed that the size of the battery cage should be increased. Instead of 450 sq cm each, battery hens would get 800 sq cm of space each – about the same as one and a half pieces of A4 paper.

Many animal welfare groups were disappointed that the Commission didn’t recommend a ban. However, the campaign was now rolling!

Animal welfare groups lobbied Members of the European Parliament (MEPs). All over Europe, animal welfare supporters were urged to write to their MEPs calling for a ban on the battery cage. Animal welfare groups are famously good at this – MPs and MEPs often get more mail on animal issues than any other! CIWF staff lobbied individual MEPs. Film of cruel conditions in battery farms, taken by CIWF investigators acting undercover, was shown on TV.

The MEPs voted on an amendment to ban the battery cage. The result - 228 for a ban; 152 against; 15 abstentions.

However, the MEPs do not decide. The real decisions are made by the Council of Agriculture Ministers. Furthermore, with the ministers a qualified majority is required.

It takes more than two thirds of the votes to pass any measure.

Lobbying the Council of Agriculture Ministers

The agriculture ministers were due to meet in Luxembourg in June 1999. Major campaigns were organised throughout Europe:

- ministers were lobbied by campaign groups
- 150,000 postcards were distributed to animal welfare supporters to send to the Minister of Agriculture
- opinion polls were organised in many countries across Europe. These demonstrated huge support for a battery cage ban
- media stunts were organised
- leaflets, booklets and a scientific report were published making the case against battery cages

Calendar of events

1964 Ruth Harrison publishes book Animal Machines – The New Factory Farming Industry, starting the debate about systems such as the battery cage and veal crate.
1965 Government sets up Brambell Commission to investigate factory farming.
1967 Compassion in World Farming (CIWF) set up to campaign against factory farming methods such as the battery cage. Pressure built up in the UK, and Europe, over the next two decades of campaigning.
1981 UK House of Commons Agriculture Committee publishes report recommending a five-year phase-out of the battery cage throughout Europe.
1996 European Commission’s Scientific Veterinary Committee concludes that the battery cage has inherent severe disadvantages for the welfare of hens.
1998 EU Commission proposes that battery cages be enlarged from 450 to 800 square centimetres.
1999 European Parliament votes for a ban on the battery cage.
1999 European Council of Agriculture Ministers votes to phase out the battery cage by 2012.
Most agriculture ministers expressed support for the ban. However, France, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Italy and Greece were against. These six countries had more than enough votes to block the move.

An Italian campaigner took his life in his hands. He went on hunger and thirst strike in Rome. He threatened not to eat or drink till the Italian government changed its position. Two days later, the Italian government announced they would support a ban.

Campaign pressure mounted on the remaining five countries. There was a food crisis in Belgium. Poisonous dioxins were found in factory farmed chickens. The political climate was changing. It was not a good time for ministers to be seen to support intensive farming.

Major international demonstrations were organised across Europe. Cakes made using free-range eggs were ceremoniously handed in to embassies and ministers. Hetty the hen joined in.

Adverts appeared in newspapers throughout the Southern countries calling for change, such as this one in Le Monde addressed to French agriculture minister Jean Glavany:

*Monsieur Glavany a la clé*  
(“Mr Glavany has the key”)

The ministers voted: thirteen for a ban; one against; one abstention. From 2012 it will be illegal to keep a hen in the kind of battery cage which is currently used.

Meanwhile, most hens are still kept in battery cages. However, more and more consumers are choosing to buy free-range.

Animal welfare groups will continue to campaign:

- against imports of battery eggs from the rest of the world
- against the “enriched battery cage” which will still be allowed under the new rules
- to persuade supermarkets not to sell battery eggs
- for better conditions for laying hens in all farming systems that produce eggs

Germany has recently announced that it will ban the traditional battery cage in 2006 and the enriched cage in 2012.
How European legislation on agriculture works

The Commission proposes

The Parliament votes

The Ministers decide

Nothing can happen unless the European Commission makes a proposal. The Commission is made up of one or two appointed commissioners from each country. Once they have made a proposal, the European Parliament (made up of MEPs from each EU country) can vote to change it, but the Parliament’s view is advisory. It can be ignored. The final decision is made by the Council of Ministers, meeting in secret. In the case of farming this group is made up of the agriculture ministers of each country.

Organisations campaigning for change have to start by lobbying the Commission to produce a proposal. MEPs and ministers are also lobbied at this stage to help build up pressure on the Commission. Once the Commission have proposed, MEPs are lobbied and then finally ministers.

This is all very complicated! It requires great international co-operation, but it can pay enormous dividends. The ban on the battery cage should affect the lives of 250 million laying hens each year.

RESEARCH ACTIVITY

The traditional battery cage will be banned throughout the EU in 2012. However, a new “enriched” cage will still be allowed. Search websites to find out more about the enriched cage. Do you think it will provide for the needs of hens?
A Global Issue - The World Trade Organisation (WTO) and Animal Welfare

Campaigning at a world level

The picture shows a battery cage in the United States. Count the heads – you should find nine. Battery hens, in the US, only get 310-350 square centimetres of space each, even less than EU hens are allowed. Should we have to import eggs from hens kept in cages such as these?

We live in a global economy. Most industrial economies have signed up to the rules of the World Trade Organisation (WTO). The WTO insists on free trade. EU governments must allow imports of meat, eggs and dairy products from the rest of the world.

Britain’s farmers and animal welfare groups are both campaigning, sometimes together, to get the WTO rules changed. Both groups argue that we should be able to ban the import of meat and eggs produced in systems which have been banned in the EU to prevent cruelty to animals.

Farmers are worried that cheap imports will put many of them out of business. Caring for animals can cost money. Laws to protect animals in the UK or Europe could help to suck in cheap, but cruel, imports from abroad. Farmers want a “level playing field” in which producers all over the world follow similar rules to protect the rights of workers, the environment and the welfare of animals. This would help to make trade fairer as well as freer.

Animal welfare groups campaign for laws to protect animals. They are particularly concerned that WTO rules discourage such laws. They want to change WTO rules to allow countries to prevent cruel imports. They also believe that, if WTO rules can be changed, countries outside the EU will be encouraged to improve their welfare rules to meet our standards. Animals throughout the world will benefit.

Free trade rules can be challenged

Sea turtles are often killed by fishing boats trawling for shrimps. All species of sea turtle are in danger of extinction. Some species land on American beaches to lay their eggs.

The rest of the year they travel the globe. The US decided to ban the import of shrimps from countries which used fishing methods which drowned turtles.

The US was taken to the WTO dispute panel for breaching free trade rules. The US was ordered to repeal the ban.

The US appealed to the WTO Appellate Board. It ruled that the US had a case, but its laws were not drafted fairly. The appeal was dismissed.

The US then modified its laws to make them fair. It provided aid and information for shrimp trawlermen to fit turtle excluder devices on their nets. Malaysia took the US back to the WTO, but this time the US won. The WTO ruled that the US could now ban shrimps from countries which used turtle-unfriendly fishing methods. Malaysia appealed against this decision, but at the fourth hearing the US won again.

This means that WTO rules will sometimes allow import bans where rules are applied fairly. However, the sea turtle case involved animals in danger of extinction. The WTO would probably still prevent an import ban aimed at improving the welfare of farm animals.

Animal welfare groups and farmers believe that WTO rules should be changed to take the welfare of all animals into account, not just those threatened with extinction.
**Do WTO rules discourage kinder laws?**

Meat chickens (known as broilers) can suffer terribly from leg problems. They have been bred to grow faster to reduce the cost of chicken meat, but often grow so fast that their health suffers. Each year many millions are thought to suffer leg pain. Millions more die of heart and lung problems connected with their huge demand for oxygen to fuel fast growth.

They suffer from overcrowding as they reach their slaughter weight. This restricts exercise (which would be good for their legs). Crowding also results in the build-up of ammonia from their droppings. This causes blisters on their breasts, feet and legs.

Animal welfare groups are campaigning for improved conditions for broilers. They want controls both on overcrowding and on growth rates to prevent suffering.

Some farmers’ groups think controls should wait till WTO rules are changed. Increasing proportions of chicken meat are now imported into Europe from countries such as Brazil and Thailand that don’t have many laws controlling farm animal welfare. Farmers are concerned that rules to protect meat chickens could simply export more of the production abroad. In fact, farmers in all parts of the world suffer from the same problem – effectively, current free trade rules make it harder for campaigners to change the law to help farm animals.

Animal welfare groups argue that it would be wrong to wait for the rest of the world. Most farm animals are meat chickens! Over 800 million are slaughtered each year in the UK alone. Animal welfare groups also believe that improvements in EU standards will increase pressure for reform of WTO rules and that campaign groups in the rest of the world will be encouraged by progress made in the EU.

**Lobbying other international organisations**

A range of international bodies such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) of the United Nations, the World Bank and the OIE (Office International des Epizooties or World Organisation for Animal Health) make decisions which affect animal welfare. For example, the World Bank might lend money to corporations setting up factory farms in less economically developed countries. Pressure groups such as CIWF now lobby such organisations regularly to include animal welfare criteria in their policies.

**Campaigning also happens at a local level**

Campaigning can work at all levels. New factory farms often require planning permission. Local animal welfare groups will often object to such proposals.

As you will have seen in this booklet, animal welfare organisations like CIWF campaign locally, nationally, in Europe and internationally against cruelty to farm animals.
Increasing numbers of animals are kept free-range. This means they are kept outside, or allowed outside some of the time. Some free-range animals, especially cattle, are kept indoors during the winter. Free-range hens and chickens are kept indoors at night to protect them from foxes.

Other animals are kept indoors in semi-intensive systems which provide more space. The animals may be kept on materials like straw which allow them to perform some of their natural behaviours.

**Organic farming of animals**

Organic farmers don’t use pesticides, insecticides or herbicides. They avoid the use of drugs like antibiotics wherever possible. They believe that all of this is good for the environment and for human and animal health.

Organic animals must have access to the outdoors for most of their lives.

**Free-range animals**

*Free-range pigs*

*Free-range meat chickens*

*Most free-range hens are kept more intensively than this. Look out for “kept in small groups” or “given tree cover” on the label.*

*Sheep mostly live free-range in most parts of the world. British beef breeds of cattle usually live outside – this is not always true abroad.*

**Semi-intensive systems**

*Some indoor systems have been adapted to meet more of the behavioural needs of farm animals than intensive systems.*
This is a statistic often quoted by farmers. If consumers always go for the cheapest meat, milk and eggs, farmers cannot make a living by producing kinder food. To become more efficient, they must do one or more of the following:

- increase the number of animals looked after by each worker
- crowd the animals closer together
- breed animals which grow faster

All of these can increase animal suffering. Of course, keeping the animals in better conditions can also make them grow better, but in general cheap food is less likely to be kind food.

Many farmers say they would like to keep their animals in more humane conditions, if only they could be sure of getting a better price for their products.

In truth, more people are now buying free-range and organic food. Over 30% of fresh eggs sold in many UK supermarkets come from non-caged systems, even though battery eggs are cheaper. Can we persuade more than 30%? Can people be persuaded to buy other free-range or organic animal products?

Consumers drive the pace of intensive farming:

It can work like this:

A shopper buys the cheapest meat
The supermarket drives down the price it pays to farmers
The farmer must become more intensive to make a living. This can increase animal suffering.

The farmer produces food more cheaply
The supermarket drives the price even lower
The farmer has to become still more intensive and so it continues …
Research a range of views on farm animal welfare issues
(individual or group activity)

- Should hens be kept in battery cages?
- Should meat chickens be confined in crowded sheds?
- Should poor people be expected to pay more for kinder food?
- Can our hard-pressed farmers cope with more legislation?
- Should we eat meat at all?

These are controversial issues. It is important to realise that people disagree about the questions raised in this booklet. It is vital to understand why people disagree.

On this page there are lists of websites of organisations from a range of different viewpoints. Use these sites to investigate views on one or more of the topics raised in this booklet. Do these views change any of your opinions?

Topics to research
Use this booklet, the library or the internet to research one or more topics from this list:
- Battery hens
- Alternative methods of egg production
- Broiler (meat) chickens
- Free-range or organic broilers
- Sow stalls
- Farrowing crates
- Fattening pigs
- Tail docking of piglets
- Castration of piglets
- Outdoor pig rearing systems
- Organic versus conventional dairy farming
- Selective breeding of farm animals
- Intensive turkey production
- Intensive duck production
- Free-range or organic ducks and turkeys
- Pate de foie gras
- Veal production
- Barley beef
- Suckler beef
- Intensive salmon farming
- Organic salmon farming
- Trout farming
- Live exports of sheep, pigs, horses or cattle

Animal Welfare Groups:
Advocates for Animals (Scottish animal welfare group)
www.advocatesforanimals.org.uk
Compassion in World Farming www.ciwf.org
Humane Slaughter Association www.hsa.org.uk
Humane Society of the United States www.hsus.org
Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals wwwrspca.org.uk
Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals www.scottishspca.org
World Animal Net www.worldanimal.net (links to animal groups worldwide)

Animal Rights and Vegetarian Groups:
Animal Aid www.animalaid.org.uk
International Vegetarian Union www.ivu.org
(links to vegetarian groups worldwide)
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) www.peta-online.org (links to several US animal rights sites)
PETA Ltd www.peta.org.uk
Vegan Society www.vegan society.com
Vegan Village www.vegan village.co.uk
Vegetarian Society www.vegsoc.org
VIVA! (Vegetarian International Voice for Animals) www.viva.org.uk

Environmental Organisations
Friends of the Earth www.foe.org.uk
Greenpeace www.greenpeace.org.uk
World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF-UK) www.wwf-uk.org

Farming Organisations
Country Land and Business Association www.cla.org.uk
Farmers Union of Wales www.fuw.org.uk
Federation of City Farms and Community Gardens www.farmgarden.org.uk
Food and Farming Education Service www.foodandfarming.org
Meat and Livestock Commission www.mlc.org.uk
National Farmers Union www.nfu.org.uk
Soil Association (association for organic farming) www.soilassociation.org.uk

NOTE TO TEACHERS
For an activity which analyses attitudes to farm animals from a range of different philosophical viewpoints (including animal welfare, animal rights, sustainable development and “humans come first”) try the Personality Test from the Farm Animals & Us Teachers’ Pack.
Campaign methods
*(small group discussion activity)*

One person in the group should keep a list of ideas.

1. Brainstorm a list of methods used in campaigning for farm animals.
2. Add to your list by carefully going through this booklet. You could obtain further ideas by looking on websites. Try to produce as long a list as possible!
3. Discuss the methods chosen. Which do you think are the most effective? Are there any methods which you think should not be used?
4. Choose a campaign. Decide which type of organisation you will be campaigning for. Design one or more campaign materials, e.g., poster, leaflet, press release, badge or sticker. Advanced activity: make a plan for a whole campaign, including lists of campaign materials required.

Press releases
*(group or individual activity)*

If you want to get into the newspapers or on the TV you will probably need to write a press release.

Activities:

1. Search the Internet for examples of press releases. These are sometimes called media releases or news releases. You will find several on CIWF’s website. For a range of press releases from organisations from different viewpoints, try the National Farmers Union, VIVA! or Friends of the Earth. In fact most of the websites listed on the page opposite contain press releases. If there isn’t a heading under *press releases*, try *news* or *media*. Sometimes there is a heading called archive or news archive for old press releases.
2. Print off the most interesting example from each website and decide which you think are the most effective.
3. Make a list of the characteristics which you think make for a good press release.
4. Choose a subject for a press release and write one!

Write a letter to a politician

Whatever your view about the intensive farming of animals, writing to MPs and MEPs is an effective way of getting your voice heard. For every letter an MP receives, they will probably assume that another 20 people meant to write.

Letters should be short, polite, and to the point. Research the websites listed on the page opposite to back up your arguments with facts.

If you don’t know who your MP is, try the website [www.locata.co.uk/commons/](http://www.locata.co.uk/commons/). This website will also give your MP’s email address if they have one. You can contact your MP in writing at the House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA.

You can find out who your MEPs are and their contact details from the website [www.europarl.org.uk/uk_meps](http://www.europarl.org.uk/uk_meps). Each region of the UK is represented by several MEPs of different parties. It is ok to write to one MEP, to one from each party or to all the MEPs who represent your region.

Lobby groups also organise letter-writing campaigns to other politicians including UK and European ministers, to newspapers (local and national), to supermarkets and to other organisations.

Research the policies of the main political parties

Use a search engine to access the websites of the main political parties. Find out if they publish policies on farm animal welfare. The key word list may be helpful. If you can’t find the relevant policy on their website, write them a letter or send them an email.

Get involved in letter writing campaigns

Contact the pressure group/s you wish to support to see if they run letter-writing campaigns. For example, paid-up supporters of CIWF receive a quarterly magazine called Farm Animal Voice which contains an Action Section which includes letter writing ideas. CIWF also runs a Compassionate Campaigners supporters list which sends out free newsletters to active supporters.
Live Animal Exports - A Current Campaign

This lorry contains sheep bound for slaughter. They could be travelling to Holland, France, Belgium, Spain, Italy or Greece. Journeys to Greece, excluding breaks, can take as long as 80 hours.

Long journeys to slaughter can be distressing. Sometimes things go badly wrong and animals die. CIWF, and other animal welfare groups, are campaigning for an eight-hour limit on journeys.

There were major demonstrations against live exports in the mid ‘90s. Passenger ferries were persuaded not to carry animal trucks. Many docks were blockaded – some stopped allowing animals through.

Live exports continue, though public pressure against the export of live calves to veal crates resulted in a Europe-wide ban on this system of keeping calves from 2007 (see front page).

In 2001 the European Parliament voted for journeys for slaughter or further fattening to be limited to eight hours or 500 km.

At the time of writing (June 2002) a proposal by the European Commission is awaited. Then the Parliament will vote and the Ministers will decide. Pressure groups on both sides of this campaign will be lobbying politicians across Europe.

Go to CIWF’s website on www.ciwf.org for updates on this story.