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The Rt Hon Nicholas Edwards MP
Secretary of State for Wales

The Farm Animal Welfare Council decided in 1980 to undertake a comprehensive review of the welfare of livestock, including poultry, at the time of slaughter. The first stage of that review was completed in January 1982 with the publication of our report on the slaughter of poultry; the second and more extensive stage was completed in June 1984 with the publication of the report on the welfare of red meat animals at the time of slaughter. We have now completed the final stage with our review on religious slaughter practices and I have pleasure in submitting the Council’s report which should be read in conjunction with the previous reports.

Our review was undertaken by a small Working Group of Council members. The findings and recommendations of that Group, which have been endorsed by the Council, form the basis of this report. We have concentrated primarily on specific aspects of religious slaughter as they relate to the Jewish and Muslim slaughter methods which are used in Great Britain. We have also commented on Sikh slaughter.

During our review we have found a widespread lack of understanding of why religious slaughter is considered necessary and how it is carried out — even among some members of the Jewish and Muslim faiths. In this report we have endeavoured to provide up-to-date factual information on the practices concerned, the religious background and why it is carried out.

Our recommendations fall into two categories — those for immediate action in order to improve present practices and the longer-term more substantial recommendations concerning the fundamental issues of religious slaughter. We must emphasise that our only concern in our review of religious slaughter practices has been the welfare of the animal.

I very much hope that you will be able to proceed with consideration of our proposals and consultation on our short-term recommendations as quickly as possible and that action will be initiated with the religious communities at an early date to implement our longer-term proposals leading to changes within three years which we believe to be in the interests of all.

Professor Sir Richard Harrison
Chairman — Farm Animal Welfare Council
Introduction

1. The welfare of livestock at the time of slaughter was the first enquiry which the Council initiated into animal welfare within its terms of reference, which are: 'to keep under review the welfare of farm animals on agricultural land, at markets, in transit and at the place of slaughter and to advise Agriculture Ministers of any legislative or other changes which may be necessary'. The report on the first stage of the slaughter enquiry, on the welfare of poultry, was published in January 1982; the second stage was completed with the publication in June 1984 of the report on red meat animals. This report on religious slaughter practices therefore completes our slaughter review exercise with the exception of a special review we are still pursuing on the slaughter of day-old chicks.

2. The religious slaughter review was undertaken by a Working Group of five Council members (see Appendix A). The findings and recommendations contained in this report, which have been endorsed by the full Council, are therefore substantially based on the comprehensive enquiry undertaken by the Working Group. During the course of this review, members visited five red meat slaughterhouses in Great Britain and one in Northern Ireland (three Halal (Muslim) and three Shechita (Jewish) — two of which were visited twice) and seven poultry slaughterhouses (two Halal and five Shechita — two of which were visited twice) to observe religious slaughter. Additional visits have been undertaken by some members but not as a formal part of the review exercise. Although the number of premises visited represents only a small proportion of slaughterhouses which carry out Halal and Shechita slaughter (see para. 23) and pre-arranged visits may not in some cases have given a fair representation of normal working conditions nevertheless the premises selected for visits were considered to have given members as realistic an impression of slaughtering activities as was possible in the circumstances. One of the slaughterhouses visited was newly-constructed and designed and operated only for Shechita slaughter of cattle and sheep and can therefore be assumed to have provided an example of Jewish slaughter facilities at their best. The Group also met and took oral evidence from leading representatives of the Jewish, Muslim and Sikh faiths during the course of the review. The Meat Research Institute (MRI) at Langford was visited specifically to discuss aspects of religious slaughter.

3. The slaughter methods we have considered are frequently referred to as 'ritual' or 'religious'. We have been examining the methods commonly in use by
Jews and Muslims and have also considered Sikh slaughter practices. For the purposes of this report we are using the term 'religious slaughter' to cover all such practices. This report concentrates primarily on specific aspects of religious slaughter as they relate to the Jewish (Shechita) and Muslim (Halal) slaughter methods which are used in Great Britain. Although we understand that the Sikh method of slaughter (Jhatka) is not practised in the UK, apart possibly from some limited slaughter of poultry carried out on private premises, we have had discussions during our review with representatives of the International Supreme Council of Sikhs in Great Britain and have therefore commented on this method of slaughter in our report (see paragraph 87).

4. The Council's report on Red Meat Animals makes recommendations on many matters which also have a bearing on the religious slaughter practices, e.g. design of slaughterhouses, lairing and handling of livestock, licensing, supervision and training of slaughtermen, and stunning practices. In addition the Council's report on Poultry Slaughter made recommendations on matters such as crate design and pre-slaughter holding and handling, which are again very relevant to this review.

5. In the initial stages of the reviews on poultry and red meat animals at slaughter, the Council publicised its proposed work and invited submissions on the subject, both from interested organisations and from members of the public. Many submissions and letters were received in response (see Appendix B). A high proportion of the 106 letters from the public related solely to religious slaughter practices, particularly for red meat animals and to a lesser extent for poultry, and all these expressed concern about the practice.

6. During our review we have found that there is a widespread lack of understanding of why religious slaughter is considered necessary and how it is carried out — even among some members of the Jewish and Muslim faiths. It is nevertheless a subject on which people from all walks of life and different faiths hold strong views and many people (including some livestock producers and slaughtermen) object to it. In this report we have endeavoured to provide factual information about the practices concerned, the religious background and relevant legislation, and the impressions gained from our enquiries and observations.

SECTION 1

Legislation

7. The Slaughterhouses Act 1974 requires that no animal may be slaughtered in a slaughterhouse unless it is either:
   (a) slaughtered instantaneously by means of a mechanically-operated instrument in proper repair;
   or
   (b) stunned prior to slaughter so that it is instantaneously rendered insensible to pain until death occurs, by means either of a mechanically-operated
instrument (such as a captive bolt pistol or percussion stunner) or of electricity or of some other means prescribed in regulations. (The use of carbon dioxide gas for stunning pigs has since been approved under this provision.)

There is an exemption from the requirements of (a) and (b) above in the case of animals slaughtered by the Jewish or Mohammedan (Muslim) method for the food of Jews or Muslims respectively, provided slaughter is carried out without the infliction of unnecessary suffering by a Jew licensed for the purpose by the Rabbinic Commission or by a Muslim. The Act further provides that slaughter and stunning may only be carried out by a person licensed for the purpose by a local authority; this requirement applies to all slaughter, including religious slaughter.

8. Under the Slaughter of Animals (Prevention of Cruelty) Regulations 1958 no adult bovine may be slaughtered by the Jewish or Muslim method unless it is restrained in a casting pen of the Weinberg, Dyne or North British Rotary type or some other type approved by Ministers. To date Ministers have not issued approvals for any other type. (Appendix F provides information and illustration of casting pens).

9. The Slaughter of Poultry Act 1967 provides that all poultry (domestic fowl, turkeys, ducks, geese, guinea fowl and quail) slaughtered must either:
   (a) be slaughtered instantaneously by dislocation of the neck or decapitation or some other method approved by Ministers (to date no other methods have been approved); or
   (b) stunned using an approved instrument so that they are instantaneously rendered insensible to pain until death occurs. Stunning is normally carried out electrically.

Again there is an exemption for slaughter by the Jewish or Muslim method for the food of Jews or Muslims respectively, provided it is carried out without the infliction of unnecessary suffering by a Jew licensed for the purpose by the Rabbinic Commission, or by a Muslim.

10. All red meat slaughterhouses must be licensed (‘registered’ in Scotland) by the local authority (unless they are operated by the local authority). Poultry slaughterhouses must be licensed by the local authority under the Poultry Meat (Hygiene) Regulations 1976, with the exception of slaughterhouses selling their own birds locally (e.g. at the farm gate); however under the Slaughter of Poultry Act all poultry slaughterhouses where stunning is undertaken must be registered with the local authority, whether or not they are licensed under the hygiene regulations. There are however no requirements in national legislation for additional licensing for slaughterhouses — either red meat or poultry — which undertake religious slaughter. Extracts of the slaughter legislation are provided at Appendix C. Although reference has been made only to legislation applying in England and Wales, with the exception of the Slaughter of Poultry Act which applies throughout Great Britain, it should be noted that equivalent legislation also applies in Scotland.

Historical background to the legislation
were confirmed by the Local Government Board and those relating to welfare contained a requirement for animals to be ‘effectually stunned’. In January 1904, a Committee was set up by the Admiralty to ‘ascertain the most humane and practicable methods of slaughtering animals for human food and to investigate and report upon the existing slaughterhouse system’.

12. As a result of their investigations, the 1904 Committee produced a report, which was subsequently presented to Parliament, which contained a number of important recommendations, of which the first was that all animals, without exception, should be stunned or otherwise rendered unconscious before they were killed. Further recommendations related to the design of slaughterhouses, the licensing of slaughtermen and uniform standards of slaughtering.

13. The 1904 Committee, having given consideration to the Jewish method of slaughter used at the time, expressed concern about the operation of casting the animal, usually by means of ropes, and the effort needed to position the animal’s head correctly. They considered that the method was difficult, painful and objectionable from a humanitarian point of view, and that the subsequent operation of throat cutting was an uncertain method of producing unconsciousness. They recommended that until some method was devised of rendering the animal unconscious prior to casting, the system should not be permitted in any establishment under Government control. This report was followed in 1908 by a circular issued by the Local Government Board to all Borough, Urban and Rural District Councils, which provided inter alia that the 1904 Committee’s recommendations on stunning should be implemented as considered necessary by means of byelaws, but that stunning should not be obligatory where slaughter was carried out by a Jew, licensed by the Chief Rabbi, provided no unnecessary suffering was inflicted.

14. The requirement for pre-slaughter stunning of horses, cattle, sheep and goats was first introduced in national legislation by the Slaughter of Animals (Scotland) Act 1928. The Act contained exemptions for both Jewish and Muslim slaughter (the latter exemption having been added during the passage of the Bill through Parliament primarily to meet the case of shipping manned by Lascar crews coming to British ports). Both exemptions contained the proviso that no unnecessary suffering should be inflicted.

15. The Scottish Act was followed in England and Wales by the Slaughter of Animals Act 1933 which was similar to the Scottish legislation but in addition introduced a requirement for the stunning of pigs.

16. The requirement for a casting pen in the 1958 Regulations (see paragraph 8) was introduced in order to control practices of restraint which were considered unacceptable on welfare grounds. There is however so far as we know nothing in the religious requirements themselves which indicates that animals must be cast before throat cutting.

Legislation and practices in other countries

17. In the European Community exemptions from the stunning requirements for religious slaughter of poultry and animals are given in Directive 74/577/EEC on Stunning of Animals before Slaughter — Article 4 — which states that ‘The
present Directive does not affect national provisions related to special methods of slaughter which are required for particular religious rites', and in Directive 71/118/EEC on Health problems affecting Trade in Fresh Poultry Meat — Annex I, Chapter V, which provides that 'Poultry brought into slaughter premises must be slaughtered immediately after stunning. However, stunning may be omitted if it is forbidden by a religious rite'. The European Convention for the Protection of Animals for Slaughter also permits exemption from the general stunning requirement in the case of religious slaughter.

18. The law in this country was originally designed to meet the needs of the Jewish and Muslim communities living in Great Britain but now involves considerable quantities of meat produced here for export to countries in the Middle East, Asia and Africa from animals slaughtered by Jewish and Muslim methods (see paragraphs 26, 83–85, and Appendix D).

19. The most up-to-date information we have on religious slaughter practices in other countries, including the European Community, is set out in Appendix E.

SECTION 2

Extent of religious slaughter in Great Britain

Observers of the faith

20. We understand that there are about ½ million Jews in Great Britain. 300,000–350,000 are said to be strict observers of the faith and about 80 per cent of these are understood to keep a 'Kosher kitchen', i.e. they adhere strictly to the Jewish rules on the consumption of meat and other foods produced and prepared in accordance with Kosher requirements.

21. The estimated population of Muslims is 1¼ million, the majority being based in cities and locations where there is a high proportion of their fellows. It is impossible to determine with any accuracy how many would regard themselves as strict adherents to particular religious faiths and practices but the strict observers may be said to be fewer than the total population in each case. We were told that the strict observers would refuse to eat meat unless it had been slaughtered by appropriate religious methods.

22. Sikhs are estimated to number around 360,000 in this country. The word 'Sikh' has two meanings, but generally it refers to a person who holds certain beliefs, lives according to these and takes part in certain rites associated with them. However, it may also denote someone who comes from a Sikh family, perhaps wears a turban, speaks Punjabi and is in a cultural sense a Sikh but has ceased to practise the religion. He is a Sikh in terms of identity only. A Sikh is a person who abides by the teaching of the Gurus and keeps it constantly in mind but the practice of the Gurus as far as the consumption of meat is concerned is
Number of animals slaughtered by religious methods in Great Britain

23. Statistics are not kept on the numbers of animals slaughtered by religious methods, though we understand there are some 89 red meat slaughterhouses (16 Shechita, 73 Halal) and some 21 licensed poultry slaughterhouses (8 Shechita, 13 Halal) involved. Religious slaughter of poultry also takes place in premises which are not licensed (see paragraph 10), but it is not possible to estimate the numbers involved. Some of the slaughterhouses undertake both religious and 'non-religious' slaughter and it is not always possible to be certain of the proportion of animals slaughtered by religious methods in these cases. Moreover fluctuations in trade can lead to considerable variations in slaughter levels. However, with those caveats, Agriculture Departments estimate that each year in Great Britain up to 91,200 cattle (54,700 Shechita, 36,500 Halal) and 1,559,000 sheep and goats (28,000 Shechita and 1,531,000 Halal) are slaughtered by religious methods. In addition an average of 220,000 poultry (45,000 Shechita and 175,000 Halal) are estimated to be slaughtered each week by religious methods in licensed poultry slaughterhouses.

24. These figures include animals and poultry slaughtered by the Halal method in premises where stunning is permitted (see paragraph 50). We believe that some 600 cattle and 317,000 sheep and goats annually are stunned before being slaughtered by the Halal method; similarly an average of some 160,500 poultry each week are stunned before Halal slaughter.

Producers' control over destination of livestock

25. As with most marketing of livestock for slaughter, the producer frequently has little knowledge of or control over the eventual destination and slaughter methods used for his stock. Therefore producers will rarely know whether or not their animals are to be slaughtered by religious methods. This is particularly so when animals are sent to market, where they may be bought by an agent acting on behalf of a slaughterhouse. If they wish to be certain of the fate of their animals producers can of course send them direct to a known slaughterhouse which does not undertake religious slaughter, even though this may conflict in some cases with their commercial judgement.

Volume of meat exported which has been obtained from animals slaughtered by religious methods

26. It has not been possible to obtain figures on the volume of export of Shechita and Halal meat, although it is known that some export does take place. Appendix D shows the volume of UK exports of fresh, frozen and chilled meat during the period 1980–1984 to certain Middle Eastern, Asian and African countries most of which will be for the Muslim markets.

Proportion of religiously slaughtered meat sold to non-Jews and non-Muslims

27. Jewish practice requires that all carcases rejected for religious reasons and the hind quarters which are not porged (see paragraph 45) cannot be consumed
as Kosher meat. This means that no more than an estimated third of the weight of all animals slaughtered according to Jewish methods finds its way into Kosher shops and a high proportion of Shechita meat which has been rejected by the Jewish Inspector as being non-Kosher is therefore distributed to the open market. In addition, a considerable quantity of meat produced from animals slaughtered by the Muslim method is sold in non-Halal outlets.

SECTION 3

Religious beliefs, traditions and requirements

28. In Great Britain the slaughter of animals for food is carried out by prescribed methods by Jews and Muslims, and to a very limited extent by the Sikhs, for consumption by members of their communities either in this country or overseas.

29. There is emphasis, in traditional Jewish, Muslim and Sikh teaching, on the need for kindness to and humane treatment of animals, and all three faiths also clearly recognise that the taking of the life of an animal is not something to be taken lightly and carries great responsibility.

30. The Jewish method of slaughtering animals and birds for food (Shechita) is described in detail in paragraphs 42-49. Members of the Jewish faith believe that the precise method is derived from Divine teaching and quote from the law (the Pentateuch, which is the first five books of the Old Testament) as the source: Deuteronomy 12.21: ‘Thou shalt kill of thy herd and of thy flock, which the Lord hath given thee, as I have commanded thee......’. There is no more precise Biblical reference and Divine law is interpreted by Rabbinic oral tradition.

31. The Muslim method of slaughter, which is described in paragraphs 50-54, is similar in both method and derivation to the Jewish method. Muslims believe that Allah (God) has laid down two fundamental principles concerning human health and humaneness to animals; these are embodied in Chapter 4 of the Koran which translated states that ‘You are forbidden to eat that which dies of itself; and blood and swine’s flesh; and that, on which the name of any besides Allah has been invoked; that which has been strangulated, or killed by a blow, or by a fall or by the horns of another beast; and that which has been eaten up by a wild beast except what you shall kill (purify) yourself; that which has been sacrificed on idols......’.

32. The traditional methods of Jewish and Muslim slaughter, and the post-mortem anatomical examinations (paragraph 44) carried out in Jewish practice, stretch far back in history. It is reasonable to assume that they derive from food hygiene requirements in early, nomadic societies.

33. Over centuries, the precise acts associated with slaughter and with post-mortem examination have assumed importance in their own right and can now be said to serve purposes which are of value to those who share particular religious or ethnic allegiances and history. We believe it vitally important...
on their own slaughter and dietary laws and customs, for these substantially contribute to and help to preserve the distinctiveness of the racial and religious groups. This is particularly true for practising Jews, for whom the preparation and taking of food play an important and central part in Jewish family life and for whom a denial of Kosher food is an attack on the distinctive Jewish way of life.

34. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for people who hold to one set of theological and religious categories to persuade others whose categories are dissimilar, in matters of religious practice and interpretation. Many religious Ministers and teachers are concerned to interpret and present truths and principles in ways which are appropriate to contemporary life, believing it to be desirable to maintain principles of religious belief and teaching, whilst adapting practices to changed circumstances, using developed knowledge and techniques to meet, possibly more fully than before, the needs identified in the principles. It is difficult to persuade people to do this however where detailed practices are themselves regarded as sacrosanct or which must be retained as having symbolic significance.

35. We must emphasise that the requirements for the different methods of religious slaughter, which are described in detail in the following paragraphs 36-54, are what we have been given to understand the Jewish and Muslim authorities stipulate. Our own observations and findings are dealt with in paragraphs 55-87 and indicate conclusively that these requirements are not always observed.

Requirements for Jewish (Shechita) slaughter

36. In this country Jews consume beef, veal, mutton, lamb and poultry, provided it is slaughtered and prepared in accordance with the laws of Shechita (known as 'Kosher' meat). Slaughter may only be carried out by an approved slaughterman of the Jewish faith, called a Shochet. He must be a person of recognised high moral character, consistent religious practice, especially trained for the office, possessing a thorough knowledge of the precise rules and regulations of Shechita as well as the condition of the animal's organs. He must also be steady of hand and qualified by examination, certified and officially appointed and subjected to re-examination at frequent intervals by the Ecclesiastical Authorities (the Rabbinic Commission — see Schedule 1 to Appendix C) who alone have the jurisdiction to license a person to exercise the functions of a Shochet. The Shochet is not just a Jewish slaughterman. He is quite often the local Minister and frequently is also a teacher of religion. We are given to understand that there is a period of training of six to seven years, the majority of which is devoted to matters of wider religious significance rather than slaughter practice. The Shochet is not employed by the abattoir in which he serves but is appointed by the local Shechita Board.

Requirements for Muslim (Halal) slaughter

37. Muslims in this country consume mainly mutton, lamb and goat meat and poultry. Some Muslims also eat beef. Islam is the world's most populous faith
and like other religions, the detail of how it is observed and practised varies from
country to country and even within countries. Consequently Muslim slaughter
procedures vary considerably in this country. All Muslims agree, however, on the
two main requirements when animals are slaughtered — the speaking of Allah’s
name at the moment of slaughter and the effective bleeding of the carcase after
slaughter. Animals must not be slaughtered in the presence of their fellows and
must be fed and watered before slaughter.

38. Slaughter can be performed by any Muslim, male or female, who is in
possession of his or her mental faculties and is capable of carrying out the
prescribed procedure. As there is no centralised Muslim board of control for
licensing slaughtermen, no special training is required or given. The only
requirement is that the slaughtermen shall be licensed by the local authority (see
paragraph 7). At the time of making the incision the name of Allah (God) is
pronounced by the Muslim slaughterer. The usual formula is ‘in the name of
Allah, Allah is most great’. This is to remind the slaughterer that he is taking the
life of a living creature; to remind him of his responsibility in observing the
prescribed requirements and to dedicate the animal to Allah. In some cases
purchasers of meat from other countries may provide their own slaughterman.

Requirements for Sikh (Jhatka) slaughter

39. One of the Commandments laid upon a Sikh is that of not eating meat
slaughtered in accordance with Muslim practice and Sikhs who eat meat consider
that the prohibition must be seen as permitting the eating of meat from animals
slaughtered at a stroke (i.e. decapitation) and not bled to death. In discussion
with Sikhs it transpired that the majority were prepared to eat meat provided it
was not slaughtered by the Halal method. However, there remain many Sikhs
who will not eat any form of meat. Whilst the cow is not sacred to Sikhs, as a
result of having lived among Hindus, the majority of Sikhs do not eat beef. In this
country, we understand that Sikhs who are not vegetarian do eat mutton and
goat meat (when it can be obtained) and also poultry which has been slaughtered
in the traditional manner.

40. As it stands, the law in this country does not preclude Jhatka slaughter
provided that for red meat animals a mechanical instrument such as a guillotine
is used.

41. In countries where Jhatka is carried out a Sikh priest is present to speak the
name of God over the animal but the man using the sword or knife is not required
to be a Sikh. It is necessary that the head of the animal is severed with a single
stroke. Any Sikh can perform the duties of a priest. Carcases obtained in this
manner are stamped ‘Jhatka’.
SECTION 4

Stated slaughter procedures

Standard Shechita slaughter in Great Britain

42. In accordance with Jewish law, the animal must be healthy at the time of slaughter. It must not have suffered any injury, nor must there be any suspicion of injury, otherwise the meat is ‘treifa’ (not Kosher) and may not be eaten. Similarly, only birds which are completely healthy and good specimens are selected for Shechita. Stunning, which is adjudged to cause physical injury prior to cutting the throat, is therefore unacceptable.

Cattle

43. The animal is restrained before slaughter in a casting pen (see Appendix F) so that it is on its back with its head resting on the ground and in a suitable position for the incision of its throat. The head must be held firmly to prevent the animal contributing to its own death. A single transverse cut (in practice we understand this means an uninterrupted cut) must be made using a reciprocal motion of the knife. The knife is called a ‘Chalaf’. The intention is for the cut to produce an immediate outpouring of blood and this is achieved by severing both jugular veins and both carotid arteries. For cattle, the blade is usually 16in long and must be extremely sharp. The blade edge must be undamaged and is examined before each animal is slaughtered in order to ensure that it is free from the slightest notch or flaw; it is sharpened at frequent intervals on a sharpening stone. (If the knife is damaged, the animal is declared ‘treifa’ and rejected). After the cut has been made, the animal is pulled from the casting pen, shackled by a hind leg and hoisted to continue the bleeding-out process.

44. Once the animal is dead, an incision is made through the abdominal wall and adjacent diaphragm and the Jewish Inspector (who may also be the Shochet) feels at arm’s length into the thorax to check for pleural adhesions or any other signs of abnormality. If any abnormalities are found, the entire carcass is rejected for Jewish consumption on the grounds that the animal was not healthy at the time of slaughter. Instructions for carrying out this inspection are contained in the ‘Talmud’ (Code of Jewish Religious, Civil and Social Law comprising the Mishna and Gemara).

45. In the subsequent process of dressing the carcass, the forequarter meat down to the eleventh rib is separated and stamped. Identifying incisions are also made on the carcass and a metal clip is inserted into the edible offal (tongue and liver) to indicate that the meat has been slaughtered in accordance with Shechita. The hindquarters of the carcass are not consumed by Jews unless they are porged (a process which removes forbidden tissues such as veins, lymphatics and the sciatic nerve and its branches). Porging is a specialised and time consuming skill which has not been practised in this country since the mid 1930s. All hindquarters and any carcasses not accepted for Kosher purposes (see paragraphs 42 and 44) are sold into alternative markets.
46. In addition to the 'post-mortem inspection' carried out by the Jewish Inspector, the carcase is also subjected to the normal inspections carried out by an authorised meat inspector of the local authority.

Sheep

47. Sheep awaiting slaughter are normally kept in a holding pen adjacent to the slaughter area. Before slaughter the wool may be shorn from the neck to ensure that the knife is not blunted by the wool. The sheep is placed manually on its back on to a metal cradle and the neck is held in an extended position by a handler. The downward incision is made with a knife about 12in long which, as with cattle, is tested for flaws and sharpened at frequent intervals. The cut has the same effect as that described in paragraph 43 for cattle and results in an immediate outpouring of blood. The sheep is shackled and hung for bleeding-out.

48. Sheep are also subjected to the same examination of the thorax as cattle, those considered 'unhealthy' at the time of slaughter are rejected for Jewish consumption (see paragraph 44). The acceptable carcases are identified in the same way as cattle to indicate that they have been slaughtered by Shechita. As with cattle, the hindquarters are not used for Jewish consumption and are sold to an alternative market.

Poultry

49. Slaughter of those birds chosen (see paragraph 67) is carried out in processing plants. The live bird is handed to a Shochet. The knife ('Chalaf') must be extremely sharp and flawless. The bird is held under the Shochet's arm and the cut is made by one single downward stroke which is intended to sever the blood vessels. The bird is placed head downwards into a cone to bleed out. Bleeding-out of the bird forms an important part of the religious procedure. After bleeding-out is complete, a Shochet removes and examines the pluck. Following the cleaning and dressing procedures, a metal clip is put into each carcase to indicate that it has been Koshered.

Muslim slaughter methods

50. Some Muslims find stunning acceptable and believe that it does not contravene Muslim teaching. For example, the then Imam of Woking indicated in 1928 that he did not think that the use of the stunner is in any way against the teaching of the Koran or the instructions of the Prophet. This instrument does not kill the animal but merely stuns it. The animal's heart continues to beat for a considerable time after the use of the instrument. Therefore, if after stunning the animal with this instrument, a Muslim slaughters it according to the prescribed law, i.e. cutting the throat while reciting 'Allah Akbar', then owing to the beat of the heart all the blood would be ejected out of the main artery, and the animal will have been properly killed and its meat eatable according to the laws of Islam. We have been advised recently that stunning of the animal before slaughter is still acceptable to some parts of the Muslim faith and does take place in some Muslim
51. As indicated in paragraph 38, there is no centralised Muslim board of control for licensing Muslim slaughtermen and the requirements for Muslim slaughter therefore are not as specific nor as stringent as the requirements for Shechita slaughter which are described in the preceding paragraphs. (See also paragraphs 79–81).

Cattle

52. The animal is either restrained in a form of casting pen or, where stunning is permitted, is stunned in the upright position in a stunning box. The intention is to provide an immediate outpouring of blood and this is achieved by severing both jugular veins and both carotid arteries using a knife. Any knife may be used provided it is sharp and of sufficient length. The knife should be sharpened before each animal is cut.

Sheep and goats

53. Having been brought from the lairage, sheep and goats are restrained individually on their backs or sides on a slaughtering cradle by one or more slaughtermen and the head is pulled back to allow the slaughterman to make the cut. The throat cutting procedure is the same as that described for cattle in paragraph 52 and has the same result.

Poultry

54. Slaughter is carried out in processing plants and in retail premises (where it takes place ‘in penny numbers’). Any birds may be slaughtered by throat cutting, e.g. chickens, turkeys etc. There are no specific procedures but Muslim slaughter is similar to Shechita slaughter. Most Muslims require that the carcase of the bird is skinned before sale.
Part II — Observations and findings on religious slaughter

SECTION 5

General comment

55. Both Jewish and Muslim teachings assert that the welfare and humane treatment of the animal is a matter of paramount importance. In fact the Jews claim that Shechita is the most humane method of slaughter. This is the nub of the argument relating to religious slaughter which brings into question such matters as the time elapsing before loss of consciousness and the disadvantages or otherwise of stunning (see paragraphs 73–76). What we have seen shows that current practice often falls far short of the ideal. This section of the report first identifies particular areas of concern to us and then presents our findings in relation to them. The report then moves on to discuss the major questions of whether we consider religious slaughter practices should be permitted on welfare grounds and if so what changes should be recommended in current practices.

Rotary pens

56. The design of a typical rotary pen is explained at Appendix F. Although rotary casting pens were introduced to reduce the stress imposed on the animal at the time of slaughter (see paragraphs 13 and 16) we found during the course of visits to slaughterhouses that a major cause for concern has been the use of the rotary casting pen for the slaughter of cattle and calves.

57. The animal is already under considerable stress, having been transported to the slaughterhouse, unloaded and housed in a strange environment. We have seen animals make strenuous efforts to avoid going up the approach ramp into the pen. Any animal suddenly enclosed in a confined space can be expected to show signs of fear and distress as we found with the use of traditional stunning pens/boxes in the course of our earlier review of livestock slaughter (paragraphs 101 and 102 of the Report on Red Meat Animals refer). Our observations during this review showed that the animals were no less frightened when entering a casting pen. The rotation of the pen to place the animal on its back is additionally stressful. Any ruminant placed on its back suffers gross discomfort due to the weight and size of the rumen with its contents pressing upon the diaphragm and
was unsatisfactory, particularly the momentum once the rotation had begun, and
the lack of an adequate braking system, which resulted in the pen swinging
initially through more than 180° and rocking backwards and forwards before
stabilising. Apart from the question of actual infliction of pain we are acutely
aware of the terror and discomfort which ensue from the inversion of cattle
followed by forcible extension of the neck, often resulting in the animal banging
its head on the floor. When the pen is in position, the animal's head is usually
restrained by the foot of an operator or by a rope halter; on one occasion because
of the violent movement of the animal's head, two or three operators were
required to hold the head steady before the slaughterman made the incision. On
some occasions we witnessed animals being held in this position for longer than
we found acceptable because the slaughterman was not always ready to do the
cutting. A further disadvantage of rotary pens, although not just a welfare
consideration, was the bruising over the sacro-lumbar and iliac regions seen in
some dressed carcases. This varied from moderate to severe and was entirely
consistent with injury incurred by the violent movements made by the animals
when suddenly turned on their backs. Such bruising was trimmed away by the
Jewish inspectors but was not considered grounds for the rejection of the carcase
as 'non-Kosher'. This bruising was not seen in animals slaughtered in the upright
position.

58. When the rotary casting pen is adapted for the slaughter of calves, the calves
are not held firmly enough and were sometimes seen to get one or both front legs
through the yoke along with the head and neck. It is also possible for calves to
work themselves around into the upright position after the pen has been rotated;
one which we saw in a Jewish slaughterhouse was in fact slaughtered in that
position and the carcase was not rejected for being 'non-Kosher'.

59. We are very concerned that the rotary-type casting pen which was
introduced with the purpose of contributing to the welfare of the animal seems in
the light of experience and subsequent knowledge, to be having quite the
contrary effect. Indeed, we are dissatisfied on welfare grounds about the whole
concept of inversion of the animal. This is unnatural and adds to the existing
distress being experienced by the animal from being in uncongenial, noisy and
unfamiliar surroundings. This distress is further compounded by having its head
restrained on the ground, often by the foot of an operator.

Operation of the Cincinnati pen

60. In the course of our review we visited Northern Ireland to see the ASPCA
(Cincinnati) restraining pen in which the animal is slaughtered in an upright
position. The use of such pens for religious slaughter is not permitted in Great
Britain (see paragraph 8) but several pens, based on the Cincinnati design, are
used for Muslim slaughter in Northern Ireland and we were very impressed with
the manner of their operation. It was evident that the design of the approach race,
which at the premises we visited was curved, was an important feature and
facilitated the entry of the animals into the pen. Detailed information on this pen
is given at Appendix F.

61. In all cases the animals were held upright in the pen and in such a way that the
head and neck were held firmly. The slaughterman appeared to have no more
difficulty carrying out the incision with the animal in this position than with the animal inverted in the rotary pen, although it was obvious that correct positioning of the chin-lift in order to extend the neck into the optimum position is very important. Moreover, the slaughterman should be at such a height to enable him to make the incision with ease.

62. We observed that the combined effects of the belly plate which takes the weight of the animal beneath its brisket and the backplate which moves it forward so that the head is properly positioned in the chin-lift are such that, following the incision, the animal is fully supported as it collapses and does not fall on to the wound so long as it remains in the pen. We must emphasise that the presence of the belly plate is absolutely vital for this process. In addition, the head-stop above the poll of the animal is absolutely essential to prevent over-extension of the neck by the chin-lift.

63. We monitored the period of time from incision of the throat to shackling and hoisting of the animals seen. This varied from 17 seconds to 30 seconds, the majority falling in the 17-18 second range.

64. Although we did not see calves slaughtered in the Cincinnati pen, we understand that a range of adjustments can be made to accept animals of differing sizes.

Handling of sheep

65. We noted that a considerable amount of force needs to be employed in restraining an animal on the slaughtering cradle in order that its throat can be cut and in many cases sheep were slaughtered within sight of their fellows. However, we have been impressed in some instances by the manner in which sheep were carried one at a time by the slaughterman from the lairage pen to the slaughtering cradle where they were slaughtered out of the sight of the others. We have observed sheep being stunned with electric tongs before slaughter by the Muslim method, but we consider that in some cases the length of time the tongs were applied was insufficient to render them unconscious and therefore totally insensible to pain after the cut had been made. Recommendations 29-31 in the Report on Red Meat Animals which relate to the use of stunning equipment apply equally to those premises where animals are slaughtered by the Muslim method and are stunned before slaughter.

Handling of poultry

66. Most poultry going for religious slaughter comes from the spent hen trade. The examination and handling of poultry in Jewish and Muslim processing establishments is in our view a major welfare problem. Although both communities claim that the welfare and treatment of animals (including birds) is of paramount importance in their religious teaching, the handling of poultry in particular leaves a great deal to be desired. Implementation of the recommendations in the Report on the Welfare of Poultry at the Time of Slaughter will go some way towards achieving improvement in this particular aspect of the existing situation.
other practices which we observed during our visits to poultry establishments which were a cause for concern.

67. For Shechita slaughter, only those birds which are completely healthy and good specimens are selected (see paragraph 42). This selection is often carried out on the lorry before the crated birds are off-loaded. We have seen such a practice and noted in this instance that those birds which the handler considered unsuitable for Shechita slaughter were re-crated for despatch to other outlets such as street markets and those considered acceptable were re-crated and taken into the slaughterhouse. We have heard of cases where these birds are left in the crates for unacceptably long periods, including overnight, without being fed or watered. On one occasion we noted during a visit to a Muslim poultry processing plant that the crates were stacked close to the water bath area where the atmosphere was very humid. In the same premises where stunning of the birds was carried out in an electrically charged water bath before throat cutting, we noted that the voltage of the stunner was set very low. We were informed that this was because the Muslim slaughterman had only agreed to the use of the stunner on the understanding that the voltage used would not stun the birds to the point where they appeared to be dead and therefore by definition they remained unstunned. Many of our recommendations in the Poultry Slaughter Report related to the alleviation of such problems.

68. In both Jewish and Muslim establishments we were very concerned at the rough way in which birds were removed from the crates. Also their handling in the bleeding room left much to be desired, with birds, which had their throats cut, frequently being thrown or even rammed into the bleeding cones where these were used. We appreciate that the job is repetitive, dirty, dusty and noisy and that in such conditions there is bound to be a risk of callous and careless handling. The fact that we were informed during our visits that one of the advantages of religious slaughter of poultry compared to slaughter on a fast-moving shackle line was that birds were handled individually and could therefore be treated more kindly and humanely was not borne out by what we observed.

69. During our visits to poultry premises we were very concerned to find that there were some types of business activity which escaped the law. We found that on retail premises where slaughter of poultry is carried out by the Muslim method, live birds (some of which are ‘rejects’ for Shechita slaughter — see paragraph 67) are kept in crates or pens and subjected to excessive handling by prospective purchasers before they are slaughtered often under the most squalid conditions. We understand that until recently this type of trade was outside the protection of the Slaughter of Poultry Act 1967. However, the position should now be improved by powers contained in the Animal Health and Welfare Act 1984 which amend the coverage of the 1967 Act so that it includes all poultry slaughter premises whether or not the slaughter is for preparation for sale for human consumption.

Cutting and bleeding-out techniques

70. In order to avoid confusion it should be understood that with non-religious slaughter the process of bleeding a stunned animal is generally carried out by a
the cut made for Jewish and Muslim slaughter is a transverse cut across the neck posterior to the angle of the jaw and is intended to sever the major blood vessels of that region as described in paragraphs 43 and 52. It was evident that there is a great variation in the degree of expertise used when making the throat incision. Particular examples, seen in Muslim slaughter, included one occasion when a deep cut was made, which almost severed the head of an animal; in another case the spinal column was severed. Sometimes the knife was not sufficiently sharp and there was difficulty in making the cut; the degree of sharpness varied from slaughterhouse to slaughterhouse; we also saw a curved skinning knife being used to slaughter sheep, although it was reasonably sharp. Although we have been told that the knife should be sharpened and sterilised before each animal is slaughtered this was not always the case.

71. We observed that the 'single transverse cut' (often described as one clean cut) demanded by the Jews (referred to at paragraph 43) means in practice a backwards and forwards stroke. On one occasion we observed a Jewish slaughterman make as many as seven backwards and forwards strokes with the knife, using a sawing action which was clearly in contravention of the Shochet's training. Indeed with both Jewish and Muslim slaughter the requirement for a single incision is open to different interpretation. Our observations suggest that the current procedure is in practice a single uninterrupted backwards and forwards motion.

72. During the course of our visits we have monitored the period of time from cutting the throat of cattle to shackling and hoisting them on to the bleeding rail and we saw a wide variation from 14-35 seconds, with the majority falling into the 17-20 second range. In some cases, both with Jewish and Muslim slaughter, we considered the animals were pulled out of the pen too quickly and before they were fully unconscious. In one particular case, cattle were shackled and hoisted very quickly after throat cutting and the incision made by the Jewish Inspector to examine the thoracic cavity was made less than one minute after the animal's throat was cut. On another occasion we saw the animal recoil when the Shochet attempted to shackle it. Sheep were always shackled and hoisted immediately. In many cases we have not been satisfied that the thoracic examination carried out in Jewish religious slaughter commenced after the animal was dead and therefore the stated practice (see paragraph 44) was not found to be the norm. We are concerned that some animals may be subjected to shackling, hoisting, thoracic incision and internal examination while they still retain some degree of sensitivity.

Loss of consciousness following throat cutting

73. We have considered the fundamental question of whether slaughter without prior effective stunning causes unnecessary pain, suffering and distress to the animal. Over the years during which the humaneness of slaughter without stunning has been debated conflicting evidence has been put forward on the time taken for animals to lose consciousness following severance of the blood vessels in the neck.

74. The collapse of an animal following severance of the major blood vessels in the neck is a manifestation of cerebral shock due to the sudden fall in pressure of
the cerebro-spinal fluid and is not due to anoxia following reduction in the flow of blood to the brain. Our observations of cattle slaughtered in the standing position in a ‘Cincinnati’ pen have shown this to occur on average five or six seconds after the cut. Nystagmus which is an indication of commencement of loss of consciousness, follows four or five seconds later. Levinger (1976) recorded the reactions of the standing animal with its throat cut, when swaying commenced in eight seconds with collapse ten seconds after the cut. This was with the head unsupported which he records as resulting in pressure on the wound, causing obstruction to the flow of blood. Severance of both jugular veins produces an immediate drop in cerebro-spinal fluid pressure (Levinger 1979) providing there is no such obstruction and this is seen to produce the collapse of the animal referred to in our observations of the use of the Cincinnati pen.

75. There is a lack of scientific evidence to indicate at what stage in the process of losing consciousness the ability to feel pain ceases. Recent published work on loss of brain responsiveness (Gregory, N.G. and Wotton, S.B. 1984) described full severance of both carotid arteries and jugular veins in calves and sheep using the electrocorticogram to measure the brain’s ability to respond to a stimulus by recording evoked potentials. Such responses can occur during many forms of anaesthesia but their absence reflects a profound disturbance of the brain approaching the level of brain death, when it is safe to assume the animal is insensible to pain. The times for this average 14 seconds for sheep and 17 seconds for calves. This work tends to contradict some earlier experimental findings (Newhook, J.C. and Blackmore, D.K., 1982) based on analysis of the brain’s spontaneous activity, which suggested that the difference in time between sheep and calves to undergo brain failure following sticking is even greater. In sheep and lambs an isoelectric or flat reading of the EEG was recorded as occurring between 18 and 70 seconds after the incision. In calves the interval was 132-297 seconds. All these findings are based on measuring electrical activity in the brain by methods which indicate profound disturbance of brain activity close to brain death. It can therefore be assumed with confidence that loss of consciousness has occurred by then. Nevertheless even the shorter times must be regarded as unacceptably long and if only one carotid artery is severed can be increased five fold. It can be assumed that these scientific experiments were carried out under ideal controlled conditions. Our observations during visits to slaughterhouses have shown that following less expert slaughter, where the cuts have been less effectively carried out, animals have apparently remained conscious for much longer periods than these.

76. It is a fact that in these conditions loss of sensibility to pain is progressive during the period leading up to total lack of consciousness but we believe that when animals are being slaughtered their welfare is paramount and loss of sensibility should be immediate. It is clear to us, from our study of currently available work and our own observations, that loss of consciousness following severance of the major blood vessels in the neck is not immediate (see paragraphs 74 and 75). We have not been convinced by arguments that direct cutting of the throat when carried out speedily and efficiently causes the animal no more suffering than if it had been effectively stunned. We acknowledge that our report on the slaughter of red meat animals pointed to shortcomings in current stunning practices and recommended that these be rectified, but the fact remains that in
The key issue

77. We believe that such a conclusion does not carry with it inherently anti-Jewish or anti-Muslim views, or restrict religious freedom. Our terms of reference have been to consider the welfare of birds or animals at the time of slaughter and in this we have become aware of the common ground shared between ourselves and the formally expressed views of Jewish and Muslim bodies concerning the need for kindness to and humane treatment of animals (see paragraph 29). Difficulties and disagreements arise, in the matter of religious slaughter, almost entirely over the question of stunning and other matters are subsidiary to it. We have already referred (paragraphs 30 and 31) to the minimal scriptural antecedents and note that Jewish law and practice are considerably governed by continuing Rabbinic oral tradition, while Muslim is less consistent. Practices that almost certainly had practical and necessary beginnings many centuries ago, relating to kindness to animals, food hygiene and a repugnance at the possibility of eating blood, thought of as the life substance, are now part of religious practice, with much greater symbolic rather than practical significance.

78. We recognise the minefield to be crossed in trying to deal with such a combination of religious symbolism and ceremonial, ethnic and religious identity and practical issues concerning the humane treatment of animals. We believe, however, that members of the Jewish and Muslim faiths should once again be encouraged to adapt their methods of slaughter in ways which still meet the needs of dietary habit and religious identity, whilst accepting modern methods to ensure that the bird’s or animal’s welfare benefits from sound contemporary practice.

Supervision, training and licensing of slaughtermen

79. The report on red meat animals makes a number of recommendations on the licensing, management, supervision and training of all slaughtermen. On our visits to slaughterhouses carrying out slaughter by Jewish and Muslim methods, we have observed a considerable contrast in standards. In most cases we have found there to be close supervision and control of the Jewish slaughter practices by the Jewish authorities. There is however a noticeable lack of direction and supervision of slaughter operations from within the Muslim community.

80. We have already commented in paragraph 36 on the training given to a Shochet who is the only person permitted to carry out Jewish slaughter. Although we have stated that much of their training is devoted to matters of wider religious significance than slaughter practice, we have noted the care which the great majority of Shochetim pay to ensuring that the knife used for the incision is always sharp and flawless and believe that they genuinely endeavour to ensure that the cutting operation itself is quick and efficient.

81. We are very concerned about the practices used by some Muslim slaughtermen and the lack of training, expertise and supervision. This can apply equally to those slaughtermen who are resident in this country as well as to those who are sent here from other countries importing Halal meat from this country. We have been informed that from a religious point of view, no formal training is required by the Muslim authorities but the act of slaughter must always be
humane. We understand however that any person of the Muslim faith irrespective of age, including children, can carry out slaughter.

Identification of rejected carcases

82. We have already pointed out that 'rejected' carcases, those which are 'non-Kosher' and the hindquarters meat from Jewish slaughterhouses are sold in alternative markets (paragraph 27). We are concerned that there is no indication to the consumer that such meat has been obtained by religious methods of slaughter so that people who object to eating meat from animals slaughtered by religious methods can choose not to buy it. Similarly, carcases which are produced by the Halal method, e.g. in excess of an export requirement or not sold to Halal outlets, are distributed to alternative markets with nothing to identify their method of preparation. We understand that these existing practices are within the framework of the present legislation in that it is not a contravention of the law to sell to others meat from animals slaughtered for the food of Jews and Muslims provided that at the time of slaughter it was the intention that it should be for the food of Jews and Muslims.

Exported meat

83. We have referred, in paragraphs 18 and 26 and Appendix D, to the volume of meat exported from the whole of the United Kingdom to certain other countries. It is reasonable to assume that much, if not all, of it will be from animals slaughtered by Shechita or Halal methods. It is not possible to be certain exactly how much was slaughtered in that way, nor in the case of meat for Muslims how many of the animals were stunned prior to slaughter. The export of such meat is of increasing significance to the UK meat trade and, in certain cases, Muslim countries ensure that slaughter is carried out by slaughtermen sent to this country for the purpose. They must be licensed by the local authority in accordance with our law.

84. The question of whether or not this trade should be encouraged is one that was frequently raised with us in the course of this review. We believe it to be outside the original intentions of the exemptions in the legislation and we are aware that many people are opposed to the practice.

85. One important consideration which we feel should be borne in mind is whether the welfare of the animals will be better served when they are slaughtered in abattoirs in the UK, rather than being exported live and slaughtered in countries overseas where welfare standards are lower and controls fewer than is the case here. We believe that to be the case now and the situation will be improved further if our recommendations are acted upon.

Deer

86. All game is forbidden to Jews and Muslims as it will have been killed by unacceptable methods (i.e. shooting). With the growth of deer farming there is
would be desirable to handle such shy and flighty animals. We would not wish to see deer subjected to slaughter by religious methods until stunning is required by law.

Slaughter by decapitation (Jhatka)

87. During our review we had discussions with the International Supreme Council of Sikhs in Great Britain about Sikh slaughter (Jhatka) which involves decapitation of the animal at a single stroke without stunning (see paragraphs 39–41). This method of slaughter is permitted under current legislation provided a mechanical instrument (e.g. a guillotine) is used. In the course of our review, and following discussion with research workers at the Meat Research Institute (MRI), we have reached the conclusion that there is considerable doubt that decapitation produces immediate insensibility. In view of this it is the opinion of the Council that in order to be humane, decapitation should be preceded by effective stunning.
88. Although this report deals specifically with religious slaughter, during our visits and consultations we were also aware of other welfare problems which relate to the slaughter of all farm animals not just those slaughtered using the methods described in this report. Our earlier reports on the Welfare of Poultry and Red Meat Animals at the Time of Slaughter contained a number of recommendations on these matters and whilst we do not think it appropriate to repeat them here, this is not because the problems no longer exist nor that we were not concerned about them. We should like to emphasise therefore that our recommendations in those two earlier reports also apply to the welfare of the animals covered by this report.

89. We have explained in paragraphs 7 and 9 that the legislation provides for an exemption from the stunning requirement when animals (including poultry) are slaughtered by the Jewish and Mohammedan method for the food of Jews and Muslims. During the course of our review, we were concerned that there is an assumption by some members of both communities that the law exempts them from compliance with other essential requirements in the legislation and not merely the stunning requirement. We recommend that both the enforcing authorities and the Jewish and Muslim communities are made aware of this matter. The recommendations which follow therefore deal with additions or amendments to existing legislation and assume that this is adhered to by both Jewish and Muslim communities.

90. We have indicated in paragraph 82, that it is not a contravention of the law to sell to others meat from animals slaughtered for the food of Jews and Muslims provided that at the time of slaughter it was the intention that it should be for the food of Jews and Muslims. It has been drawn to our attention that animals (particularly poultry) are being slaughtered by religious methods when it is known at the time of slaughter that the meat is to be sold on to alternative markets. We therefore recommend that the law should be enforced in this respect.

91. Our recommendations fall into two distinct categories. The first defined in paragraph 92, proposes a fundamental review leading to change within three years; the second, as defined in paragraph 95 relates to changes which should be introduced immediately and which we believe will lead to improvements in present practice.

92. As indicated in paragraph 76 we have been concerned during the course of
stunned before bleeding. The up-to-date scientific evidence available and our own observations leave no doubt in our minds that religious methods of slaughter, even when carried out under ideal conditions, must result in a degree of pain, suffering and distress which does not occur in the properly stunned animal. We accept that the religious requirements and intentions of both the Muslim and Jewish communities are to cause as little pain and suffering as possible to the animals being slaughtered. In our discussions, some members told us that if they could be convinced that their methods of slaughter caused unnecessary suffering they would respond to the demand for change. We believe that our findings show conclusively that change is needed. However, we have to acknowledge that over the centuries the acts associated with religious slaughter have assumed a cultural significance in their own right and have become symbols that are important in the traditions of those who adhere to those religions. We have to recognise that in these circumstances the change we would like to see cannot be achieved overnight. We see no reason however, given goodwill, why such change could not be achieved and become legally enforceable within a period of three years.

93. We therefore recommend that Ministers should require the Jewish and Muslim communities to review their methods of slaughter so as to develop alternatives which permit effective stunning. Their findings should be presented to Ministers so that the legislative provisions which permit slaughter without stunning of animals (including poultry) by Jews and Muslims can be repealed within the next three years.

94. In paragraph 87 dealing with Sikh slaughter (Jhatka) we noted that instantaneous slaughter of the unstunned animal by decapitation is currently permitted, provided that in the case of red meat animals a mechanical instrument is used. We recommend that within three years the legislation permitting slaughter by decapitation without stunning of all animals (including poultry) should be repealed.

95. We recommend that the following changes should be introduced in the slaughter methods and practices with immediate effect.

Presentation for slaughter

Cattle

(a) We have referred in paragraphs 57 and 59 to the terror and discomfort which ensue from the inversion of cattle in the rotary pen. Following our observations of animals slaughtered in the upright position whilst restrained in the ASPCA-type pen we are convinced that this imposes much less discomfort and stress upon the animal. Indeed, in our Report on Red Meat Animals, we have suggested that such a pen is desirable for all forms of stunning (paragraph 108 of that Report refers). We therefore recommend that the law be amended to permit the use of a pen which restrains the animal in a standing position provided that the design of the pen, which must be approved by Ministers, incorporates effective restraint and support for the animal. We recommend that with immediate effect all new installations should incorporate such a pen and in any event, that the use of rotary pens should be prohibited at the end of the next two years.
(b) We further recommend that no animal should be permitted to be placed into a restraining pen until the slaughterman is in position and ready to carry out the incision (see paragraph 57).
(c) A captive bolt pistol or some other mechanical stunning device ready for immediate use, must be kept available in a position close to the restraining pen for use in case of emergency.

Sheep and goats
(d) Unnecessary distress is caused to unstunned sheep when they are picked up by the fleece or dragged considerable distances from the crowding pen to the cradle or table on which they are to be slaughtered. The cradle or table should be sited in such a position that it minimises such handling and where necessary, structural alterations should be made to facilitate this requirement.
(e) There is a tendency in some slaughterhouses to 'stock-pile' animals on the slaughtering cradle or table. The current legislation prohibiting slaughter of animals within sight of each other must be enforced which means, for example, that sheep must be slaughtered individually on the cradle or table.

Slaughter
Knives
(f) We recommend that the single reciprocal cut, as described in paragraph 71 should be the only permitted method of slaughter used on unstunned animals.
(g) We further recommend that the knife used must be large enough for the size of the animal and that before the slaughter of each animal, the knife must be inspected to ensure that the cutting edge is sharp and undamaged.

Shackling and hoisting
(h) We have referred in paragraph 72 to the period of time which we monitored from cutting the throat of cattle to shackling and hoisting onto the bleeding rail. In paragraphs 74 and 75 we have recorded our observations on loss of consciousness in the ASPCA-type pen and referred to recent scientific work on loss of brain responsiveness. We therefore recommend that unless the animal, i.e. cattle, sheep, goats and calves, has been stunned before or after throat cutting it must not be moved after the cut has been made until it is unconscious but in any case not less than 20 seconds for sheep and goats and 30 seconds for calves and adult bovines.

Poultry
considered suitable to be moved to other premises for slaughter. Provision must be made at all poultry slaughterhouses which carry out religious slaughter for slaughter by non-religious methods. This will necessitate the provision of suitable alternative means of achieving humane slaughter such as effective electrical stunning or mechanical dislocation of the neck. It is important that in licensing such slaughterhouses the local authority is satisfied that not only are facilities available for non-religious slaughter but also that they will be used where appropriate.

(j) We also recommend that legislation is introduced which requires that when birds are being inspected, this must be done humanely.

(k) We are concerned at the length of time which some birds are left in crates, especially in some of the smaller Muslim establishments and at the amount and type of handling such birds are subjected to. We recommend that legislation should be introduced making it an offence for birds to be held in crates for a total of more than 12 hours. Where it is necessary to hold birds for longer than 12 hours they must be moved to accommodation which gives them sufficient freedom of movement to be able, without difficulty, to stand normally, turn round and stretch their wings; they must also be provided with food and water.

(l) We expressed concern in the Poultry Slaughter Report that some poultry slaughter is carried out in retail Muslim establishments which were outside the scope of the legislation. Although the powers contained in the Animal Health and Welfare Act 1984 amend the scope of the Slaughter of Poultry Act 1967 to include such premises, we recommend that all premises used for the religious slaughter of poultry and all slaughtermen carrying out such slaughter must be licensed.

Deer

(m) In paragraph 86 we have mentioned the possibility of deer being slaughtered in abattoirs. We recommend that deer should not be subjected to slaughter by religious methods until stunning is required by law.

Identification and labelling of meat

(n) In paragraphs 45 and 82 we refer to the fact that a substantial proportion of meat which has been produced using religious slaughter methods finds its way on to alternative markets with nothing to identify its origin. This means that more animals (including poultry) are slaughtered by religious methods than are eventually consumed by the religious communities concerned. We feel that consumers when purchasing meat should be aware of the method by which that meat was prepared in order that they may have the option of selecting meat which accords with their own views on slaughter methods. We therefore recommend that all carcases and cuts prepared from animals (including poultry) slaughtered by religious methods and offered for sale down to, and including the retail level, should be clearly labelled to indicate the method of slaughter.
A comprehensive review such as we have carried out and the preparation of a detailed report inevitably involve the participation and co-operation of many people.

I am particularly grateful to the Members of the Council, especially to those of our Religious Slaughter Working Group, who freely gave of their time in undertaking a review which necessitated close observation of religious slaughter operations and involvement in an area of work in which many would be reluctant to participate.

My thanks are due to all who eased the way for our fact finding visits, particularly to the slaughterhouse managements and staff who allowed us to observe their work and made us very welcome; also to the Environmental Health Officers, Meat Inspectors, Shochetim and local officers of the State Veterinary Service who were generally present on our visits and contributed much useful information. I also wish to thank the representatives of the Jewish, Muslim and Sikh communities with whom we had discussions and who willingly answered all our questions.

We also received considerable help from the administrative and veterinary staff of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food who provided us with information and technical advice.

Finally, we are very grateful to the staff of the Council's Secretariat who have had the responsibility for organising and arranging all stages of the review and on whom much of the work in preparing the report has fallen.

R J Harrison
Chairman
Farm Animal Welfare Council

The Farm Animal Welfare Council was set up in July 1979 by the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food and the Secretaries of State for Scotland and for Wales under the Chairmanship of Professor Sir Richard Harrison, Emeritus Professor of Anatomy, University of Cambridge. It has been given the responsibility of keeping under review the welfare of farm animals on agricultural land, at markets, in transit and at the place of slaughter. The Council advises Agriculture Ministers of any legislative or other changes that may be necessary and as an independent advisory body is free to publish any advice so given.

Members of the Council are appointed by Ministers and serve in a personal capacity.

They are:

Chairman:
Professor Sir Richard Harrison, FRS, MA, MD, DSc, MRCS, LRCP.

Members:
Mr C B Atkinson, ARICS
Mrs M A S Bates, BSc (Agric)
* Rev A L Birbeck, MA
* Mr S Burgess, FBIM
Mr J H Cullimore, MBE, JP
Professor J M M Cunningham, CBE, BSc (Agric), PhD, FRSE, FI Biol.
Dr M S Dawkins, MA, D Phil
Mr R Ewbank, MVSc, MRCVS, FI Biol
* Mrs R Harrison
Mr D L Haxby, MRCVS
Mr J A Inverarity
Mr M R Lampard, MA
Mr R Macpherson, MRCVS
Mr E T F Marsh, BEM
Dr D W B Sainsbury, MA, BSc, MRCVS
* Mr P Staines
Mr J G Thomas, BSc (Agric)
Mr P A Walker, JP
Professor A J F Webster, MA, Vet MB, PhD, MRCVS

* Members of the Religious Slaughter Working Group

The late Mr P L Brown, BSc, MRCVS was also a member of the Religious Slaughter Working Group.

Former members of the Council on the Religious Slaughter Working Group during the early stages of the review were:
Mr H F C Hebeler, CBE, FRCVS
Mr M Nicholson, MBE, MA, Dip Ag (Cantab)

Farm Animal Welfare Council Secretariat
Hook Rise South
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KT6 7NF
Organisations and individuals who gave oral and written evidence

The following gave oral evidence:
The Board of Deputies of British Jews
   Dayan I D Berger
   Dr Sydney Torrance
   Mr Sidney Ormonde
   Mr David Massel
   Mrs Z Cohen

The Bishop of Birmingham, Dr Hugh Montefiore

Association of United Synagogue Ladies Guilds
   Mrs M Kosky
   Mrs Ann Harris

Islamic Foundation, Leicester
   Mr Mushak Ali

Union of Muslim Organisations of UK & Eire
   Dr S N Darsh
   Dr Syed Pasha
   Mr Saeed Ahmed
   Maulana Shah Manzoor Al Hamdani
   Maulana Muhammed Ahmed

International Supreme Council of Sikhs in Great Britain
   Gurcharan Singh Khalsa
   Councillor Harcharan Singh Wadhwa
   Kesar Singh Mand
   Mukhtyar Singh

The following gave written evidence:
   Animal Health Trust
   Association of Meat Inspectors (GB) Ltd
   Bransby Home of Rest for Horses
Meat and Livestock Commission
The Federation of Fresh Meat Wholesalers
Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
The Ponies of Britain
National Union of Agricultural and Allied Workers
Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons
British Veterinary Association
Universities Federation for Animal Welfare
Council of Justice to Animals and Humane Slaughter Association
Compassion in World Farming
Central Council of Societies in Scotland for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
National Council of Women of Great Britain
The National Farmers Union
Farm Animal Welfare Co-ordinating Executive

In addition, written submissions were received from 106 members of the public.
Slaughterhouses Act 1974

PART II

Slaughter of animals

Provisions as to slaughter

Methods of slaughter in slaughterhouses and knacker's yards.

36.—(1) Subject to the provisions of this section, no animal to which this section applies shall, in a slaughterhouse or knacker's yard, be slaughtered otherwise than instantaneously by means of a mechanically-operated instrument in proper repair unless—

(a) by stunning, effected by means of a mechanically-operated instrument or an instrument for stunning by means of electricity, being in either case an instrument in proper repair, it is instantaneously rendered insensible to pain until death supervenes; or

(b) by such other means as may be prescribed by regulations under this section, it is rendered insensible to pain until death supervenes, and there are complied with such conditions (if any) as respects the use of those means as may be so prescribed.

(2) Regulations under this section shall be made by the Minister, after consultation with such organisations as appear to him to represent the interests concerned; and the regulations—

(a) may, if the Minister thinks fit, make different provision as respects different classes of animals to which this section applies and as respects different classes of slaughterhouses or knackers' yards; and
(b) may make such incidental or consequential provision as may appear to the Minister to be necessary or expedient for the purposes of the regulations, including, in particular, in a case where a condition as respects the use of any means of rendering an animal insensible to pain consists in the giving of any approval to any matter by a local authority, provision for securing a right of appeal to a magistrates' court against a withholding or withdrawal of approval.

(3) Subsection (1) above shall not apply to the slaughter, without the infliction of unnecessary suffering, of an animal—

(a) by the Jewish method for the food of Jews and by a Jew duly licensed for the purpose by the Rabbinical Commission referred to in Schedule I to this Act; or

(b) by the Mohammedan method for the food of Mohammedans and by a Mohammedan.

(4) Any person who slaughters or attempts to slaughter any animal in contravention of subsection (1) above shall be guilty of an offence, unless he proves that by reason of an accident or other emergency the contravention was necessary for preventing physical injury or suffering to any person or animal.

(5) This section applies to horses, cattle, sheep, swine and goats.

Licensing of slaughtermen

Slaughtermen to be licensed.

39.—(1) Subject to subsection (2) below, no animal to which section 36 above applies shall be slaughtered or stunned in a slaughterhouse or knacker's yard by any person except in accordance with a licence granted by a local authority and in force under this section.

(2) Subsection (1) above shall not apply with respect to the slaughter, under the Animal Health Act 1981, of an animal by an officer of, or a person employed by, the Minister.

(3) Any person who slaughters or stuns, or attempts to slaughter or stun, any animal in contravention of subsection (1) above shall be guilty of an offence, unless he proves that by reason of an accident or other emergency the contravention was necessary for preventing physical injury or suffering to any person or animal.

40.—(1) A licence under section 39 above (in this section referred to as a 'licence')—

Licences and applications for licences...
the food of Jews or the Mohammedan method for
the food of Mohammedans, shall specify—
(i) the kinds of animals which may be
slaughtered or stunned by the holder of the
licence; and
(ii) the types of instruments which may be used by
him for slaughtering or stunning any such
animal.

SCHEDULE 1

The Rabbinical Commission for the Licensing of
Shochetim

Membership

1. The Rabbinical Commission for the licensing of Shochetim (in this
Schedule referred to as 'the Commission') shall consist of a permanent chairman
and nine other members.

2. The Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of Great Britain and
the Commonwealth shall, by virtue of his office, be the permanent chairman of
the Commission.

3. Of the members of the Commission other than the permanent chairman—
   (a) one, who shall be vice-chairman, shall be appointed by the Spanish and
       Portuguese Synagogue (London);
   (b) three shall be appointed by the Beth Din appointed by the United
       Synagogue (London);
   (c) two shall be appointed by the Federation of Synagogues (London);
   (d) one shall be appointed by the Union of Orthodox Hebrew
       Congregations (London); and
   (e) two shall be appointed by the president for the time being of the London
       committee of deputies of British Jews to represent provincial
       congregations.

Supplementary provisions

4. The functions of the Commission shall be exercisable notwithstanding any
   vacancy amongst the members thereof.

5. The quorum of the Commission shall be four.
The Slaughter of Animals (Prevention of Cruelty) Regulations, 1958

Part IV

17. No person shall slaughter any bull, ox, bullock, cow, heifer or steer by the Jewish or Mohammedan method without the use of a casting pen of the Weinberg, Dyne or North British Rotary type or such other type as may be approved by the Minister.

The Slaughter of Poultry Act 1967

1.(1) Subject to the provisions of this section, no bird to which this Act applies shall be slaughtered unless it is slaughtered instantaneously by means of decapitation or dislocation of the neck or some other method approved by the Ministers, or it is, by stunning effected by means of an instrument of a kind approved by them and in proper repair, instantaneously rendered insensible to pain until death supervenes.

(2) The foregoing subsection shall not apply to the slaughter, without the infliction of unnecessary suffering, of a bird—

(a) by the Jewish method for the food of Jews and by a Jew duly licensed for the purpose by the Rabbinical Commission referred to in Schedule I to the Slaughter of Animals Act 1958; or

(b) by the Muslim method for the food of Muslims and by a Muslim.
UK exports of fresh, frozen and chilled meats to Israel and to those Middle Eastern, Asian and African countries where Islam is the predominant religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Beef and veal (tonnes)</th>
<th>Mutton and lamb (tonnes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —   —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1,737  2,353    682   6,918</td>
<td>6,461 1,121 2,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —  —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —  —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>4,350  365      1,043 3,346</td>
<td>24,898 9     2     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —  —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —  —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>11     14        89    2,503</td>
<td>459   4     1    2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —  —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>122    24        587   1,269</td>
<td>903   5     71   5 8 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>1,407  604      —     628  2,758</td>
<td>—     —   —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —  —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>13     128       649   429</td>
<td>—     —   —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauretania</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —  —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>142    1,037     1,064 1,248</td>
<td>609   56    40   51 25 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>0      0         1      9  147</td>
<td>0     1     0    0 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>4      18        1      —</td>
<td>6     —   —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>87     844       357   1,716</td>
<td>3,941 94    79   19 30 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0      0         0      —</td>
<td>1     —   —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siera Leone</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —  —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —  —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and North Yemen</td>
<td>—        —                  —</td>
<td>1     —   —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0      —        26     7  3</td>
<td>—     4   2    1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —  —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>—      —        240    3,571</td>
<td>6,411 45    —    305 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —  —     —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td>—      —        —      —</td>
<td>—   —  —     —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

— = Nil
0 = Less than 500 kg

Source: Overseas Trade Statistics

Note: It should not be assumed that the total quantity of this meat came from animals slaughtered by religious methods.
# Religious slaughter practices elsewhere than in Great Britain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Legislation provides for:</th>
<th>Additional information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Total exemption from stunning</td>
<td>New draft bill provides for some restrictions to total exemption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning for Jewish slaughter</td>
<td>Only in abattoirs where there is constant veterinary supervision. Special restraining box used. Muslims have agreed to stun cattle (with a captive bolt pistol) before slaughter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
<td>Only Rabbis who have a permit can carry out Jewish slaughter. Permits renewed every six months. Suitable Muslims can carry out Muslim slaughter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
<td>Cattle slaughter by Jewish method must be in box of special design in some Länder. Muslim slaughter with stunning permitted in some Länder but not others. Plan by Federal Ministry to impose a uniform state of affairs allowing religious slaughter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
<td>Must be carried out in strict accordance with established standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
<td>Must conform to EC Convention. Supervision by veterinary officers. Stunning not permitted by Muslims. Cincinatti Box and other similar types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
<td>Slaughterhouses must be licensed for religious slaughter by local authority. Veterinary presence required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
<td>No religious slaughter for past 10-15 years; no demand for such meat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
<td>Jewish and Muslim slaughter carried out only in approved abattoirs and in the presence of a veterinary or meat inspector. Non available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other European Countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Religious slaughter on conscious animals forbidden by the Constitution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Religious slaughter permitted under veterinary supervision. All animals except goats and sheep to be stunned first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Religious slaughter permitted. Sold only to small local community of Jews and Muslims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Jewish slaughter permitted only in certain Länder. No veterinary presence required. Stunning required for Muslim slaughter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scandinavian Countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Religious slaughter permitted on conscious animals provided they are stunned immediately they have been cut. Veterinarian must be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>No exemption for religious slaughter. All animals must be stunned prior to slaughter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>All animals slaughtered by religious methods must be stunned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No legislative restrictions on how religious slaughter is carried out. Some Muslims accept stunning. Veterinary presence required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Exemption from stunning</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
<td>Weinberg and Elizabeth (ASPCA) pens approved. Calves under 70 kilos must be stunned post-cutting for Shechita slaughter. Halal slaughter of calves not permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Exemption from stunning</td>
<td>Special restraining box required for cattle. Muslim slaughter requires stunning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Restraining pens

Rotary casting pens (Weinberg, North British or Dyne)

The rotary casting pen (see Fig 1) is basically a cattle crush, supported on a set of rollers at each end, which the animal enters from the rear by a ramp. The animal is shut into the pen with its head protruding through a yoke at the front. At the rear of the casting pen is a door to which is attached a plate enabling the internal dimensions of the pen to be adjusted in accordance with the size of the animal. After this adjustment has been made, the pen is rotated, by means of a lever, through 180° so that the animal is then on its back. The pen has a braking system which should be used to stop the pen in the correct position. It is capable of being rotated in excess of 180°. Rotation is about the long axis of the animal.

The pen is adapted for the slaughter of calves by the use of a steel ramp within the pen which raises the calf sufficiently for its head to fit through the yoke and its back to be held by a restraining plate.

ASPCA pen (Cincinnati pen)

This pen (see Fig 2) is manufactured by an American company, the Cincinnati Butchers' Supply Company to a patent held by The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. It is widely used in America and has been installed in two slaughterhouses in Northern Ireland for the Muslim slaughter of cattle. Some slaughterhouses have made minor variations to the pen but the basic principle is the same. It is not used in any slaughterhouses in GB because the regulations only permit approval of casting or rotating pens.

Cattle enter the pens singly from a conventional race. As the guillotine gate closes behind the animal, it is moved forward by a wedge-shaped pusher attached to the gate until its head projects from the opening at the opposite side of the pen. It is then secured by a neck yoke, which moves downward, and a plate which travels up from the floor to lift the underside of the body. The head is raised by a chin lift, extending the neck and thus facilitating its transverse incision from below. The guillotine gate, wedge, yoke, plate, chin-lift and side gate of the pen are all
pneumatically operated and are controlled by an operative standing at a control panel on the opposite side of the pen to the side gate. As soon as the neck has been incised, the side gate is raised and the shackler has ready access to the animal's right hind leg. When bleeding is sufficiently advanced, the yoke, chin-lift and belly-plate are released and the carcase is pulled out of the pen by the hoist, transferred to the overhead rail and moved forward to the dressing line.

Fig 1. Rotary casting pen
Fig 2. ASPCA pen (Cincinnati)
## Glossary of terms

(As used in the context of this report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anoxia</td>
<td>deficiency of oxygen in tissues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeding cone</td>
<td>cone (usually metal) into which a bird is put after having its throat cut; the head and neck pass through the bottom of the cone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeding/Bleeding out</td>
<td>release of blood from the slaughtered animal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisket</td>
<td>breast of animal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carotid arteries</td>
<td>the two major blood vessels in the neck carrying cortex of the brain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casting pen</td>
<td>pen used for turning animal upside down before slaughter — see Appendix F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral shock</td>
<td>interference with the normal function of the brain which can be due to changes in pressure of the cerebro-spinal fluid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebro-spinal fluid</td>
<td>the fluid which fills the space found along the axis of the brain and spinal cord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalaf</td>
<td>knife used in Shechita slaughter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati pen</td>
<td>type of restraining pen in which the animal is slaughtered in an upright position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrocorticogram</td>
<td>record of electrical voltage changes in the cortex of the brain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evoked potentials</td>
<td>changes in electrical activity of the brain induced by an external stimulus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halal</td>
<td>method of slaughter practised by Muslims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliac region</td>
<td>that part of the body adjacent to the ileum (a pelvic bone).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imam</td>
<td>Muslim leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Supreme Council of Sikhs</td>
<td>represents the Sikh culture and religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>religion of Muslims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhatka</td>
<td>method of slaughter practised by Sikhs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koran</td>
<td>sacred book of the Muslims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosher</td>
<td>food fulfilling requirements of Jewish law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphatic</td>
<td>adjective used to describe the glands and vessels which carry lymph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>believer in Islam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nystagmus</td>
<td>continual oscillation of eyeballs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poll</td>
<td>highest point of animal's skull, between the ears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porging</td>
<td>a process to remove forbidden tissues such as veins, lymphatics and the sciatic nerve and its branches from the hindquarters of slaughtered animals to permit consumption by Jews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluck</td>
<td>the contents of the thorax removed during the process of dressing the carcase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Commission</td>
<td>ruling Jewish body which licences Jewish slaughtermen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary pen</td>
<td>see casting pen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumen</td>
<td>the large stomach of ruminants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacro lumbar</td>
<td>the region of the body which relates to the junction of the lumbar vertebrae and the sacrum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shackled</td>
<td>the attachment of an animal to fastenings (shackles) (usually by a hind leg) by which it can be winched up and hung for bleeding-out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shechita</td>
<td>method of slaughter practised by Jews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shochet(im)</td>
<td>approved slaughterman/men of the Jewish faith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent hens</td>
<td>laying hens which have ceased to be profitable and are no longer required for egg production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stunning</td>
<td>rendering unconscious and insensible to pain i.e. knocking out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse cut</td>
<td>cut from one side of the neck to the other (with the intention of severing the main blood vessels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trefa</td>
<td>food not fulfilling requirements of Jewish law i.e. not Kosher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoracic cavity</td>
<td>the body cavity enclosed by the rib cage and diaphragm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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