

Rotten Eggs Being Thrown Against California Prop 2

By Wayne Pacelle

President and Chief Executive Officer

Humane Society of the United States

The basic workings of a democracy depend upon the integrity of its government. Adherence to the rule of law is a foundation stone upon which any civil society is built. It is especially vital that we as a nation keep elections clean—by allowing qualified citizens to vote, by not suppressing voting through intimidation or arcane rules, by not using the instruments of the state to influence elections, and by allowing proper tabulations of all votes cast.

That's why it's important that California's Yes on Prop 2 campaign is taking the federal government to court to prevent an illegal expenditure of \$3 million to oppose Prop 2—a popular anti-cruelty ballot initiative that will simply provide more humane treatment of California farm animals. Just yesterday, the campaign announced that this expenditure has been temporarily put on hold while a federal court decides whether the advertising violates federal law.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) had approved an American Egg Board (AEB) ad campaign in California between now and election day—the very period when the campaign to phase out battery cages for laying hens (and to phase out veal and gestation crates) is at high tide. So Yes on Prop 2 filed a lawsuit in U.S. District Court in San Francisco to challenge this federal action.

As a federal commodity promotion program, the AEB is strictly prohibited from expending any checkoff program funds “for the purpose of influencing governmental policy or action.” 7 U.S.C. § 2707(h).

Under an agreement the Yes on Prop 2 campaign reached with the USDA and the AEB, no federally-funded print, television, or radio advertisements will run in California for at least one month while the court considers the campaign's request for an injunction.

One source says that the series of ads for this California campaign may have even been produced by the same public relations firm handling the No on Proposition 2 campaign. And it appears that they'll even have some of the same spokespersons, and use messaging from the very same script as the No on Prop 2 campaign.

The USDA and the AEB can advertise in any state but California between now and election day, to avoid the charge of an illegal political expenditure. And they can do so in 50 states after November 4 without complaint from anyone.

Agribusiness firms are already spending millions to defeat Prop 2, and they hardly needed an illegal infusion of check-off funds authorized by the USDA to supplement their political campaign.

The only reason AEB and USDA would spend \$3 million between now and the election is to augment the formal No on Proposition 2 campaign. That is against the law, and it is highly unethical.

em>Wayne Pacelle is president and CEO of The Humane Society of the United States, a supporter of Yes on Prop. 2 – Californians for Humane Farms.

Posted on August 24, 2008

Comments

Take a close look at the wording of Proposition 2. Probably written by extremists, an examination of the text of the proposed law reveals intent beyond the stated claims of its proponents.

First: the actual proposed title "Prevention of Farm Animal Cruelty Act" is not the same as is seen in the summary by the legislative analyst (makes me wonder if he or she belongs to the sponsoring group).

Second: the use of the word "cruel" labels farm workers as cruel. All those who have raised or worked with animals using the current standards of care are now declared "cruel".

Third: the law refers to the affected farm animals as "his or her". Henceforth all animals, even those destined for slaughter are now nearly human.

There is more.

Therefore, I do not believe the intent of Prop 2 is to improve standards of confinement. We can be sure that the selected wording will be used by extremists as a precedent to demand future concessions by agribusiness and even pet owners.

If objective agricultural wording had been chosen I would be supporting improved standards. As it is, I will vote "No" on Prop 2.

California law should be good for the California People, it should not label them as cruel. And proposed law should be presented to voters in an honest fashion.

You should be voting no on prop 2. Im in High school and currently involved in the FFA they are willing to make exceptions for 4-H but not FFA they dont have any good knowledge. They no nothing about the gestation crates for swine we put them in there for only a certian amount of time so they DONT crush their babies. People who want to vote yes on Prop 2 so

not know what they are talking about they only target the people that DONT take care of their animals but in reality the agriculture section of this strate is doing the right thing. If they are willing to have 88% egg Costs go up and pay that into taxes which is rediculous if you ask me, then they can go ahead and do that but the people voting yes dont need to bring down the whole state. California is the 1st largest producer of eggs!!! And the 5th LARGEST consumer, they say its going to better but in reality its not!!

My name is Sergeant Bryan Jones from the United States Marine Corp. I would first like to say that you are a sorry excuse for a man wanting to pick on a High School Student. Second thing i would like to say is that I grew up on one of the "Crewl" Poltry ranches you are talking about and would like you to think about what you are asking. First with the space requirements that you are imposing for these animals our ranch will go from roughly 300,000 birds to less than 90,000 think about the egg production lost from that alone. now we will have to provide extra workers because your proposition will eliminate cages we will have to provide extra workers to search for the eggs left now on the ground where these birds deficate so after finding the egg and washing the egg you now have to decide how long that perticular egg has been on the ground to decide if it could be rotten so lose egg production which will lose money but hire extra hands to find the eggs that may no longer be good so what you are asking for will drive all ranchers out of california this in turn will mean that eggs will be trucked if from in most cases tyson food corp. in arkansas costing diesel for the truck plus the driver payroll but it will only go up a penny an egg you say where did you pull that from the egg production association is saying 90 cents an egg that means you will be paying on average about 12.00 dollars a carton i personally belive it will not be that much i am thinking an extra 50 cents an egg either way ill tell you this much the egg mcmuffin will not be on the dollar menu any more any way i apreciate that you would like to express your feelings on the proposition which i am sorry to say passed because i fight for the right for you to do so but i dont like the fact that you have taken it upon yourself to pick on a high school girl to make your point and to roperchick i would like to say thank you for fighting the good fight and even though allan does not appreciate the facts i think you have got a pretty good grip on what is actually in the proposition

thank all of you who took the time to read this and i hope you will realize the impact of this bill and help the california farmers to pass bills in the future that will revise this bill to more workable salution