Shayla Scott
Senate Committee On Rules
SB85
5

Dear Senate Committee on Rules:

I am writing to show my support for the passing of bill SB 85, as I feel profoundly concerned to learn that the Oregon Dept. of Agriculture isn't already doing this. Studying the confined animal feeding operations run by farmers, paid by the agricultural industry, is the same as, a Veterinary Technician studying the condition of the patients in the environments they are providing care to animals within. I expect a Veterinary Technician to be on top of their game with ensuring the care of my animal when hospitalized for animal care services. I hold this same expectation to animal industries that profit from the factory farm and locally raised farm industry. I am a consumer of meats. However, realizing that the Oregon State Department of Agriculture isn't already studying confined animal feeding operations is an absolute turn off for me, and I am reconsidering my future consumption of meat products purchased from suppliers in Oregon.

While I enjoy, and pay a lot of money to consume meat products, I do so only out of trust that every person involved in the agricultural growth and harvest process for beef, veal, lamb, chicken, is doing their job in a way that ensures the highest quality of life for animals existing in the agricultural industry. For species such as cow and pigs, I value their ability to be sentient, and to see and react to the stress imposed onto members of their own kind. I value this because it is how we, as humans, feel about ourselves and the world around us.

I want animals to be free of standing in dry, hot fields lacking access to water and shade during the hot sun. An example of what I do not want to support, are cattle entering auction grounds existing off Hwy 97N, located in Madras, OR. This is not ok, as none of the animals in this environment have shelter from the harsh elements of hot, blazing weather as we see mid-July, or in storms. For suppliers to feel this is ok, makes me question the integrity and value they have for the animals they are profiting from. I choose not to support this process, which means eating less meat, and looking very closely at labels, all lacking details that many Oregon consumers want to know to feel good about what is entering our bodies. As consumers, it isn't just our right to know what ingredients are involved. We also want to know how animals were treated in the process. Because meat consumption puts women at higher risk for breast cancer, the Oregon State Department of Agriculture needs to be held responsible for more than just ensuring food, water, and slaughter of livestock. Before buying meat, it is my right to know if suppliers are tethering social animals to small, singly housed huts. Most animals used for meat consumption are, and rely on

social connections with members of their own species. I will not consume meat from social animals living in singly housed conditions, as I know that excess cortisol (stress hormone) levels will ruin the taste and the quality of the meat consumed.

There is the saying, "we are what we eat," and I truly believe this. I do not want to ingest meat from animals that were treated poorly and not given a full lifetime of opportunities to exist naturally and to utilize natural adaptations that are unique to the individual species. I don't need choose to pack around stress of animals through meat that I consume. While I enjoy meat products to great levels, I hold more value for how the animal is treated than for the taste or protein acquired from their meat. Food science technology has, and is evolving to show other options that are less cancer-causing than we see in meat consumption.

I urge you to pass this bill, as it's only a small step to ensuring the quality of care that animals receive when raised and solely valued for the profit they produce.

Thank you so much for reading this letter, and for considering my perspectives to increase the standard of care for animals used for agriculture.