

The Humane Movement

1966



selected discussion papers

of the

National Leadership Conference of

The Humane Society of the United States

September 24-26, 1965

CONTENTS

Foreword	3
The Challenges of Leadership (Robert J. Chenoweth).	4
Treasurer's Report (Edward M. Bostick) . .	11
Humane Education of the Next Generation of Americans (Dr. Stuart Westerlund) . .	13
The National Humane Education Center and the Welfare of Animals (Mel L. Morse).	19
Use of the Legislative Process in Protecting Animals (Hugh McNamee)	24
Operation SPARED (Mrs. Kay Clausing) . . .	32
How Can We Best Help Laboratory Animals Now? (Oliver Evans)	37

Foreword

On September 24-26, 1965, prominent humane leaders and humanitarians from almost every state attended the eleventh annual conference of The Humane Society of the United States. They came to study, evaluate and discuss some of the major national cruelties facing the American humane movement. They participated in committee meetings, forums, and seminars that thoroughly analyzed these major animal welfare problems and deliberated ways of solving them.

The purpose of this booklet is to give every interested person, especially those who could not attend the 1965 meeting, the opportunity to read the principal speeches. These addresses, delivered by experts, reach to the frontiers of the humane movement in their significance to humane endeavor and propagation of the humane philosophy. They explore in depth the implications of possible programs in areas of major activity and offer practical advice on how humane workers and humanitarians alike can increase and intensify their current efforts.

We feel there is something of value to everyone in the booklet. It is by no means a complete account of all the proceedings at the annual meeting but it shows the direction of unified thinking and planning in the humane movement. Hopefully, it may inspire a renewal of determination and purpose to accelerate current anti-cruelty campaigns and work more positively towards future goals.

The problems facing our movement are not diminished by even the most inspirational of annual meetings. Knowledge and understanding of what can be done are essential in seeking to remedy conditions that involve cruelty to animals. We have tried in the following pages to help develop that knowledge and understanding among all humanitarians.

R. J. CHENOWETH,
Chairman of the Board

Copies of this report have been sent without charge to all HSUS members and to all American humane societies. Other persons are welcome to one free copy upon request. Additional copies will be mailed for 15 cents each.

The Challenges of Leadership

By R. J. Chenoweth, Kansas City, Missouri

Chairman of The HSUS Board of Directors

It has often been my custom, at these annual meetings of our Society, to discuss our accomplishments during the past year, evaluate our successes and failures in terms of relief of animal suffering, and talk at some length about our future plans. Each year has brought new victories, new advances, and always a new set of problems to tackle with the determination and renewed strength of purpose that seem a natural product of these annual Conferences.

In this, our eleventh annual meeting, at a time when major issues may seem to threaten the humane movement, it seems fitting to examine in depth the responsibilities of leadership we have as the leading national humane organization and how we have discharged those obligations. The influence which our society exerts is awesome in the immensity of suffering and numbers of animals involved and we cannot ignore the self-analysis and examination of conscience that are prime requisites of good leadership.

When a great and demanding need exists in any field of endeavor, it is a historical fact that men of intelligence, integrity and goodwill will find a way to fill that need. Like a rudderless ship, in 1954, the American humane movement was drifting without course or compass in a sea of indifference to animal welfare and outright cruelty for man's personal gain. National animal welfare work had languished for years; there was little direction to humane work at the state and local levels. The humane movement had become, in the eyes of an apathetic public, synonymous with cat and dog rescue work.

There was a great, basic need—a crying need—for leadership. An organization was needed to consolidate the myriad but scattered efforts of a thousand local humane societies. It had to be a national society with selfless dedication, courage, and a singleness of purpose that would bring order, direction and inspiration to struggling humanitarians. In particular, it had to be a society that would combine realistic planning with maximum potential for success while, at the same time, establishing bold objectives towards which all could work.

The HSUS was organized to fill this challenging role. From the very beginning, the new society justified the faith which so many people bestowed upon it. It quickly set forth the fundamental principle of working to oppose and seek to prevent all uses or exploitation of animals that cause pain, suffering or fear. Within this framework of policy and purpose, it set out to improve conditions for all kinds of animals under all circumstances. Abstract ideology was recognized but concrete measures for the relief of animal suffering that had been too long delayed were immediately put into practice.

The burdens of leadership weighed heavily in those formative years. There was so much to be done that the new society despaired of fulfilling its obligations to a newly-awakened humane movement. HSUS directors and officers knew full well—as they know now—that leadership is an earned privilege, not a right. They recognized that respect and achievement were the only real criteria and they set about meeting the challenges that had existed for so long without any real effort to resolve them.

The “dog and cat” image projected by the humane movement was a natural outgrowth of the pre-occupation of humane societies and humanitarians with the influx of these unwanted animals into humane society shelters and public pounds. Although millions of cats and dogs were being euthanized every year, little thought was given to the obvious fact that the killing was nothing more than dealing with the effect rather than the cause. The HSUS, in a practical approach to this major problem, launched a campaign to reduce surplus animal breeding by advocacy of neutering pets. Appropriate leaflets were produced, filmstrips were developed and distributed, national publicity was sought and obtained, and humane societies and individual humanitarians urged to spread the message to an uninformed public.

The program was, and continues to be, long range. It nevertheless demonstrated the practical approach and fearlessness of the new organization. A major problem that had not been faced before suddenly became a publicized cruelty and everybody knew how to do their share towards stopping it.

The massive campaign for humane slaughter legislation left no doubt that the humane movement, working in unison and under competent leadership, could gain significant victories even against the strongest opposition. Enactment of the Federal Act, so widely acclaimed by humanitarians as a great humane legislative victory and by politicians as a masterful demonstration of political strategy, was recognized by The HSUS only as a vitally important first step in securing corrective legislation governing all phases of the rearing, handling, transporting and slaughtering of livestock. In leadership, The HSUS welcomed the victory of humane slaughter which it fought so hard to achieve but considered it as only one battle in the war for improvement of all conditions for food animals.

Outspoken criticism of sports hunting and advocacy of humane trapping methods soon brought sharp ridicule of the new society. The HSUS attacked the traditional glamor and masculinity attached to hunting, exposing it for the brutal cruelty it is and advocating the shortening of hunting seasons as one practical method to reduce the annual carnage of animals. At the same time, society publicity condemned the use of steel jaw traps, calling for perfection of the Conibear killer trap and increased research into simulated fur development. Legislation requiring use of humane trapping methods on government lands was fully supported as The HSUS led a newly-optimistic humane movement towards new goals.

The orbit of national activity in which we operated for so many of those early years did not allow the development of influence and leadership on the state and local level so important to a healthy, grass roots participation. Your society was acutely conscious of this deficit and even the preparation of materials and publications helpful to local humane societies did not seem to fulfill this requirement of truly competent leadership. There had to be a way to proceed from national to state and local humane activities without losing any of the cumulative force which played such a large part in past successes.

An eighteenth century Scottish writer and philosopher, Dugald Stewart, once said the faculty of imagination is the principal source of human improvement—a faculty equally basic to securing humane improvement. In seeking an effective way to organize humane work at the local level, HSUS leadership showed itself richly endowed with that faculty by creating and launching a program of organization of state branches and affiliated local societies. It was an ambitious undertaking that, even now, has really just begun. It has all of the elements of extending our work and influence into vast areas of the nation—the community problems of animal protection and their solution, personal involvement at the local level, support by a large national organization, direction of programs towards immediate relief of animal suffering locally, and eventual relief of millions of animals nationally.

HSUS branches in California, Connecticut, New Jersey, Minnesota and Utah are providing that help but there are many other states where this program can best advance the humane cause. It is a sound middle-point between the dangers of too much centralization, on the one hand, and the anarchy and waste of a multitude of local organizations that cannot and will not work with one another, on the other hand. The United States needs our type of truly national humane society, organized to meet cruelties in each of the 50 states as well as cruelties of national nature. Our programs in the states where we have established branches are aggressive, intelligent and productive. They are a true product of leadership—a machinery for use

by future generations of humane workers. You might say we are determining what the future shape of the American humane movement shall be.

It has never escaped the attention of The HSUS that animal problems, as they affect individual animals, are essentially local problems. Only by understanding the needs and difficulties locally can we truly understand and recognize what is needed state-wide or nationally. Yet, local problems differ widely in their severity and complexity—even local humanitarians disagree on what situation should be remedied first. In every community there are many kinds of animals, each with its special problems. Should we, for local work, choose the county with the worst pound, the one with the most starving stray cats and dogs, the one with the least humane dog warden, the farmers who know the least about caring for livestock or, taking a different approach, the fewest people who care anything about animals?

We could, of course, at the national level decide these things but it would be an arbitrary decision, not at all compatible with the dictates of true leadership. This is the sort of thing that is, by right, the province of a state branch. The solution to each specific case might require technical assistance or advice, the kind our Field and Service Departments specialize in, but the problems to tackle and the priority of importance must lie at the local level.

One cannot, of course, simply sally forth into a given state and organize a branch of The HSUS. Nothing worthwhile is that easy and, if it were, the prospect of permanency would be remote. Thus, while your Society continues its efforts to establish state branches, it continues also to initiate national programs that will reach down to the grass roots level, laying a favorable foundation for effective humane work and the improvement that can always be made for suffering animals in any community.

Apart from the technical services which we supply to these communities, there are programs of immense significance, costly and sometimes not understood, that will have the most far-reaching consequences in relation to animal welfare. Consider, for example, the National Humane Education Center, now being developed near Waterford, Virginia. This educational and training institution exemplifies our desire to achieve a widespread improvement in humane work that will eventually reach into virtually every community. This capacity to plan and execute programs of far-reaching significance is perhaps the most important quality of leadership since it has produced, in the National Humane Education Center, a means of assuring good leadership throughout the movement.

In every community, men and women are needed who, by right moral thinking and sound practical argument, will influence others to recognize and accept humanitarianism as a better way of life—indeed, the

essential way of life. This is the way leadership should work in our movement so that, from the ranks of local leaders, will come national leaders of dedication, courage and vast experience.

The HSUS recognizes, of course, that it is not enough merely to train humane leaders for the future. No matter how capable such leaders might be, results will depend upon the attitudes and interest of the general public. Anything done now to develop favorable public opinion will naturally increase results.

Foreseeing this, The HSUS has expanded its humane education activities far beyond its normal program of television announcements, news releases, radio spots, literature distribution, etc. These efforts have been aimed primarily at adults in the hope that they would convey proper attitudes to children. Without minimizing the value of this program and without interfering with it in any way, your Society has added a new dimension that represents an ultimate in future planning--the inculcation of humane attitudes in children.

A little later, you will hear an important talk by Dr. Stuart Westerlund of George Washington University in Washington, D. C. I ask you to listen to it carefully because Dr. Westerlund will speak of a project that parallels the National Humane Education Center in potential benefit to suffering animals. It is a new approach at the national level, one that will produce citizens responsive to moral obligations and opposed to cruelty in all of its forms.

All of this future programming does not ease the burden of responsibility which your Society carries in current anti-cruelty work. A great problem--one requiring much strength and fortitude to combat--is discouragement of humanitarians and humane societies when animal welfare campaigns fail or bring no immediate results.

It is seldom understood that fortitude of spirit is closely related to dedication and that setbacks are at least as certain in our work as in any other. Defeat of a humane slaughter bill in New Jersey, failure in an effort to enact an Easter chick law in Montana, or unsuccessful opposition to pound seizure legislation in Connecticut are nothing more than battles lost in a never-ending war. They are no more than temporary reverses and do not shake real conviction and devotion to our cause. The HSUS is fortunate that its members possess those inner resources of spirit that enable the Society to stand strong even in defeat and rise from it to renew the struggle.

Over all the challenges of leadership we have discussed so far, the responsibility we have towards millions of laboratory animals stands supreme. There is no single item of more immediate importance, no one campaign that could reduce such an immensity of suffering. Yet, the present situation in our own movement is such that the courage and conviction that have always marked our approach to this and all other battles in the war against cruelty are now objects of attack and criticism from organizations that are supposedly working for

the same objective: protection for research animals through federal law. I will waste no time in counterattacking those societies who have belittled us, and the entire humane movement, with irresponsible tirades of invective and innuendo based upon self-interest and studied avoidance of the facts. I hope it is sufficient to say that a quality common to all leaders, in humane work or elsewhere, is a willingness to study, analyze, prepare, to know their field of activity thoroughly and to act accordingly within the bounds of the possible.

We are at a time in the history of the humane movement when we must leave behind the old idea of different societies with different dreams and different approaches offering a choice of different types of humanitarianism to the world. It has become very clear that multiplicity of organizational policies and programs have confused our cause in the minds of the public and have actually retarded our progress. In our present world, there remains increasingly but one road into the future--a road along which your own society has already set forth, confident that others will follow.

In writing and sponsoring the Rogers bill, H.R. 10049, for example, your Society acted soberly and in the best interests of the millions of experimental animals that have received no relief from suffering in all of the years the humane movement has been trying for remedial legislation. Bill after bill, sponsored by society after society, had been introduced in Congress to no avail. Until The HSUS initiated a complete study of all existing laboratory animal legislation and determined to write a new bill that could unify the humane movement in principles and action, no one seemed to consider what was really possible in the way of getting strong legislation through Congress.

This study resulted in a new comprehension of what could, and could not, be done in regulating the care, housing, procurement and use of research animals. HSUS directors and staff members felt this obligation of leadership more than any other and sought the cooperation of other leading humane societies in discussing the drafting of the new bill. Some cooperated, others didn't. Nevertheless, the Society produced a new approach to laboratory legislation whose strength was quickly recognized by Congressmen like William Randall of Missouri and Claude Pepper of Florida, both of whom had introduced strong bills in the past but who now introduced identical legislation to the Rogers bill. At the same time, leading humane societies in all parts of the country joined in support of the new legislation.

In our optimism over the prospect of enactment of the Rogers bill, we must not overlook or minimize the fierce opposition which the bill will encounter from research-oriented medical organizations. Those same medical interests that so bitterly opposed the former Randall-Pepper bills will not stand idly by now. It must not be forgotten that the main philosophical and material threat to our cam-

campaign for laboratory animal legislation comes from a scientific community so reliant on science alone that it would leave the world with no sense of the real direction and purpose of existence if unopposed.

In our desire to win protection for laboratory animals, as in all other areas, The HSUS is responding to the challenges of leadership, ably fulfilling its responsibilities to the many societies and individuals who look to it for guidance. Flexibility in strategy and planning has won more victories throughout the years than stubborn commitment to a losing course of action and your Society will continue to exercise this essential of good leadership.

At the same time, The HSUS never intends to get so far in front that it is acting on its own, without the support of the humane movement. Such a development would not yield maximum results for the benefit of animals. The motto of close cooperation with local organizations and individuals which has characterized HSUS activity from the start has been largely responsible for fostering a potent, nationwide force that now embraces most of the humane movement.

What has been achieved and what will be achieved is determined by the combined strength and determination of that force. In my own opinion, this great and growing potential for good stands as the best monument to the inspirational leadership which your Society has provided throughout these past eleven years.

Treasurer's Report

By Edward M. Bostick, Falls Church, Va.

This report, required by HSUS by-laws, was presented at the Corporation meeting.

It is a pleasure to be able to convey to you figures relating to the financial standing of The Humane Society of the United States. First, however, I would like to acknowledge the invaluable services of our Assistant Treasurer, Mrs. Worthy Gardner, and The HSUS Office Manager, Mrs. Moneta Morgan, without whose help your Treasurer could not function.

You will all remember some years ago that John Foster Dulles said that brinksmanship was one of the prerequisites to the successful conduct of international affairs. If Mr. Dulles was correct in this statement, I can think of no better training ground for a Secretary of State than the post as Treasurer of The Humane Society of the United States. Your Society exists perpetually on the brink of the abyss of financial chaos.

Every year there are times when the General Fund balance is reduced to precariously small proportions. The situation gives frequent cause for alarm; yet it has its bright side, too. If The HSUS had been launched under conservative financial management, always trying to lay up a reserve against a rainy day, it would be but a small segment of what it is today. Fred Myers' courageous and aggressive policy of spend all you can get your hands on for animal welfare and the Lord (meaning the humane constituency) will provide has been basic in the Society's development. You have provided in the past and we continue in the same policy in the faith that you will continue to provide in the future.

The HSUS continues to take in more every year and to spend more every year with no reserves of any kind being set aside to bolster the General Fund.

To review a few figures: The net worth of the General Fund on August 31 was \$39,000. However, half of this sum is represented by notes held by The HSUS from its various Branches. At this writing there is little prospect that these notes will be paid in the foreseeable future. From the remainder, deducting miscellaneous assets represented by furniture and equipment, there is little cash left.

There is substantial money in the account restricted to the National Humane Education Center but an additional \$100,000 is necessary before construction contracts can be let. The HSUS takes pride in the fact that it has been selected to act as trustee of various other trust funds—but all of these funds have certain designated purposes for which income is to be spent—and these purposes do not include the General Fund of The HSUS.

Lastly, a very substantial sum appears on the balance sheet which is held by the Mellon Bank under a trust agreement for the benefit of those who have purchased HSUS annuities. The sale of annuities shows a modest profit to The HSUS but this profit becomes available only over a long period of years.

From this very brief review, it is readily apparent that The HSUS General Fund must continue to receive your generous support or the activities of the Society will rapidly decrease. I personally am committed to The HSUS in the belief that it is the outstanding performer on the national scene in the field of animal welfare. I urge you to be as generous as you can and to help The HSUS in soliciting donations from your friends as well. In my opinion, there is no better vehicle for translating our dollars into effective work for the animals who need our help.

Humane Education of the Next Generation of Americans

By Dr. Stuart Westerlund, Washington, D. C.

Associate Professor of Education, The George Washington University

“I cannot bring you anything new and strange about humane education, for I am not possessed of anything but what you yourselves do know.” This is a quotation from an address to teachers by Edward Hyatt, former Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of California well over forty years ago, and one which certainly illustrates my position today.

My primary responsibility at this Conference is to share with you some of the highlights of our present research project on the subject of humane education. But, being a philosopher of sorts, I should first like to philosophize a bit, and perhaps lay a predicate for my later remarks.

In an age of nuclear power and dynamic change, it seems important to ask the question, “what kind of person must I be to meet the challenges of the times?” Inherent in this question and intimately related to education is the concept of humanitarianism. But what about this question, humanitarianism and education?

In the process of education, three major aspects stand out sharply: philosophy, psychology, and evaluation. It is through philosophy of education that we establish goals and objectives. In other words, where are we going? What do we want? What is really important? Without a philosophy we wander aimlessly in the vast desert known as “no man’s land.” Psychology speaks of methodology, the means whereby we might achieve our goals; it is the instrument by which we hope to achieve our objectives. Without a methodology we are like a ship without a rudder. We may know where we want to go, but are unable to get there because we lack the required mechanism. I mention evaluation as the third major aspect because it helps us to determine the extent to which we have achieved our goals. It seems to me that these three major aspects of education are important.

Applying this scheme to the subject under discussion, I would like to point out that in our society, in every age, there has existed—at least in a general way—the goal of humaneness. This goal has not

always been implicit nor even explicit but has nevertheless permeated the very essence of our national heritage. Relative to education, this goal has received only incidental treatment relative to a positive developmental approach. I am not at all certain that there exists, on the part of many educators, an awareness of such a goal in education. This can be recognized when we examine the various methods and materials utilized in our schools today. It is also recognized by the fact that there exists little understanding with regards to the terms "humaneness" and/or "humane education."

Applying the aspect of evaluation to which we alluded earlier, we need only to note the ever-widening gap between technology and the humanities generally. I am not an anti-space probe individual, but I do believe that in this spectacular era we must do some evaluating.

Superintendent Hyatt, in his address to the teachers in California over forty years ago, stated that "The State of California has officially recognized the value and the necessity of this branch of education (humaneness). By formal statute, regularly enacted, it has been ranked with the list of subjects prescribed for the schools of the state. So far as legislative recognition is concerned, humane education stands alongside reading, writing, and arithmetic and the other time-honored subjects of the standard curriculum.

"In carrying these messages of humane civilization from the statute books to the children, translating them on the way so that those who run may read, we are entirely dependent upon the 12,000 public school teachers who are now working for our commonwealth. It is only as we interest them, kindle life and light and enthusiasm into them, that we can hope to see these things reappear in the children. And this is easier said than done.

"It is possible for the teacher to say things that her children will never forget. I would beg all the teachers of the state to get some conception of this movement into their own souls, and to grasp it, to know what it is for, what it is driving at, to feel it. I would have them absorb a fund of sentiment to have on tap, honest sentiment enriched by incident and song and story... The stream cannot rise above its source, but if it has a chance it will rise nearly to its source. Enthusiasm is everything. I would not chill it. Without it we shall get nowhere, with this or any other thing..."

I like this; I think Hyatt was right. But, as I mentioned a few moments ago, I don't believe much of an awareness of this exists today with regards to the curriculum in our schools. I shall attempt to add credence to this statement in a few moments when I will share with you the results of some of my visits to various school systems. But I would like to philosophize yet for a moment or two.

It has been a popular notion for some time now that education per se is what the world needs if we are to realize world peace, understanding, prosperity, brotherly-love, etc. But what do we mean by

education? Teach a man to write and he might forge checks. No, education is not enough; it must be the right kind of education, and this necessarily involves the teaching of humaneness. For many years, we talked about the three R's: reading, riting, rithmetic. Now we talk about the six R's: reading, riting, rithmetic, remedial reading, remedial riting, remedial rithmetic. But even the six R's are not enough. Many of us feel strongly that it is not enough to teach a man how to earn a living; it is essential also that he learn how to live.

The dust of the centuries blows over the ruins of dead nations or civilizations that realized technological achievements. But this was often accomplished as the result of the misery and suffering of all forms of life.

In 1927, Randall J. Condon penned the following educational ideals: "Teach reading, writing, and arithmetic, of course, but not as fundamentals, except as in the learning one is taught to read fine things, to write beautiful thoughts, and to know that in the fundamentals of life the sum of one's happiness cannot be obtained by subtracting from others, and that the way to multiply the value of one's possessions is to divide them with others, especially those in need. Teach geography, but only that to world knowledge may be added world sympathy and understanding and fellowship. Teach history that against its gray background of suffering and sorrow and struggle we may better understand the present and may project a fine future. Teach civics to make strong the ideals of liberty and justice, and to make free, through obedience, the citizens of a republic. Teach science, but always as the handmate of religion, to reveal how the brooding spirt of God created the world and all that is therein and set the stars in their courses in accordance with the eternal laws that He himself had ordained. Teach music and art and literature. Reveal beauty and truth. Inculcate social and civic ideals. Teach that which gives intelligence and skill, but forget not soul culture, for out of this comes the more abundant life bringing forth the fruits of the spirit. These are the real fundamentals in education; for character is higher than intelligence, and the soul shall never die."

Theory is important in the field of research, and without it, research loses much of its effectiveness. Intuitive feeling or expression is important, as well as assumptions and hypotheses.

I have expressed certain notions, feelings, assumptions, thus far in an effort to indicate that what we have done in our research efforts up to this point, and what we hope to do in the future, is based upon not only a recognition of the need, but also some understanding of the problem.

Now to the research.

Stated simply, the present study was an attempt to determine what has been or is being done in our schools relative to humane education, to develop an awareness of the problem, to obtain professional

opinions, to obtain a sample relative to humane attitudes, and to develop a prospectus for a major research study on this subject.

I will not take the time here to deal with our library findings; except to say that there is not very much in the literature. I had a graduate student at the Library of Congress for a month, and he came up with very little.

As the project director, personal visits were made by me to several school systems where programs in humane education are conducted. With the exception of one, nothing of significance was observed. Some programs consist of drawing pictures in art classes, sometimes with "kindness" captions. It is not meant here that these programs are of no value whatever, but rather that the impact in terms of attitude development is not very great. To illustrate a point, I should like to use an analogy here. Much criticism has been leveled at educators regarding the subject of reading (very often by educators). There are claims that reading is taught only incidentally after the third grade. What is often meant by this is that reading in the first three grades constitutes the focal point of the curriculum, and rightly so, because of the necessity for the development of a foundation upon which other subjects or disciplines is built. The concern regarding the incidental approach after the third grade has implications both for future development and also for reinforcement.

My inference is along the same line. With reference to my opening statement regarding the kind of person required for successful continuation of our national heritage, humaneness is an integral part of the necessary foundation upon which successful living is realized. An annual poster contest or any other vague incidental approach to the problem of developing positive attitudes of kindness is far too little to make an appreciable impact in terms of development of reinforcement.

From our visits with teachers and administrators, and as a result of the pilot study, we have established that there is a need for the teaching of humaneness in the schools, and that it is feasible.

In connection with the major study, we are quite aware of goals and objectives. We have learned from the present study something about materials and methods as well as a plan for evaluation.

Materials and methods must be developed and utilized in such a way as to occupy the kind of position in the curriculum that was suggested by Superintendent of Schools Hyatt, that is, in line with reading, writing, and arithmetic.

We recognize first of all that teachers must be properly trained before they can do an effective job of teaching humaneness. This means that courses of instruction in humaneness must be developed and offered in our teacher training institutions—a course entitled something like "Methods of Teaching Humaneness." Here teachers would learn how to develop resource units and other materials

necessary to do a superior job in the teaching of humaneness. This is one of the objectives in our prospectus.

In terms of materials, the following will all be utilized: textbooks, various other books, films, filmstrips, slides, art materials, science materials, pamphlets. All of the above would contain the content of the course, but include in a direct and dynamic way, the subject of humaneness—humaneness to all of life. This, of course, requires a great deal of development and experimentation. Experimental projects, projects in cooperation with local service clubs, and societies. Actual contact with animals would be a prime concern. As indicated by both teachers and administrators, actual contact with animals is considered to be an important approach.

It is proposed that experimental programs be set up in the school systems which participated in the pilot study. This would give us geographical representativeness and would contribute greatly to the evaluation aspect. We would then initiate our experimental programs in the selected schools in the various areas, having control and experimental groups. At the end of the school year, participants would react to an inventory concerning humane attitudes and the results compared to the mean established for that area prior to the initiation of the experimental program. Other measurement procedures will be utilized to determine the relative merits of the various methods and materials.

Perhaps the biggest assessment we have to make before undertaking all of this is to determine the needs of the nation in terms of the humanities and define the role of humane education in meeting those needs. We will have to show clearly in the major study the benefits which positive attitudes towards moral and ethical values will bring in the development of character and the total personality generally. There is no better way to foster these positive attitudes than through an effectively administered classroom program that integrates the humane ideology with our present educational processes.

The end result of our major study will be a "packaged" program easily adaptable to any community, rural or city. It will include techniques and methods for selecting and training teachers for their key roles in executing the program as part of their schools' curriculums. This is, of course, of the greatest importance since the example which teachers set to children is going to be far more productive and beneficial than mere learning by rote.

Our progress so far gives every indication of a happy marriage between humanitarianism and education in a relatively few years. We have already established the teaching of humane attitudes as an important, fundamental, philosophical concept of education and we now know that there are practical means by which the goal we seek can be achieved. The cooperation we have received from educators,

the response we have evoked from students, teachers, curriculum experts and others in our preliminary survey shows an astonishing eagerness for this kind of program. To me, this means that those most essential to the success of our program—the students at whom it is aimed and the teachers and administrators—need and want what we are trying to give them.

There could be no better guarantee of success for this program which reaches beyond the protection of animals to the higher and more important concept of developing a society that includes the betterment of people.

The National Humane Education Center and the Welfare of Animals

By Mel L. Morse, San Rafael, California

Executive Director, Humane Society of Marin County

Those of you who have been associated with the humane movement for some time have many times heard us use the term “humane education.” I am sure that our educators will argue that we misuse the term, but perhaps it conveys things to those of us actively engaged in animal welfare work that make its use correct.

I do not intend to burden you with any philosophical discussion of humane education as we have persons who are far more qualified to do so than I. I will, however, expose you to some ideas that I have had on the subject and perhaps I will provoke you into doing something about it.

What I want specifically to discuss with you is the HSUS National Humane Education Center and the needs that it will fulfill.

The role of all humane organizations is the prevention of cruelty and, in order to do this, we must be prepared to show a better way. We cannot stand back saying “no” or “you can’t do that” unless we are prepared to show why. We must understand that cruelty is not always a sadistic act and one whose perpetrator needs the attention of a psychiatrist. I am sure that there are many cruelty cases that should be handled in such a manner, but not very many of them get or deserve this distinction. Usually we move to correct the problem and try to see that it does not happen again; then we use the cruelty case to point out some of the evils and go on to the next one.

I must point out, also, that very little humane education is involved in formal education. This is not true because of a lack of interest, but there has been no great effort nationally to see that effective tools and useful information is offered. There is a great need for such education and students graduating from teachers’ colleges should have been indoctrinated in humane education, the reasons for it, and methods of teaching it. With such a background we will see more instruction given to pupils on the benefits of a knowledge of the reasons for kindness, compassion and consideration, not only for animals, but for humans.

There is another program of education being conducted by humane organizations all over the country which should be humane education. Some do a good job, some bad. Some do a great deal, and some very little. But in each contact by a humane society representative with a person who has ownership, control, or custody of an animal, there should be an exchange that results in an understanding regarding the rights and needs of animals and the responsibilities that should be borne by the person who is the owner, controller, or custodian of an animal.

When a person arrives at the animal shelter with a basket full of newborn kittens for which he wants a good home—even though all of his efforts have failed—you have a person ripe for some humane principles and information about surplus breeding.

An investigation by a humane agent—whether it be for an animal tied in the snow, rain or sun, or because of reported abuse to an animal—is an opportunity not just for direct correction but also for education.

When a person adopts an animal from an animal shelter, there are many things to be considered—whether he is prepared to accept the responsibilities of animal ownership and whether he can devote the time and the attention necessary to it. If not, the adoption should not be completed and even the refusal should be a means of education. Every representative of every humane society, from the manager to the clerical and kennel employees, should be prepared to carry out this part of the Society's education program. And, equally important, the Directors comprising the Board should also fully understand the program and the need for it in the community.

Where are all these people going to get the information that they need to do this program effectively? I believe that it should come from the National Humane Education Center in Waterford, Virginia. The humane movement is at least 50 years overdue in providing a training program for teachers and workers. Many of you have heard this need discussed in local and national meetings of the humane movement for many years.

When Fred Myers first discussed with me the possibility of the Waterford project, we both felt that at long last something concrete was going to be done—and the benefactors had our undying gratitude. The land and some cash were made available and steps were taken to get the construction and programming underway. Several problems arose later that delayed the scheduling, but the site is there and many improvements have been made and plans have been drawn. The next steps are to construct, staff, and operate the facility and I hope that this will proceed without any further delay. Additional funds are going to be needed to make this project an effective tool for the furtherance of the humane ideal. I am sure that all of you will assist in its development.

One phase of this program probably interests me more than any other: a national center where educational materials can be developed, studied, tried, and put into the field for use by teachers and others. Another, equally important, phase is that at long last there will be a training school for humane society managers, municipal pound operators, and others interested in humane work in the local community.

Even though I will again be accused of being too shelter oriented, I will say that, in my opinion, the work of the local society is the heart of the entire humane movement. Most of the organizations who are active today had to work out their problems on their own, with little help from a national organization—as much as it was needed and as much as such programs have been pushed by national humane officials.

The national organizations themselves were founded by persons who worked in local humane societies and saw the need for national leadership and a way to inaugurate programs on a larger and wider scale than was possible by the local organization. We are in great need of a continuing strong, active leadership on both the national and local level.

Our training program up to now has been limited to the ability of a Board of Directors to send a prospective employee to another society for training. In some instances this was inadequate, as the organization to which the person was sent was not doing a program that was similar to the one needed in a particular area. For instance, a man in training in a large city operation will get very little information about the problems of livestock, wildlife, etc., that are peculiar to a rural area. True, the basic office procedures are the same but the functions are not too parallel.

The Humane Society of Marin County is glad to receive trainees. We have several each year from organizations in various parts of the country. We also welcome workers, members of Boards of Directors, government officials, who are exploring programs, procedures, policies, and the equipment and the means to implement them.

One can learn a great deal by being exposed actively to a humane society program. It is, very definitely, the best way to learn and evaluate—to see that the humane movement is something with which they can become actively associated. I did this myself just 26 years ago this month.

In many instances Board of Directors have had to look to other local societies to supply a person who could run their operation. They have been at the mercy at times of the society, getting a person who was going to be fired. There have been all too many instances where Boards have offered a job to one of the key employees of another organization, creating a void with no one to fill it. So it got to be a vicious circle.

Many workers have found themselves in humane work because of

sheer desperation on the part of a Board of Directors who wanted a "body" to do some work because the Board members themselves did not have time to do it, or the knowledge. Some of these individuals have come to be real assets to the society and to the humane movement but others have been steadily accepting their salaries and have done nothing to further the ideal or the movement.

Those of you who are Directors know that this is true. You have known of the frustrations.

Where are these potential people coming from, and how do we go about getting them? The answer, I believe, is the National Humane Education Center.

A Board of Directors should be able to send a person to be trained and know that the person who is turned out by such training is adequate. No amount of training, however, is going to change the fact that in many instances there is a clash of personalities. The teachers at the Center, however, will be able to see if that one ingredient, "heart, humaneness, or compassion"—call it what you will—is there. If it is not, then the wrong person is taking the course. Knowledge alone is not going to get the job done. The person who is turned out of the Center as a humane worker should be an ambassador of good will and a teacher of humaneness. I believe that each person now involved in the humane movement, either as a professional worker or as a volunteer, should be interested in furthering the cause. We should attract new people and encourage these new people in the belief that this is a wonderful field of endeavor. We have so much in our favor. We can offer interesting and rewarding work. We can offer incentive and pride in accomplishment.

We should be striving to meet adequate wage standards and realize that the results of our humane activities depend a great deal on the persons who are actively engaged as paid workers. We need to upgrade our personnel and to attract more and more young people into this field. All of you who operate shelters have inquiries as to whether this is a field for young people, and you should answer in the affirmative. The movement is growing and the need for professional workers is greater now than ever before due to the fact that so many animal control and animal welfare programs have priority in local government. This is due to necessity but whether the local pound is run humanely or not depends a great deal upon us who are setting the pattern and training the people. Animals deserve a better fate than they are getting. Each new city and each new community is going to need some animal control and programs of animal welfare. The persons who are going to conduct these programs are, for the most part, not now working in the animal welfare field.

The need for humane workers is not limited to the operation of an animal shelter. We want very badly for the caretakers of laboratory animals to be humane and qualified to handle animals properly.

We want veterinarians to be able to hire qualified and humane workers in their hospitals. Animal control officers working for municipal governments should have a knowledge and understanding of animals. The qualification tests that are given under civil service can determine the extent of the individual's knowledge, but they certainly cannot judge the humaneness of the individual and whether the animals that come under his control will be brutalized.

What are you doing in your community with the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts who are working on merit badge programs involving first aid, care and keeping—dog care, cat care, horse care?

Are the animal interest groups in your community coming to you with their meetings? Are you furthering animal welfare through the local cat shows and dog shows? Have you considered giving instruction in horse care that would be available for all?

Do your teachers come to you for field trips or questions on various animal problems?

Are you available when the human, in distress because of some misfortune such as fire, accident, or death, needs care for his animals?

Our organization in San Rafael makes it a deliberate part of its program to be the guiding force and motivation for good animal control and animal welfare. I sincerely believe that every organization should.

Through these groups you will get your support, morally and financially. Through these contacts you will strengthen your Board of Directors. You have more members, volunteer workers, and personnel.

You will be running a humane education program that is within your reach and which does not need much explanation for everyone to understand it.

You can do such programs and can benefit by outlines, programs, and materials from the National Humane Education Center.

I hope that I have outlined for you some of the needs for the new training center. I have not spent much time telling you that in the operation of the Center, it will immediately be serving the needs of a vast community in Loudoun County not only as an animal shelter but as a localized humane education center whereby local citizens, teachers, and officials may use and develop the facilities to better their own community. But, at the same time, their experiences and knowledge will be helpful to any and all similar communities in America. Let's get the program of this type of humane education on the way. It is long overdue.

Use of the Legislative Process in Protecting Animals

By Hugh Mc Namee, Cleveland, Ohio

Attorney

The statements that I shall make in this address are based upon experience gained by me as a lawyer, and as a member of the Ohio House of Representatives. That experience was applied to the successful pioneer attempt to enact the Ohio Rodeo Law of which I was the author and the pilot. Ohio is the first state in which a law has been passed to prohibit certain cruelty practices prevalent in rodeos and thus virtually eliminate them as a medium of public entertainment.

The origin of legislation is in some comprehension of a condition that needs correction by law. Such reform requires drafting a bill adequate to accomplish the desired objective. If there is no known precedent, the draft must necessarily be a novel composition. If there is precedent, it may serve as a model for a bill. Discovery of precedent is usually made through examination of statutes of states where legislation on the subject matter in question has been enacted. If the reformation desired is of a condition unsatisfactorily covered by an existing statute of the state where action will be undertaken, discovery of its existence is simpler and the drafting problem is one of amendment. The legal search involved and the composition of a bill require the services of a lawyer or a person otherwise qualified by training or experience. It is better that this be done before seeking a member of a legislative body to sponsor the reform objective.

Where an attempt has been made to get a bill passed in some prior assembly of the legislature, the above mentioned preliminaries have been done and there is an experience base from which to go forward. If that attempt has been made in some state other than your own, the national humane societies will have knowledge of it and can aid by furnishing or getting a copy of a bill for you.

The concept of the promoter having been formulated and embodied in a bill satisfactory to him, there will be more probability of acceptance of the proposed form by the prospective sponsor. Even if willing to undertake the task of drafting, the composition by the

sponsor may not be of such design as the promoter believes necessary to accomplish the purpose. Nor may it be if the sponsor has it done for him by the drafting service provided for assistance to legislators.

Assuming that there is a choice in the matter, the sponsor selected should be one who, above all else, is of humane disposition. Most of them are, for in fact if they were not, it would be an impossible task to get any humane legislation enacted. Preferably, the sponsor should be a member of the majority party in his branch of the legislature, because of the greater likelihood of support from the ranks of his own party, and because from it the chairmen of committees are appointed. A sponsor who has some seniority is by reason of that fact more experienced in legislative processes and has wider acquaintance among his colleagues. Generally, too, such a sponsor is more likely to be respected in greater degree by his colleagues and to be more influential among them.

It is highly desirable to have co-sponsorship of a bill by a member of the opposite party who has the characteristics desired and who would have like standing within his party as has the principal sponsor in his. The selection of the legislator to act as co-sponsor should be left to the judgment of the sponsor who is better qualified to make the decision.

If these preliminary and highly important steps can be taken prior to the convening of the assembly or in its early states, the chances of getting action and gaining what may well be needed time are much better. In the early period of the legislative session, there are fewer bills and consequently less clamor and less competition for committee hearing and for floor action than will be the case in the advanced stage of the session when, among other things, the members of the legislature become concerned with terminating the session and returning to their homes. As each day of the legislative session passes prior to the deadline, if there be one, for the introduction of bills, more and more bills are introduced. The volume becomes so great that it is an impossibility to give time, attention and consideration to all of them, regardless of the merits of their proposals. Consequently, many very meritorious bills never even get a committee hearing.

To illustrate the point, in July, at the time of the completion of enactment of the Rodeo Bill in Ohio, approximately 1,350 bills had been introduced of which action on 183 had been completed.

After introduction, the bill is assigned to a committee in accordance with the rules and practice prevailing, which may be expeditious or may be delayed, depending upon the method in use. In the Ohio House, bills are first assigned to a Reference Committee, which in turn refers them to a Study Committee. This may result in some delay. Usually bills are assigned to a committee constituted for consideration of matters of the type with which they deal.

When the assignment has been made, there may be further delay for various reasons, including volume of business assigned to the specific committee, opinion as to priority of importance, disinterest in the matter on the part of the Chairman, failure to focus his attention upon its importance, the influential effect of opposition forces, and so forth. The Chairmen of Committees have the prerogative of scheduling of hearings on bills assigned to their committees, so it is very important, therefore, that the Chairman before whose committee a bill is pending be tactfully and courteously informed on the subject and requested to schedule it for action.

It should be self-evident that all matters necessary and essential to persuasive presentation to the committee of the merits of a bill should be prepared well in advance of the time scheduled for hearing. Hearings commonly are scheduled on rather short notice and unless adequate preparation has been made, proponents of measures will fail in accomplishing their objectives.

Preparation for presentation requires accumulation and assembling of evidence in support of the subject matter of the bill under consideration as well as of such as may be useful in rebuttal or refutation of evidence or arguments anticipated to be made by assumed or disclosed opposition. If presentable in documentary form, copies of evidence or statements filed with the Committee will serve a very useful purpose. Where appropriate, photographs are of valuable assistance. Use of photographs in hearings on the Ohio Rodeo Bill were extremely helpful in getting favorable action both in committees of the House and Senate, and in floor presentation. These were submitted to the Committees by Frank McMahan, HSUS Director of Field Services, whose presentations of evidence to the committees were major factors in the passage of the bill. An illustration of the effective use of documented evidence in statistical form is that which was used at the hearing before the Senate Agriculture Committee on the slaughter bill. The statistical information had been compiled by Fred Pucher of Cleveland, Ohio, a member of HSUS, and was made available by me to Don Maxfield, HSUS representative from New Jersey, who appeared as a witness before the committee.

Evidence of great weight and value is that obtained from professional sources, particularly from Doctors of Veterinary Medicine, of whom some will be found who are willing to give supporting letters. In Ohio, letters in support of the Rodeo Bill were obtained from several eminent members of that profession.

The most distinguished of those members is Dr. W. F. Guard of Columbus, Ohio, Professor Emeritus of Veterinary Medicine at Ohio State University, who, at my request, promptly and co-operatively gave a letter approving the bill. Arrangement to get this important item of evidence was made by long-distance telephone call, and procurement of it is probative of the merit of the use of that means of

communication. We have not yet met in person. The suggestion to contact Dr. Guard was made by Dr. Daniel C. Stearns, of Cleveland, Ohio, who made available to me for use in evidence a photograph showing severe injury made by an abrasive bit to the tongue of a horse. Regrettably, however, too many members of the profession of veterinary medicine are as devoid of humane consideration for animals as are Doctors of Medicine.

Witnesses selected for presentation of pertinent evidence should be persons who are conversant with and informed upon the subject matter with which the bill deals, and competent to answer questions by committee members concerning provisions and effects of the bill. It is well to have in attendance at a hearing a number of persons who evidence their support of the bill by their presence. The nature, volume and form of evidence to be proffered will be governed by factors which include the nature of the subject matter of the bill, the importance of the problem involved and the amount of time allotted or estimated for the hearing. Committee time is always precious and for this reason, among others, supplemental documentary evidence has value.

In connection with each step along the way of progress of a bill to final enactment, as wide a range of support for it as reasonably can be should be marshalled. For bills of humane character, the primary source of support will be humanely disposed individuals, humane societies and their members. Contact must be made with them, information and explanation transmitted to them, and their active support solicited. In form the support mainly will be letters and telegrams, in addition to which, and to some extent, personal contact with the legislators representing the respective districts of supporters should be made, especially if there is prior acquaintance. At the beginning there should be expressions of appreciation of the undertaking addressed to the sponsors, which will encourage and sustain their interest in the task and enable them to demonstrate, to some extent, to their colleagues that the bill has popular appeal. At this point contact should be made with and communications addressed to the representatives from their own constituents requesting support when the bill comes up for a vote. In repetition, the same sort of support should be directed to the chairman of the committee when assignment of the bill has been made known. To a lesser degree, the same action should be taken with respect to the members of the committee, particularly by supporters who are constituents of their respective districts. Representatives are more attentive to pleas from their own districts and, in consequence, may be more interested in attending committee meetings scheduled to consider matters thus brought to their attention, or, when unable to do so because of some schedule conflict, may request the chairman of the committee to record their votes upon the bill. Absence from

committee meetings, or failure to be placed on record, may mean the difference between recommendation and failure.

When a committee has recommended a bill for passage, it goes to a calendar committee, whatever may be its name, which selects for floor action such bills and at such time as it pleases. It is the most powerful of committees. It is important to solicit its favor also, lest there be no further action. If the bill is scheduled for floor action, and there be time, there should be renewed contact of representatives by constituents. After each step of progress those whose favor has been sought and granted should be thanked for it, not only as a matter of courtesy, but also because there may be another bill for another time. Friends gained should be retained.

Most occupants of elective public office welcome opportunities to appear as speakers before groups of their constituents. Invitations to them to speak at humane society meetings would afford opportunities for forming or renewing acquaintances which can be very advantageous to both parties. When such invitations are extended and accepted, intensive effort should be made for good attendance as a courtesy to the guest speaker and for mutual benefit.

If the bill passes, the job is only half done because, with little exception, State Legislatures consist of two bodies. There is an advantage in having the bill introduced in both branches because it may get earlier attention in one than in the other. If that is undertaken, arrangements in respect thereto are best left to the primary sponsor. The usual practice is that when one branch has begun action on a bill, the other will await the result, withholding action on the bill in the meantime. In any case, when a bill has passed in one branch, it goes to the other, where the same legislative procedures must take place to result in enactment. Naturally, a bill has impetus when it has passed in one branch, but that is no assurance of passage in the other. Consequently, each step of the supporting action must be taken again with respect to the members of the other branch.

It is very helpful to have a roster of the legislative membership which gives useful information about each member and informs of the composition of committees. A roster may be obtained upon request to one's own representative or to either clerk of the legislature. Also published from time to time are bulletins in volume form which give the status of all matters before the legislature as of the date of publication. These may be procured in the same manner. An extremely useful service in following progress of legislation is a daily reporting service in condensed form which informs of the day-by-day activities, and through which, if not otherwise known, one may learn of events or schedules concerning matters of interest to him. In Ohio, such a service is available but it is a business enterprise selling to subscribers. A competent co-worker resident of the capital city of a state, who can devote some of his time to watching

legislative activities and developments, forming and firming acquaintance with legislators, and promptly passing along news of importance, can contribute very substantially to the success of the program.

The basic purpose of activity is to persuade legislators to a concurrence in views of supporters, or, as the case may be, of opponents of bills. It is my opinion that this is best done through personal contact and correspondence as above indicated. The support base may be widened through club and association groups not directly identified with the humane movement, if persuaded to act. Of course, editorial support by newspapers and other publications helps much, but interest in specific proposals is difficult to obtain, particularly in large cities, unless the proposed measures appear to be of great and general public interest. How much of this sort of support solicitation can be done depends upon the number and ability of persons active in the project, and facilities available to do it. How much of it should be done that can be is a question of judgment related to the objective. There is a danger, of course, in seeking wide general publicity and support of miscellaneous clubs and organizations, because it may have an adverse effect of stirring up opposition which might not otherwise develop. For example, in Ohio, no support for the Rodeo Bill was sought from horse owner groups because of the possibility of arousing opposition. The Rodeo Cowboys Association missed the boat on this one and was much chagrined in consequence.

To bring legislative projects to success requires management, assumption or delegation of responsibility and authority, some know-how, experience in dealing with such matters, co-operation on a state-wide basis to demonstrate that the matters are not simply of local character, use of time, journeys to the capital city and expense. The best and surest method of rounding up co-operation is by liberal use of long distance calls. This is very effective in gaining support of individuals and humane groups. They quickly respond to the request for aid by a strange voice when the authenticity and merit of the project are explained and when the request is for aid in the form of activity, not a solicitation for money. Whoever, individually or as a management group, undertakes a promotional project should realize that the expense involved must be borne by such individual or group. Solicitation of financial aid may preclude co-operative action otherwise obtainable.

These remarks have been addressed principally to the subject of proposed new legislation, but the suggestions as to activity are equally applicable to opposition to proposals of a character objectionable to humane societies and individuals. Of this type are the proposals by the American Law Institute for exemption from the application of cruelty law of persons experimenting upon animals, even at the grade school level. Opposition defeated such an exemption bill before the Illinois Senate this year. Unless timely, vigorous and

effective opposition to such proposals is interposed, diabolical measures become law. When that happens, it is likely to remain so. Preventive action will have a much better chance of success than a campaign to repeal.

The occurrence in Illinois illustrates the usefulness and effectiveness of many of the suggestions that I have made. Discovery of this school-bill proposal in time to spread the word and mount opposition to it impeded its passage in the House and killed it in a Senate Committee. This was accomplished by watchfulness of measures introduced, learning or understanding the objectives sought, arousing opposition by bulletins, declaring it by letters to newspapers and to legislators, and so forth. One newspaper account stated that some legislators received as many as 500 letters each. One legislator supporting the bill was quoted as bemoaning the effect of such mass expressions of public opinion.

Not all opposition, however, to a bill or to component parts of it may come along from non-humane sources, but may come from within the humane community, as you well know. Although the A.H.A. joined in support of the Ohio Rodeo Bill, I was informed by Mr. Thomas Justice, President of A.H.A., that at the mid-west conference of that Society, the necessity of the prohibition of the use of twisted wire snaffles and electric prods was questioned. When I told him that I was opposed to any amendment deleting those prohibitions, he did not insist. However, prior to the Senate Committee hearing one of its members put to me the question of the necessity of prohibiting use of wire snaffles. At the hearing that question was well answered by exhibition of the photograph of the horse's injured tongue. Accept from any source or any society support which is genuine and not designed to scuttle the bill, even though such support comes from persons or societies whom you will vigorously oppose on other matters or policies.

Up to this point attention has been directed to action on the state level but the same principles apply to action on the national or municipal level. In municipal matters there is more opportunity for direct contact and consultation with the councilman representing the ward of one's residence, and he is interested in the problems brought to him by his neighbors. If his interest is aroused in respect to some matter, for example, a spaying program, by evidence presented of public savings, diminution of a problem and beneficial humane results, much good may result. Proposed municipal ordinances are usually drafted by City Law Directors at the request of councilmen, but such representatives sponsor also proposed ordinances of other origin.

In suppression of cruelty to animals through legislation so much needs to be done and there are so few to do it. Unless done by you it will not be done. Initial attempts, if not successful, must be

renewed with patience and persistence. Immeasurable will be your spiritual reward for a successful contribution to the protection of our fellow-creatures, the helpless and abused animals.

Our Pet Population Explosion and Operation SPARED

By Mrs. Kay Clausing, Westmont, New Jersey

Education Director, Animal Welfare Association

A national campaign is being launched anew to create an awareness of the damage and cruelty which result from the uncontrolled breeding of dogs and cats — and to promote cooperation and remedial action on ALL fronts. As its chairman, I would have preferred first acting and then talking about accomplishments, for ideas are worthless until they are put into action. However, we do have a master plan, which I shall touch upon briefly, in part. Some of the plan is already in operation.

It has often been said that people in the humane movement spend too much time talking to each other. In a sense, this is true, but the adoption policies of a large percentage of shelters do not indicate that we have gotten our message through to them!

Large numbers of unspayed females are still flowing from shelters of humane societies across the nation. It is difficult to understand why these shelters continue to release females, without making spaying compulsory, having had the experience of getting mama AND her puppies or kittens back six months later, time after time. Although not excusable, even among smaller societies, we feel that these are sometimes motivated by the fact that they want to give the individual animal, which they see before them, a chance for life.

I believe that I also know the reasoning behind some of the larger societies refusing to acknowledge the surplus animal problem. I have heard it said regarding the term surplus animals that this is the trade-mark of another organization, meaning the HSUS, of course.

This evidence of rivalry among humane societies is difficult to understand, since we ALL are working (or should be) for a common cause. As chairman of this Committee, it is my ambition to achieve unity among humane societies regarding solutions to this tragic problem of surplus animals. Unity has already been demonstrated, at least in part, with the Rogers-Pepper Bill. So it is possible, too, with our Committee. To help achieve this, we plan to call this project "Operation SPARED" and invite top officials from leading humane groups who will embrace our unity of purpose to partici-

pate, making this their committee, too. Yes, what I am saying is that the purpose of "Operation SPARED" is not to serve any single humane group, but rather the entire humane movement.

All humane societies are dedicated to preventing cruelty and suffering. No society can effectively prevent cruelty unless it makes spaying compulsory for all females released for adoption and talks spaying to every owner of a female. Even if the home is a good one in every other respect, if a female is permitted to produce even one litter, the humane society is simply delaying or postponing cruelty. In fact, it is perpetuating it. When the female (which your society otherwise placed so carefully) has a litter, often its owners are not qualified to judge what constitutes a good home. In fact, they are relieved to find any home. Many of these puppies and kittens are reaching homes where they will be neglected or cruelly abused—but will continue to reproduce, possibly to be abandoned later. Some are given to wardens or wind up in marts where they are sold cheaply to children whose parents do not even want a pet—or they are sold by weight at rural auctions.

Societies continue to investigate and act upon cruelties which could have been prevented (but weren't) by shutting down the original kitten or puppy mill — and to which the abused animal which they are now trying to help is related. Thus, instead of actively preventing cruelty, I reiterate, many societies are merely delaying it — and perpetuating it.

Because I have worked at grass root levels, I understand how thinly we in the humane movement are already dividing our time and our energies. Thus, to facilitate the participation of individual humane societies, we plan to issue ready-to-use kits. These will include a brief outline of our purpose and goals, along with samples of materials for distribution, and concrete suggestions for putting them to use. Time does not permit my elaborating on this, but we have worked out some of the details, using materials effectively on a tri-county basis on my home grounds. Among them will be a new pamphlet, aimed at the conscience of individual owners of unspayed female pets and unaltered male cats.

There will also be a new folder written to convince dealers, pet shops, and individual breeders of pedigreed pets, of the importance and wisdom of making spaying compulsory for all animals sold or given as pets. Do not underestimate the numbers of these animals. Of the pet advertisements 80% are pedigrees for sale (the other 20% are free kittens and puppies, of course). Many of these end up producing mixed breed litters, too. I first spoke at local kennel club meetings regarding this and my approach was at once accepted. I have since written a condensation of this, entitled "Stop Them From Depreciating Your Breed" which appeared in Popular Dogs magazine a few months ago. As a result of the article, breeders from various

parts of the country have contacted me, all in complete accord — with some even wanting to make castration of their male pedigreed pets compulsory.

The essence of my message was this. Everyone who buys or is given a pedigreed pet fancies himself a breeder, often first because he wants one litter. But this soon becomes a hobby and then a means of making a “fast buck.” He knows little about selective breeding, thus depreciating the breed. You’ve seen this happen to the cocker, boxer, German shepherd, and collie. It is now happening to the beagle, poodle, and the Siamese cat. A pedigree is no longer assurance that the pet will be characteristic of the breed. Fanciers of the breed (and potential buyers) who see these poor specimens, not bred selectively, soon change their minds about owning one. And often the dispositions of these animals are defective, too. The unrewarding, though blameless, pet is soon neglected and given free access to the outdoors where it will mate accidentally and produce mixed breed litters whose offspring also continue to reproduce, ad infinitum!

These backyard breeders undersell the ethical dealers, thus attracting their customers away and flooding the market. Here, too, we have devised solutions for the breeders, along with the mechanics. Purchasers of a pedigreed pet are given a “Proof of Spaying” form, to be completed by their veterinarians, and the dealer or breeder withholds the papers until such proof is presented.

One of the chief obstacles of making spaying compulsory lies in releasing kittens and puppies, to be spayed at a later date. Even humane societies which collect the spaying fee in advance find that the pet owners often do not follow through. Also, a person who is convinced now of the importance of spaying can be less enthusiastic about this a few months later, especially if his financial conditions have changed, or if he has moved beyond the area of the humane society’s jurisdiction. Often, too, it is physically impossible to follow up effectively on these spayings.

For these reasons, this Committee has been exploring a new concept in spaying, which has already been proven to be practical. Whole litters of female kittens and puppies are spayed en masse, in less than an hour, between the ages of 5 and 8 weeks. Although it is a complete spaying operation, the animals are adoptable within 24 hours. There have been no noticeable side effects, long range or otherwise, and the mortality rate is no higher than from spayings performed at a later age. Males, too, can be castrated at the same time, so that no fertile pet need be released.

It has been demonstrated, too, that this spaying technique represents a savings in time, and thus spaying fees can be reduced. Actually, veterinarians using this technique would realize a number of advantages including a monetary gain, for through spaying more

animals, they would acquire many additional life-long clients who will use their services for immunization, etc.

Before this technique will be acceptable, we must first create an awareness among veterinarians regarding the dire need for this. Veterinarians who are not closely associated with humane societies normally see only the animals about which people care. The veterinarians are unaware of the flood of surplus animals which are born to die, almost at once — or which are doomed to prolonged suffering — until death mercifully releases them. These are the animals which reach us in such pitiful condition, if they reach us at all.

The next step in our working with veterinarians, after a local pilot project, will be education through every available means of communication. Our plans include a professionally produced film for veterinarians, demonstrating the technique and explaining its many advantages. It will be shown at county, state and national levels. We shall, of course, continue to explore new drug possibilities and new techniques.

Another area where large numbers of animals are released is public pounds. Here, of course, we shall educate officials on local and state levels regarding the seriousness and magnitude of this problem, through their own publications. We shall work for legislation to make licensing fees for unspayed females prohibitively high and to enact ordinances making immediate spaying compulsory for all females released for adoption.

Every writer knows that he must adapt his materials to the audience which he plans to reach. It is a fact that not everyone is as concerned as we regarding the moral aspects of the surplus animal problem. Thus, our educational efforts must include a variety of approaches.

Incidentally, “Operation SPARED” is meaningful in that the word “Operation” suggests the spaying operation itself, and “SPARED” implies that animals will be spared cruelty and suffering from being born, only to be destroyed promptly or otherwise. Compassionate people, too, will be spared the heartbreak and anguish of the situation. But “Operation SPARED” also has additional significance. The letters S-P-A-R-E-D spell: Spay Pet Animals (to) Reduce Enormous Destruction. The destruction which we plan to reduce is all-inclusive. Obviously it includes the flood of millions of animals destroyed by pounds and shelters, born to die almost at once — or after prolonged suffering. But there is also much destruction of property by stray animals and by those with irresponsible owners, destruction of farm animals and wild life by abandoned animals in an effort to survive, destruction of human life caused by pets on highways, etc. Truly, the surplus animal problem touches the lives of almost every man, woman and child in America.

The humane movement must succeed in creating a powerful public impression of the seriousness and importance of the surplus animal problem. We shall enlist in our cause, inactive, advisory and honorary capacities, prominent people from all walks of life. We shall use every available means of communication including radio, TV, outdoor advertising, newspapers, magazines, transit advertising, specialized publications, along with new and existing materials of our own.

We are confident that after "Operation SPARED" becomes a household word (and it will), the problem will be recognized by all as a major one. We plan to make the term "Pet Population Explosion" as familiar as the expression, "Population Explosion."

Additional plans for our committee, too numerous to even touch upon, are exciting challenges which we feel can be met successfully. Your societies will be contacted at various stages of our development. In the meantime, we are appealing to each of you to participate in this, your "Operation SPARED."

We ask each of you to send us a copy of any and all of your materials related to surplus animals, whether they are already in use or merely being considered. Perhaps you have drafted a model ordinance, or have radio or TV scripts on the subject — or simply a few scattered ideas. Do send them ALL to our clearing house, regardless of whether you feel that they have merit. Let our committee decide this. Possibly even a few words will suggest a new slant or a different approach to us. We do not have all of the answers; possibly you have some of them which we are seeking. Among other things, we are especially interested in learning the mechanics of various compulsory spaying programs in operation. Let us not waste valuable time duplicating efforts, when perhaps you have already said or done it better.

We are counting on each of you to be a member of our brainstorming team in absentia, via long distance. Please flood us with all of your materials, sending them directly to me for expediency, c/o my local society: Animal Welfare Assn., Box 35, Collingswood, N.J. And if you wish to participate more actively in the work of our committee, we would like to hear about this, too.

It is our fondest hope that, with time and continued effort, we shall have disseminated our message so widely that harboring an unspayed female dog or cat will be considered a stigma, and public opinion (and law) will be such that persons will be eager to conform.

Actually, Goethe has given us the magic key: "Only begin and the mind grows heated. Only begin and the task will be completed."

How Can We Best Help Laboratory Animals Now?

By Oliver Evans, Washington, D. C.

HSUS President

Instead of making an attempt to describe all of the varied activities of The HSUS during the past year and to discuss plans for the coming year, I think it is appropriate that I devote my time exclusively to the announced topic, "How can we best help laboratory animals now?"

This is a subject of tremendous importance to The HSUS and to its members. It is a subject of tremendous importance to the humane movement as a whole. And, above all, it is a subject of critical importance to the welfare of the animals themselves.

It is only appropriate that I do so for—as head of The HSUS staff—I made or approved of all decisions involved in the process of drafting the new bill, H.R. 10049, and of negotiating it with Rep. Paul Rogers.

Various drafts of bills were submitted to The HSUS Board of Directors and then, when the last draft was prepared, it was at my suggestion that our Chairman, Mr. Chenoweth, appointed a committee consisting of those five members of The HSUS board who had displayed the greatest interest in laboratory animal legislation and who had examined the drafts submitted with the keenest scrutiny and who had been most discriminating in rejecting some provisions and in making suggestions for improvements in others. This five member committee spent two full days before making its recommendation of approval to the full Board.

It is worth reviewing the events of the last five years. The strategic situation of laboratory animal legislation in the Congress cannot be understood without doing so. The decisions taken by The HSUS Board have validity only in the context of these events.

Five years ago the first bill for the protection of laboratory animals, the Cooper bill, was introduced in Congress. The Cooper bill was followed in the next Congress by The HSUS sponsored Moulder bill and the Clark bill. As most of you know, the Clark bill and the Moulder bill, though much stronger, followed the same general administrative framework: licensing of laboratories and individuals,

pain limiting clauses, inspection, standards for physical plant and animal care, etc.

The move for this legislation gained momentum and reached a high water mark in 1962 when hearings were held by a House subcommittee under the chairmanship of Rep. Kenneth Roberts. Since that date no constructive move has been made in Congress to secure passage of either of these bills. In session after session they were re-introduced. But their sponsors were never able to mobilize sufficient support to have them taken seriously again. It became evident that these bills would be re-introduced and referred to committee—there to languish until the end of the session. This could go on over and over again but nothing—absolutely nothing—would be done to relieve or diminish the suffering of animals in laboratories.

Something had to be done and The HSUS staff made it its business to identify the roadblocks and to find out the pre-requisites for good legislation which would have a reasonable chance of enactment.

About a year ago discussions were held with and letters were written to officers of other humane societies indicating our belief that some movement to new positions by the national humane movement was necessary if the passage of legislation were seriously desired. A degree of flexibility and willingness to negotiate on the part of The HSUS was indicated in these discussions and letters.

Meetings were held in the fall of 1964, then in January of this year, and toward the end of the winter and during the spring a number of meetings were held. During the same period HSUS staff members, greatly aided by two of the society's Directors and one of its members in particular, explored the political situation.

Laws are made by Congressmen and Senators. They are influenced by their own thinking, by pressure from the Administration, and by the voters back home. In Washington a great deal of time was spent in talking with Congressmen and persons in various capacities in executive departments. Congressman after Congressman told us, in effect, "if the humane movement doesn't know what it wants, you can't expect Congress to find out for you."

This position motivated your staff in seeking to find common ground in a bill which as many as possible of the national societies would support. In the late spring Congressman Paul Rogers invited to his office representatives of those societies which had sponsored legislation and announced to them that if they would work out a new bill which would command their united support, he would not only introduce it but would work hard for its passage. This statement, coming from one of the senior members of the subcommittee to which such legislation would be assigned, and from the chairman of a committee investigating the operations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was to us a meaningful offer.

During the months preceding this meeting in Mr. Rogers' office, we had found uniform objection to the requirements of the Randall-Pepper bill and of the Clark-Cleveland bill for a license issued by the federal government to individual scientists as a pre-requisite to the pursuit of their chosen profession in covered laboratories. It is true that the federal government does issue individual licenses in certain professions where there is a critical and direct relationship to the safety of the public. For example, a federal agency licenses airplane pilots.

On the other hand, in its detailed regulation of the investment business, the Securities and Exchange Act does not provide for licensing of securities salesmen but leaves this field to the states. Similarly, architects, doctors, engineers, school teachers, accountants, and lawyers are licensed by the states. Congress will hesitate to change the precedent established for these professions and to lay itself open to a charge of unwarranted infringement of states rights.

It therefore became necessary to analyze the goals to be achieved by licensing and then to discover some other acceptable and effective means of achieving them.

As I shall point out to you later, these same goals have been achieved in drafting the provisions of H.R. 10049—even to the extent of improving upon the machinery of enforcement set up in the Randall-Pepper and the Clark-Cleveland bills.

The HSUS rightly placed great store by the provision drafted by Fred Myers placing the officer charged with the administration and enforcement of the Act in the Department of Justice where he would be totally independent of the pressures which might be brought to bear upon someone in an ordinary staff capacity in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, our explorations revealed the fact that the Department of Justice does not act as an administrative agency. For example, the Department of Agriculture is the administering agency for price support programs and for all other matters which logically fall within its scope, and only in cases where prosecution in court for violation of the law seems warranted are matters referred by the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice acts as counsel and lawyer for other departments of government.

To launch the Department of Justice as an administrative agency as proposed in the Randall-Pepper bill turned out to be a matter for wishful thinking.

Here, again, the achievement of the desired goal—independence from pressure within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—had to be achieved by some new means. A diligent search was made and, finally, in consultation with one of the lawyers employed by the House of Representatives to assist Congressmen in drafting legislation, language was found which had served to establish

offices completely independent from political pressure but within existing executive departments. Counsel for the offices created under this language confirmed that these officers were—in fact—free from any dictation or pressure from the Secretary or other personnel of the department in question. You will find this language in Section 2 of H.R. 10049: “. . .there shall be located for administrative purposes within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an independent Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare . . . headed by a Coordinator . . . who shall be appointed by the President.”

The most widespread political objections found to the former bills were in the field of pain limitation provisions. These provisions constitute the heart of any legislation for the protection of laboratory animals. And, yet, the provisions written into the former bills virtually guaranteed that these bills could not be passed. Congressmen are in Congress because the majority of people vote for them—and it is a rare bird indeed—the truly dedicated idealist—who will lend his support to legislation which seems to be in direct opposition to programs as popular and as widely supported as medical research.

Consider, for a moment, the fact that appropriations by the Federal government for biomedical research have multiplied some twenty times in the last fifteen years. That enthusiasm for these programs has not abated at all is evidenced by the selection by President Johnson, as part of his program of consensus, legislation for large appropriations for new programs to find cures for heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

Some research to achieve these goals will involve severe pain to animals. Other procedures will involve prolonged pain. Herein lies the dilemma of the humane movement.

It is impossible to mobilize meaningful support in the Congress for legislation which will hamper or impede the programs designed to achieve these goals. Much as we would like to see the objective of painless research achieved we must recognize that if we had continued indefinitely to support legislation containing the kind of pain limiting clause of the Randall-Pepper bill, we would not only be deceiving ourselves but—more importantly—we would be failing in our duty to bring every possible measure of relief to the animals used in research. The support of legislation which cannot be passed is an exercise in futility.

It is our compassionate duty to search for those provisions which will bring the greatest possible benefits to laboratory animals and still have a reasonable chance of enactment into law.

To my way of thinking it is not only ridiculous—but it is morally reprehensible—to settle for less than can be achieved. Why try for a bill to provide merely for care and housing when there is a good chance that a united humane movement can get a great deal more? Every year—this year, next year, and the next—we must never cease

trying for better and better legislation to reduce the suffering of animals in laboratories. The law passed in one year is the foundation for further advances in subsequent years.

To demonstrate to you that the philosophical position underlying the foregoing rationale fits into long established HSUS policy, I am going to quote a policy statement adopted by The HSUS Board in May of 1960:

“The HSUS holds that cruelty is immoral, regardless of the pretext for it. Our membership, in a national referendum conducted a few years ago, declared it to be fundamental HSUS policy to oppose and to seek to prevent all uses of animals that cause pain, suffering, or fear. The HSUS Board of Directors adheres to that policy.

“We think that it would be also immoral, however, to refuse to rescue a single animal from suffering, merely because we cannot abolish all suffering. We do not reject humane progress, even if progress does not immediately attain the ultimate objectives of our ideals. The HSUS will always support any legislation and any action that will genuinely prevent cruelty and suffering.”

This brief policy statement was drafted by Fred Myers and unanimously adopted by the Board of Directors. Clearly, The HSUS Board, in giving its support to the Rogers-Pepper bill, has acted in conformance with established policy.

I think it is also appropriate that I should cover a few of the salient features of H.R. 10049 which I have not already touched upon.

As the bill is written, the Coordinator—who is the chief administrative and enforcement officer—is appointed by the President to be the head of an independent Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare.

It has been suggested that the goal of complete independence from pressures might be even further insured by provision in the law for a specific term of years for his appointment. Then the Coordinator would be subject to removal only for dereliction in the performance of his duties. When hearings are held, The HSUS plans to recommend amending the present language to provide a five-year term of office for the Coordinator.

H.R. 10049 has a wider coverage of laboratories than the Randall-Pepper bill and, also, contains important additional provisions relating specifically to procedures which involve stress but not pain. By contrast, the Clark-Cleveland bill covers only those laboratories where government funds are spent; it exempts the vast drug industry—where more than half the animals are used.

As I have mentioned earlier in connection with enforcement machinery, Congress and officials in the Administration have said very plainly and very clearly that they are not going to approve the licensing of individuals. We asked ourselves, therefore, in writing the new bill how the goals of individual licensing could be achieved without such licensing. The result of our study and drafting is a

bill with an enforcement system that operates on four levels and not only accomplishes the purposes of individual licensing but assures even greater flexibility of operation and, therefore, far greater protection for the animals.

The Coordinator will issue a Certificate of Approval (a license) to the head of any covered laboratory who then is charged with full responsibility for the care and use of animals, for permitting inspections at any time, for operating the laboratory in conformance with the Act and with all directives (rules and regulations) issued under it, and for approval of the competence of the investigators working in his laboratory.

For failure to comply with the Act and with directives (1) the Certificate of Approval of the head of the laboratory may be suspended or revoked, (2) the head of the laboratory may be made temporarily or permanently ineligible to use animals in research, (3) no payments of federal funds may be made under grants or contracts during a period of non-compliance, and (4) at any time that a laboratory is not supervised by a holder of a Certificate of Approval, all animals shall be in the custody of an appointee of the Coordinator.

Individual researchers, although not licensed, must meet qualifications as a prerequisite to carrying out research and are subject to temporary or permanent ineligibility to use animals in research as a penalty for violation.

Probably the greatest criticism of the new bill has centered around its pain provisions. The criticism has shown a strange and unusual lack of comprehension of fairly straightforward and simple English. One of the critics published the statement that the Rogers-Pepper bill is "a bill which offers no restriction on the infliction of pain." This, of course, is a false statement. Another critic published the statement that "When a researcher plans an experiment for which there is no such directive, and the experiment is not 'compatible' with the section describing standards (meaning that the experiment will cause pain or other suffering), the researcher simply obtains a special directive which he displays near the animals throughout the experiment."

This statement, of course, is a distortion of the facts by choice of words. Either the writer does not really understand what is involved in the pain provisions of the new bill or is not interested in full reporting. For example, the writer says that the researcher simply obtains a special directive. Let us examine carefully what is involved in obtaining permission to perform a painful procedure.

Before any painful procedure can be initiated, three very clear, very definite, steps must be followed for the protection of the animal:

1. The researcher must first get the concurrence of the head of his laboratory. They in turn, together, notify the Coordinator

describing in detail the procedure proposed to be used and the reasons for it.

2. The Coordinator must then determine whether there is any alternative—less painful—means of accomplishing the purpose of the proposal and, if not, the procedure must be absolutely necessary as a means of directly achieving the alleviation of suffering, the prolongation of life, the prevention or cure of disease, or the promotion of national safety.

3. After the Coordinator has made his determination, he must then give interested animal welfare organizations the opportunity to show whether the procedure is necessary according to the provisions of the Act and the opportunity to recommend alternative means of accomplishing the purpose of the proposal before the special directive is issued.

Three very clear, very definite, steps must be followed for the protection of the animals. There is nothing at all simple about obtaining such a special directive.

But a great deal more can be said about the pain provisions of the new bill. All procedures shall conform with directives—directives in whose formation humane societies have participated. If the procedure is painless, it must conform with published general directives. If the procedure involves stress or pain, it comes under the system I just described, and requires a special directive.

In either case, directives will prescribe surgical and other techniques, the use of anesthetics, post-operative care, and the method and timing of painless destruction of animals. In drawing up both general and special directives the Coordinator is directed to work toward refinement of techniques in order to reduce distress to the animals to a minimum, the widest use of statistical techniques in experimental design and sampling to reduce to a minimum the number of animals used, the elimination of duplication of experiments, and the substitution of non-sentient or less sentient forms of life for higher forms.

The provision for student work requires that it be painless except under conditions specified by the Coordinator. Further discussion has indicated that our congressional sponsors are agreeable to tightening or eliminating this exception and The HSUS will so recommend in hearings.

Unannounced, periodic inspections are provided for in contrast to the Clark-Cleveland bill which only states that laboratories must admit representatives of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at any time; the Secretary should be directed to employ inspectors and to conduct inspections to insure compliance with the law.

A provision not found in other bills is that relating to participation by the humane movement in the administrative process. The Coor-

dinator is directed to consult with representatives of interested animal welfare organizations in the formation of all directives. The humane movement will, thus, have an opportunity to make its voice heard in this important administrative function and also to become fully informed on practices in laboratories. Humanitarians have long sought a better knowledge of the numbers of animals used, their treatment, and the procedures to which they are subjected.

There are many other provisions of the bill—all of which have a bearing on improving conditions for animals—but they are too numerous and too detailed to examine in the time available. I am sure they will be covered in the committee deliberations which will soon follow.

However, suffice it to say that all of the provisions of H.R. 10049 have been drafted in the light of the experience gained since the first bills were introduced in this country—and especially with the benefit of the detailed report issued by the Littlewood Committee. This committee, appointed by the government, made a detailed study of all matters relating to the use of animals in laboratories in England and published its comprehensive findings after two years of investigation and hearings.

A lot of work, a great deal of careful thought, and the exercise of all the ingenuity we possess has gone into making H.R. 10049 a bill with the greatest possible protection for laboratory animals in that form which will win the widest acceptance possible.

May I stress again the importance of passing this bill?

It will establish three basic principles on which all laboratory animal legislation, now and in the future, will rest. They are:

1. Federal regulation of the care, husbandry, and housing of laboratory animals;
2. determination by a Federal agency of procedures prohibited and procedures allowed in using animals in laboratories;
3. prohibition or allowance of experimental purposes by a Federal agency if pain to animals is involved.

These principles are basic to any effective legislation.

Some have wondered if this emphasis on winning wide acceptance has meant compromise with principle. Nothing could be farther from the fact. It is devotion to the principle that something must be done and not just talked about that led us to place so much emphasis upon acceptable form as well as upon the substance of good legislation.

That our efforts have met with some degree of success is attested to not only by the introduction of H.R. 10049 by Mr. Rogers but also by its co-sponsorship by Representatives Claude Pepper, William Springer, Leo O'Brien, William Randall, and Oliva Huot. These Congressmen constitute a bi-partisan group of impressive capabilities. Some are senior members of the House of Representatives

Health and Safety Subcommittee. Most importantly, these men are working for H.R. 10049 and mean to pass it.

Work with the AHA has brought that society from support of a weak and totally unsatisfactory bill last year to the support of H.R. 10049.

Work with other national societies has not been productive. It was not anticipated that the National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare would support H.R. 10049 as this society has a record of withholding full support from all bills for the regulation of laboratories heretofore introduced. Its present position—that a care and housing bill—the weakest bill of all—should now be passed is senseless.

The Society for Animal Protective Legislation was invited to participate in the process of drafting a new bill but did not display a cooperative attitude and, when the new bill was finally introduced, reacted violently. This is regrettable but, I believe, not suicidal for the cause of protection for laboratory animals.

Since its introduction on July 26, humanitarians have been reading and studying H.R. 10049. Support for it is growing daily. The Maryland federation of humane societies is officially on record in its favor. The legislative committee of the Maine federation also is on record. The Florida federation is expected to endorse it at its meeting tomorrow.

H.R. 10049 has been referred to the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Mr. Oren Harris of Arkansas, who is chairman of both the full committee and the subcommittee, has been appointed to the federal bench and will don his robes after Congress adjourns this fall. Mr. Rogers has obtained the consent of Mr. Harris and of Mr. O'Brien, one of our co-sponsors and the ranking Democratic member of the committee, for Mr. O'Brien to preside at hearings on our bill. It is a great joy to me to be able to announce to you that these hearings will be held starting at 10 a.m. on September 30, 1965.

I urge each one of you to read—and re-read—this bill so that you understand thoroughly not only its great strengths but its limitations. Obviously, it is not a final answer—but it is a tremendous start in the long battle for the elimination of suffering of animals in laboratories.

Bear in mind that this bill is not a propaganda piece designed to inform the public of the high principles of humanitarians. It is a bill which we intend to pass in order to bring substantial relief to animals in laboratories as soon as possible—and which can be passed in 1966 if all humanitarians of good will buckle down and work for it.

Board of Directors and Officers The Humane Society of the United States

Robert J. Chenoweth <i>Chairman</i> Kansas City, Mo.	Miss Edith J. Goode Washington, D.C.
D. Collis Wager <i>Vice-Chairman</i> Utica, N.Y.	Mrs. G. Martel Hall Nacogdoches, Texas
Edward M. Bostick <i>Treasurer</i> Falls Church, Va.	Frederic D. Kerr San Rafael, Calif.
Miss Grace Conahan <i>Secretary</i> Webster Groves, Mo.	Prof. James T. Mehorter Maplewood, N.J.
Oliver Evans <i>President</i> Washington, D.C.	Mrs. George F. Milliken New York, N.Y.
Cleveland Amory New York, N.Y.	Jacques V. Sichel Union, N.J.
Dr. Myra Babcock Detroit, Mich.	F. L. Thomsen St. Petersburg, Fla.
	Mrs. Edward S. Voss Monkton, Md.

Honorary Directors

Mrs. Bolling Barton Pikesville, Md.	Mrs. M. D. Ravenscroft Santa Barbara, Calif.
C. Edward Boggs Hong Kong	Arthur P. Redman Seattle, Wash.
Mrs. Irene Castle Lake Forest, Ill.	Mrs. Alice Wagner Mountainside, N.J.
Miss Mildred Fitz-Hugh Lake Forest, Ill.	Alice Morgan Wright Albany, N.Y.