A Commitment Reaffirmed

During the summer of 1980, The HSUS employed Ms. Natasha Atkins, a wildlife biologist, to develop and coordinate a program addressing wildlife concerns. Prominent among those were endangered species and predator control. At that time, no one could have predicted the utter disaster that would face wildlife in light of policies of the current administration and the general attitude of Congress toward the environment and its inhabitants. It was with considerable regret, therefore, that we accepted Natasha’s resignation due to her relocation in California.

It became increasingly clear that the battle lines regarding the wildlife of our nation were being drawn on many fronts. Our need for a strong and effective leader in this area of concern became greater than ever before. It is for that reason that the announcement of the appointment of Dr. John W. Grandy as President of Wildlife and Environment is of such timely significance.

Having served as the Executive Vice President of Defenders of Wildlife for the past six years and as the chief assistant to the senior scientist for the President’s Council on Environmental Quality, Dr. Grandy brings to The HSUS a depth and breadth of leadership in this area unparalleled in the animal welfare movement.

He has effectively challenged many proposed governmental actions and policies affecting wildlife, using a vast array of legal talent in the Washington, D.C., area. In his capacity as our President for Wildlife and Environment, he has already initiated a challenge to the Department of the Interior’s decision to permit denning (the killing of coyote pups in their dens) and the reintroduction of compound 1080 (a lethal agent for destroying predators) for experimental use. Joining The HSUS in this challenge are Defenders of Wildlife, Environmental Defense Fund, Friends of the Earth, Fund for Animals, National Resource Defense Council, National Audubon Society, National Parks and Conservation Association, Sierra Club, Society for Animal Protective Legislation, and the Wilderness Society.

In this critical time for our environment and its wildlife inhabitants, The HSUS vigorously reaffirms its commitment to do battle with those who would seek to abuse or destroy this magnificent heritage.

I am also pleased to announce the appointment of Ms. Deborah Salem as editor of The Humane Society News. Deborah brings to this position a broad background of experience, having served as the editor of Animals, a publication of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and, more recently, as the managing editor of Equus, a publication for equestrians.
No Veal This Meal
The HSUS has launched a national campaign to convince diners in "white-tablecloth" restaurants to choose something other than milk-fed veal when they next visit their favorite eating place. Advertisements describing the conditions under which many veal calves are raised and suggesting diners "Think Twice" before ordering milk-fed veal will appear in the January, 1982 issues of Chicago, Boston, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia's city magazines in prime veal-consuming locations. Ads in New York City, the largest market for milk-fed veal in the country, appeared in The New York Times and New York in December. City magazines have a high percentage of top restaurant advertisers and attract many out-of-town and local gourmets. The HSUS expects to attract a tremendous amount of attention from its ads on restaurants' home turf. If you live near any of these prime veal markets or have access to any of these publications, take a look at the January issues and let us know what you think of our "Think Twice" ads! HSUS members will receive a mailing regarding this campaign in February.

Sponsorship Withdrawn
The $150,000 1982 Greyhound Grand Prix, scheduled to be run in January at the lyewood Greyhound Track in Florida, will be the last sponsored byRalston Purina, the giant petfood manufacturer. This information was communicated to President John A. Hoyt by James Reed, Manager of Public Relations for Ralston Purina in response to Hoyt's request that Purina break its ties with this greyhound racing extravaganza. Once Ralston Purina's contractual obligation to the race's promoters has been fulfilled this month, it will withdraw its sponsorship of the event. We are pleased that Purina has acted to dissociate itself from a sport the HSUS has opposed for several years as one causing abuse and suffering to thousands of animals used in coursing events and other training procedures.

SPCA Seeks Big Winner
Although the Roanoke Valley SPCA has been raising money for years through its Tuesday night bingo games, it decided to kick off its shelter-building fund drive by selling chances to win a far bigger prize. In December, SPCA members began selling 150 raffle tickets at $100 each with a four-bedroom, brick-frame colonial home in Roanoke to go to the holder of the winning ticket. The home's builder, the brother of SPCA board member Harry Bosen, would keep $130,000 of the $200,000 to be raised from ticket sales, and the remainder would go to the SPCA. Although Roanoke Valley doesn't know how long it will take its members to sell all 2000 tickets, SPCA staffer and former board member Maggie Robertson reports they "have had a lot of interest" already from potential ticket-buyers/home owners. High interest rates nationwide have caused people otherwise unable to find home buyers with adequate financing to join forces with not-for-profit organizations to come up with this novel sales method. Everyone seems to win: the homeowner who sells his house, the lucky purchaser of the raffle ticket, and the organization. "You should see this house, it's beautiful," says Robertson. "Once we have raffled the house, we'll start our candy-selling campaign in the spring. We have a long way to go before we can build our new shelter.

We Are Disappointed
Recently, an advertisement offering a "dog résumé," "cat résumé," and "plant résumé" for sale for $24.50 each ran in The Washington Post. Although we wrote a letter requesting information on this intriguing employment service, we have not, as yet, received a reply. The question remains, does the company mail you a standard résumé or do you supply individual information on each animal and let them compile personalized/animalized job histories? We realized the job market was tight, but we had no idea people were sending all family members out to work.

Guide Takes Off
After nearly three years of development and field testing, People & Animals: A Human Education Curriculum Guide, was released at the 1981 HSUS Annual Convention. Developed by the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education, the education division of The HSUS, the guide is the most comprehensive document currently available in humane education.

Since it was first made available for field testing in the fall of 1980, the guide has been received with enthusiasm by individuals within the livestock industry who feel that it is "irresponsible" to teach young children that meat comes from animals and "anthropomor­phic" to suggest that animals have emotions and can suffer from stress. The widespread attention given the Guide by various agri­cultural groups and publications has stimulated, rather than cur­tailed, interest in it.

Response from the educational community has been very favorable. Educational administrators who reviewed the guide commend its development and field testing, its user friendliness, the quality of the activities presented. An overwhelming 80 per­cent of the 350 classroom teachers involved in the field test of the guide indicated a willingness to use it on a regular basis.

The complete guide consists of four books, each representing a different level, spanning preschool through sixth grade. Each book is structured around 35 concepts, under the general headings of Hu­man/Animal Relationships, Pet Animals, Wild Animals, and Farm Animals. Each concept is design­ed to produce activities in language arts, social studies, math, and health/science.

For prices and ordering infor­mation, write NAAHE, Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423.

Humane Victory
Harpooned
Japan, Norway, and Iceland have filed objections to the Inter­national Whaling Commission's decision to phase-out the cold harpoon in 1983 as reported in the Fall 1981 issue of The HSUS News), thereby giving notice that they will not comply with that decision. Other whaling nations may follow suit.

The three countries say no al­ternative method of killing minke whales is available. The explosive harpoon used on larger whales ruins too much of the meat of the smaller minke, making its use un­profitable.

As the great whales have dwindled in numbers in recent years, whalers have concentrated on the minke. In 1982, that spe­cies alone comprises about 35 per­cent of the total IWC allowable catch. Inadvertently, the IWC has confused more and more of the minke quotas have increased.

Japan alone has filed a second objection aimed at the decision not to allow sperm whaling in the North Pacific. Even though it has a chance to receive a small quota of sperm whales at the special March, 1983, meeting it requested, Japan is leaving nothing to chance.

The president of Japan's sole whaling company, according to The Japan Times, said the "anti-whaling groups are now shifting their strategy from the argument of resources...to a moral issue. And if it is a moral issue, Japan will fight to the end. For the IWC is not a forum to debate a moral issue, and to force a certain moral issue onto others is an outrage­ous thing."

Since the IWC has no enforce­ment mechanism of its own, it is now up to the other member na­tions to pressure those objecting to halting fish imports from any na­tion that harpoons the minke.

NAAHE Director Kathy Savsky (second from left) answered questions about People & Animals, NAAHE's new curriculum guide, at The HSUS Annual Con­ference.
Animal protectionists have waged many battles in defense of wildlife during the past decade. We fought for species being decimated by pesticides and poisons; for marine mammals killed for meat and fur or drowned in fishing nets; for wildlife being destroyed by international trade; and for the endangered species of the world whose lives are in jeopardy from hunting and collecting pressures and from habitat destruction.

We were rewarded for our perseverance. 1971 saw a ban on DDT; 1972, a ban on predator poisons and passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act; 1973, the signing of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and enactment of the world’s most important conservation law, The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA).

These were difficult fights fiercely opposed by special interests every step of the way. Unfortunately, they are battles that will not stay won. With the changing decade has come a changing attitude: animal exploiters are playing to an administration that values development and economic “progress” more than the country’s natural heritage.

As luck would have it, just when an unfriendly administration is in power, the Endangered Species Act must be reauthorized or die. Environmental protectionists and animal welfare proponents will have to fight and fight again to keep from losing the ESA for good.

How desperate is the plight of the world’s wildlife?

Let’s take Hawaii as an example. More than half of Hawaii’s plants and almost one-third of its insect species have already become extinct or face that prospect. With the disappearance of plant and insect life, other species can no longer survive. All of Hawaii’s native mammals are now extinct. Hawaii alone contains almost half the endangered birds found in the United States, birds that, without protection, will also become extinct, adding their names to the rapidly growing list of species that have disappeared forever.

Throughout the world, wildlife faces the same struggle to survive. In the United States alone, over 4,000 species of animal and plants may be threatened with extinction.

For over 3½ billion years, extinction has been a way of life on earth, some species giving way as others better able to adapt to changing conditions evolved. But extinction is no longer the natural process it once was. Guns, greed, and a ravenous appetite for land and energy have brought us to the point where we are...
losing one species every day. Over-hunting has brought the giant whales and the spotted cats to the brink of extinction. Pesticides such as DDT accumulated in fish and have decimated our bald eagle and pelican populations. We blithely introduce species to new areas where they compete with or prey on native ani-

mals and plants.

But the biggest threat to our wild-life today is our destruction of habitat—the areas that provide conditions essential for a species to survive. When we pave a field for a shopping center, or bulldoze a forest to build a housing development, we destroy those natural areas animals and plants need so desperately in order to survive.

Do we really care if the Hawaiian Poo-uli, the Oo Aa, and all those other species with their funny names disappear? Those of us in animal welfare don’t need to be convinced that the survival of the species is as im-

portant as the survival of the bald eagle and the leopard; but even those of us who feel no moral commitment to our wildlife or who can only appreci-

ate beautiful or useful species must admit the arguments for protecting all endangered species are compelling.

We rely on wild species of plants and animals to furnish us with products essential for industry, medicine, and agriculture, but we are only beginning to understand how depend-

tent we are on the natural world, where all plants and animals play crucial roles.

Who could have predicted that a lowly mold, Penicillium, would be perhaps the greatest medical discover-
y or that corn, a wild grass species from Mexico, would eventually become one of the world’s most important sources of food? As our exploitation of the world’s natural areas continues, who will speak for these wild species? Sixteen years ago, the Endangered Species Preservation Act was signed. A growing awareness of the problems caused by trade in endangered species and habitat destruction resulted in several legislative changes including the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the strongest law ever passed to help con-

serve wild plants and animals.

How does the ESA protect endan-

gered species?

The purpose of the ESA is to pre-

serve species that are “endangered” (current in danger of becoming ex-
nct) or “threatened” (likely to become endangered in the foresee-
able future) and to restore the pop-

ulations of these species to a level at which they are no longer endangered. Any species, including invertebrates such as insects or mollusks, may be considered for protection. Whether a species should be listed under the ESA is determined by the Fish and Wildlife Service (Department of In-

terior) or by the National Marine Fisheries Service (Department of Commerce) based on biological evi-
dence. An entire species need not be threatened or endangered to be listed: local populations of vertebrates can be listed separately before the spe-
cies as a whole is in trouble.

The ESA makes it illegal to kill, collect, or injure endangered species of animals. Threatened species are protected by different restrictions, but all restrictions must have as their goal the restoration of species. With a few exceptions, interstate and international commerce in en-
dangered species are prohibited. The ESA also protects species in other countries by authorizing funds for conservation efforts. In addition, the ESA estab-lishes a cooperative role between the federal and state governments for carrying out conservation programs in the various states, and it allows for the purchase of habitat where necessary for the conservation of a species. Perhaps the most important—and most controversial—element in Section 7: it requires all federal agencies (such as the Environmental Protection Agency or the U.S. Forest Service) to insure that their projects will not jeopardize the survival of any endangered or threatened spe-
cies or destroy the critical habitat of such species. This is especially im-
portant because no species can sur-

vive in the wild if the environment on which it depends for food and shelter is destroyed.

Since 1973, there have been a num-

ber of amendments to the Endangered Species Act. Some of these—increased protection for plants, revised penalty provisions, and a requirement that business-

consideration conflicts be decided be-

fore a project begins—have been favorable. However, other amend-
ments have weakened the ESA, allowing the administration to accommodate development interests that perceived the ESA as too restric-
tive. Two of these amendments have reduced protection for inverte-
brate species and increased the im-
portance of economic considerations when designating critical habitat.

Does the ESA impede economic de-

velopment?

Ever since the small-darter con-

servationists strove to halt construction of the Tellico Dam in 1978, there has been growing fear that endangered species protection will prevent all economic development. Section 7 is designed to prohibit unnecessary destruction of endangered and threat-
ened species or critical habitat. It provides for a formal process of con-

sultation between agencies to iden-
tify less harmful alternatives to the proposed project. Where reasonable alternatives cannot be found, the ESA—or the Service—will face an exemption process. The important point is that many proposed federal projects are both destructive to endangered species and economically unjustifiable: only 3 out of 5200 conflicts have not been satisfactorily resolved. That alterna-
tives and compromises can be found testifies to the strength of the ESA and its compatibility with develop-

ment in our country.

How reauthorization works

The Endangered Species Act must be reauthorized by Congress by Oc-
tober 1, 1982, to remain in effect. The reauthorization process can be simple or complicated, depending on the attitude of the Congress toward ESA.

Congress has four options:

• It could allow the ESA to expire.
• It could add amendments to strengthen the ESA.
• It could add amendments to weaken the ESA and/or lessen pro-
tection for animals, such as the bob-
cat, listed under the CITES treaty.

It could simply reauthorize fund-
ing for the act as it is currently writ-
ten and continue to provide protec-
tion for animals listed under CITES for a given length of time. Animal protectionists hope for a three-year extension of funding for the Fish and Wildlife Service’s implementation of the ESA and CITES.

Foies of the ESA

During this process of reauthori-

zation, many of the existing rules of the ESA, including that which protects animals under CITES, may be changed or repealed. Already, ene-

mies of the act have been identified in Congress, in industry, and in the administration itself. Most will try to weaken provisions for habitat-

protection or slow down the process for listing species, both of which are essential to the Endangered Spe-
cies Act is to be a meaningful con-

servation law.

The Endangered-Species Legislation Landmarks

1966: Passage of Endangered Species Preservation Act, providing a program for protection and recovery of endangered species and a list of endangered species.

1969: Passage of Endangered Species Conservation Act, providing im-
PORTATION of endangered species into U.S. and expanding scope of 1966 act.

1972: Enactment of Marine Mammal Protection Act

1973: Passage of Convention on International Trade in Endangered Spe-
cies (CITES) which prohibits trade in endangered species products.

Passage of Endangered Species Act of 1973, designed to conserve threatened species and the ecosystems on which they depend. First distinction between "threatened" and "endangered" and first pro-
tection offered native plants. Amended in 1978 to increase state-
federal cooperation and establish a method of resolving develop-
ment-conservation conflicts.

Departments of the Interior and Agriculture: The Fish and Wildlife
Endangered Species Need Your Help!

Without a massive campaign in support of the Endangered Species Act, thousands of species may be doomed to extinction.

What you can do:
1. Compile information on rare species in your area. Note how the ESA benefits them. This information will make your letters to legislators more informed and persuasive.
2. If you belong to a local humane society or other group, schedule 30 minutes at a meeting this winter to discuss endangered species and the ESA. Recruit volunteers to write their representatives (at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, and the House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515) in support of the ESA.
3. Write the key House and Senate leaders who will be conducting hearings in the spring: in the Senate, John Chafee and Robert Stafford (the Senate Office Building, address above); in the House, John Breaux and Walter B. Jones (the House Office Building, address above). Letters do make a difference, especially in an election year like 1982. Send a carbon copy of each letter you write to President Reagan (The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., Washington, D.C. 20500).
4. Meet with your state fish-and-wildlife officials to ask for their written support for the ESA. These letters should be sent to legislators, as well.
5. Call the editors of your local newspaper and ask them to interest them in a program on the ESA.
6. Publicize the ESA in your community by organizing panel discussions (including opponents of the ESA) and distributing information there. The Office of Endangered Species publishes lists of endangered plants and animals broken down by geographical area; they can be obtained by writing OES, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240.
7. Meet with other animal welfare groups to discuss where joint efforts can be made. Commonly organized efforts are important.

Praise These People!

Deserving of special mention are those members of Congress who played key roles in the hearings held in October on laboratory animal legislation in the U.S. House.

The HSUS’s Drs. Michael Fox and Andrew Rowan were invited to present testimony before the National Science, Research, and Technology Subcommittee of the House Science and Technology Committee. Their testimony stressed the abuses of animals in experimentation and the urgent need to develop alternatives.

The hearings followed closely on the heels of the controversy surrounding the seizure of 17 research monkeys from the Silver Spring, Maryland, Institute of Behavioral Research, and the charging of its director, Dr. Edward Taub, with animal cruelty. Alex Pacheco, who as a volunteer at IBR gathered the information that led to the police raid on the facility, testified before the subcommittee about the specific conditions at IBR. (See Law Notes and major article in this issue.)

The hearings focused on all the current legislation dealing with laboratory animals rather than on a single bill. They drew witnesses from the animal welfare and scientific communities as well as from the USDA and National Institutes of Health.

The Taub incident seemed to spark the interest of several subcommittee members, who suddenly seemed much more willing to believe abuses could occur behind the closed doors of even USDA-regulated research facilities. Previously, concerned citizens have been regarded as “isolated cases” by the lay public, the scientific community found itself and its work under the intense scrutiny of the press, the public, and the Congress.

“We believe there are many changes that can be made in current law which would not jeopardize the quality of research and testing in the United States but would alleviate the intense pain and stress inflicted on animals,” Fox told the subcommittee. “Alternative methods of testing are needed, not only to alleviate animal suffering, but also to make research and testing less expensive and more efficient.”

Testimony presented by government and scientific-community witnesses clearly demonstrated to the subcommittee members that the current protection afforded lab animals is woefully inadequate. Paul was one of the monkeys denied adequate veterinary care by psychologist Edward Taub, according to the court’s decision. Testimony during the lab animal hearings clearly demonstrated to the committee that current protection afforded lab animals is woefully inadequate.

Congress: Representative Jim Martin of North Carolina has already suggested dropping the plan for invertebrates in the next session, claiming that Congress never intended for these species to be included in the ESA.

Sportsmen: The International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (IAFWA), which includes the state game agencies, wants to gut the section of the ESA that requires the U.S. to fulfill its obligation to CITES. These groups believe that CITES unduly restricts their trapping and hunting of beaver and lynx. The Reagan Administration: The White House has already stated that the Endangered Species Act needs reform. In its effort to reduce regulations, the Vice President’s task force wants to make sure that “potential enemies” are the primary consideration of endangered species matters.

What does the future hold?
We’ve taken the earth for granted. We have assumed it had an endless supply of minerals and timber; limitless amount of open land and water; and an endless ability to recover from our exploitation. Now we must renew our commitment to giving a chance to every species struggling to survive in our midst. We cannot let the natural world as irrelevant and trivial. We know we must fight so that native methods of testing are needed, not only to alleviate animal suffering, but also to make research and testing less expensive and more efficient.

Your Help!

The hearings held in October on laboratory animal legislation in the U.S. House...
Animal Welfare: The Present Crisis

The HSUS 1981 Annual Conference brought together hundreds of animal protectionists concerned about the crucial problems facing animals today.

East met West—and Midwest, North, and South—at the 1981 Annual Conference held in St. Louis, Missouri, October 14-17. Conference attendees bailing from all points of the compass came to the Chase-Park Plaza to listen to prestigious, accomplished animal protectionists and be heard by the Resolutions Committee, HSUS staff members, and colleagues. Although the actions of the present administration and the state of the economy kept the mood serious, they didn’t dampen the enthusiasm of hundreds of attendees, many of whom were participating in their first Annual Conference, or hinder the free-flowing exchange of ideas during four days of workshops.

The St. Louis activities were inaugurated by a stellar line-up of wildlife experts, including Dr. Michael Fox, Dr. Stephen Kellert of Yale University, and Dr. John Grandy, now the HSUS’s Vice President for Wildlife and Environment, who presented papers at the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems’s symposium “Wildlife Management in the United States: Scientific and Humane Issues in Conservation Programs,” on October 14.

On Saturday, The HSUS membership adopted a resolution requesting the resignation of Secretary of the Interior James Watt (an action which received national media attention), and feted its Krutch Medalist, Hope Ryden, at the closing banquet.

Many participants, humane-society professionals and private citizens alike, said they left St. Louis with much to think about and an increased commitment to animal welfare. All in all, that was quite an achievement.

Saturday night banquet highlights included the presentation of certificates of appreciation to United Press International’s Gregory Gordon (above) for his series on drug abuse in horseracing and KTVI-TV (St. Louis) reporter Richard Amme (below) for his puppy-mill exposé. “NBC Magazine”’s dogfighting segment and ABC-TV’s “20/20” segment on animal rights were also honored.

Neal Black (left), President of the Livestock Institute, debated Dr. Michael Fox on “Modern Farming: Are There Welfare Concerns?”; Moderator Patricia Forkan was part of the attentive audience.
New Occasions Teach New Duties

Excerpts from the keynote address of President John Hoyt at the 1981 HSUS annual conference.

The seriousness of the 1981 conference theme, “Animal Welfare: The Present Crisis,” was reflected in HSUS President Hoyt’s keynote address, received with rapt attention by Thursday’s conference audience.

We need and want government involvement in the use of animals in laboratories; we want the federal government to become involved in racetracks; we are fighting for continued government involvement in the transportation of horses; and we have just begun our legislative fight for the government to qualify the methods by which animals are raised on the farm. Without this kind of oversight and control, the consequences for these animals will very likely be greater suffering and abuse.

Not only is the federal government’s lack of funding affecting the welfare of animals adversely, so also is the lack of monitoring at state and local levels and within humane societies themselves.

Threatened by a lack of adequate funding in the enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act and wild horse and endangered species protection. Along with spending cuts, there seems to be a clear mandate for less government interference in our lives. But when applied to animal welfare concerns, it means government will now exert less control over the use and abuse of animals by governmental agencies and private enterprise alike.

We must all find common ground and lack of community or professional support ....

I think we need to recognize and acknowledge that each of these crises provides opportunities for new initiatives and imaginative responses not previously utilized. For example, James Watt in his attitudes and positions has been so extreme that he has served to unite in common cause groups that historically have shared little in common. Reduction in regulatory activity by the government provides a new opportunity for the humane movement to approach directly those segments of industry that use thousands, sometimes millions of animals in their producing and manufacturing processes every year.

Excerpts from the keynote address of President John Hoyt at the 1981 HSUS annual conference.

New England Bound

The HSUS annual conference for 1982 will be held from November 2 through 6, 1982, in Danvers, Massachusetts. New England is beautiful in the autumn, so plan on joining hundreds of your fellow-members, humane-society colleagues, and new acquaintances at the Radisson-Ferncroft, 20 miles north of historic Boston. Look for details in upcoming issues of The HSUS News.

The complete text of President Hoyt’s keynote address is available in printed form from The HSUS, 2100 L St., N.W., Washing ton, D.C. 20037.
1981 Resolutions
Adopted at the 1981 Annual Conference

Factory Farming
(Certain Modern Intensive Systems)

Whereas "Factory" farming refers to the intensive livestock and poultry-rearing practices that frequently cause extreme privation and suffering to animals; and

Whereas animals should not be regarded merely as food machines; and

Whereas in many instances, such as the rearing ofveal calves, factory farming methods are unnecessary as more humane and economically viable methods of rearing the animals already exist; and

Whereas many opponents of intensive livestock and poultry rearing deny that any problem exists; therefore be it

RESOLVED that The HSUS vigorously continue its campaign to bring awareness of this problem to the public as well as the agricultural community in order to replace factory farming practices with more humane methods of rearing livestock and poultry; and be it

RESOLVED that The HSUS continue to work vigorously for the passage of federal legislation that would create a Federal Farm Animal Husbandry Committee to assess current factory farming methods and practices.

Humane Transportation of Horses Intended for Slaughter

Whereas the widespread consumption of horse meat is steadily rising in the world and approximately 330,000 horses are transported to slaughter plants each year; and

Whereas horses in the process of being transported exhibit to slaughter plants are often subjected to severe conditions that are injurious to the maintenance of adequate food and water, and are subjected to intense cold or heat; and

Whereas legislation is needed so that horses can be assured of humane transportation; therefore be it

RESOLVED that The HSUS develop a program to continue to support and vigorously work for the passage of legislation at both federal and state levels to establish humane standards for shipping horses intended for slaughter.

Introduction of Non-Native Species

Whereas non-native species, commonly referred to as "exotics," have been introduced into the wild accidently or intentionally by pet owners, agricultural and wildlife agencies; and

Whereas these species frequently disrupt the natural ecosystems by preying on, competing with, and transmitting disease to native wildlife species, as well as by destroying wildlife habitat; and

Whereas such environmental destruction is a serious threat to the very survival of native species; therefore be it

RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States, recognizing the serious ecological and animal welfare concerns arising from introductions of exotic species into the wild and the consequent need for greater restrictions upon such introductions, make the complexities of this issue known to its constituencies; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that The HSUS work for stronger enforcement of state and national laws, and international treaties governing the importation of wildlife.

Ritual Slaughter

Whereas the shackling and hoisting of livestock prior to slaughter results in the suffering of animals and is a slaughter handling technique that is not a requirement of ritual slaughter; and

Whereas an alternative humane prehandling technique has been successfully used with large animals and a similar technique holds promise for the humane slaughter handling of small animals; therefore be it

RESOLVED that The HSUS intensify its efforts to promote the adoption and use of these alternative slaughter techniques; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that The HSUS support federal, state, and local legislation that would help achieve these objectives.

Interior Secretary Watt

Whereas The HSUS and other animal welfare advocates have been striving over the past decade to enhance existing laws that protect America's wildlife and its habitat; and

Whereas dedicated efforts of hundreds of individuals and organizations have worked to bring wildlife protection laws into being; and

Whereas Secretary of the Interior James Watt is charged with the responsibility of wise stewardship over the nation's wildlife and natural resources; and

Whereas Secretary Watt has not acted on this particular issue by virtue of the following actions:

- Encouraged Alaska to carry out "wolf culling" programs; and
- Worked to gut the Wild Horse and Burro Act by advocating mass slaughter of animal populations; and
- Worked to gut the endangered species laws to permit killing of wild horses and burros.

Whereas The HSUS has long been a proponent of humane solutions to animal welfare issues; and

Whereas the HSUS has advocated for the protection and conservation of our nation's wildlife and natural resources; therefore be it

RESOLVED that the HSUS call on the removal of James G. Watt, and for the appointment of a new Secretary of the Interior whose philosophy is truly one of wise stewardship and conservation of our nation's wildlife and lands; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that The HSUS urge its membership to make it known to President Reagan and to their representatives and senators that Secretary Watt must be replaced.

Predators: Interior Allows Denning: Proposes Poison

On November 19, 1981, the Interior Department announced that it will permit the denning of feral cats and dogs and is proposing experimental use of poisons and other chemicals. The announcement, made by Robert Jantzen, Director of the Interior Department's Fish and Wildlife Service, followed months of rumors that Secretary Watt and other high department officials were considering such a change.

Denning, the unusually brutal killing of coyote puppies in their dens by poisons of burning flares, barbed wire, and trebel hooks, has been essentially banned since 1979. At that time, Secretary of the Interior Cecil Andrus prohibited denning, except in rare instances, because it is inhumane and because coyote puppies could not possibly kill sheep.

Interior is also requesting an "experimental" permit from the Environmental Protection Agency to test the compound 1080 to kill predacious 1080 again, under the guise of an experimental program. The Fish and Wildlife Service has said that a test period to begin in 1980 be put in chunks of meat-like tallow balts put out on the open range to kill indiscriminately.

Our objections to this program are too numerous to detail here. But, in sum, we object because the programs are brutally inhumane, threaten non-target wildlife, and are killing the animals that are the natural predators of the 1080 again. In addition, the programs represent a step back into the dark ages when "the only good coyote was a dead coyote."
Bedroll Naturalist

The HSUS's 1981 Joseph Wood Krutch Medalist, author and filmmaker Hope Ryden, believes that, in a world of technological gimmickry, there is still room for the old-fashioned wildlife observer.

Ever since 1968, when she first caught sight of wild horses running free across a western plain, Hope Ryden has been dedicated to bringing magnificent portraits of unpopular species—the mustang, bobcat, and coyote—to the rest of the world. Through her award-winning books, she has, almost single-handedly, succeeded in changing the image of these misunderstood and persecuted inhabitants of our wild spaces.

Ryden: The role of the individual observer is, and always has been, to server is, and always has been, to interact with its environment. And allow me to observe their animals until they tolerate my presence and allow me to observe their interaction, how they capture prey, and what they do with it. There aren’t many people who do what I do anymore, partly because it is a lot harder to do! It requires a lot of faith in what I’ve ever thought was won has significantly to the research being done.

Ryden: Scientists are trying to answer intellectual questions and are primarily motivated by intellectual curiosity. We are motivated primarily by compassion for the individual animals themselves. But it would be hypercritical to criticize much of what biologists do because we in animal protection use so much of their data to prove our own positions on issues.

News: How do the goals of wildlife biologists and animal protectionists differ?

Ryden: Scientists are trying to answer intellectual questions and are primarily motivated by intellectual curiosity. We are motivated primarily by compassion for the individual animals themselves. But it would be hypercritical to criticize much of what biologists do because we in animal protection use so much of their data to prove our own positions on issues.

News: Which of your achievements has given you the most satisfaction?

Ryden: I’m writing a children’s book on bobcats to take advantage of the material I have accumulated and, some time in the future, I hope to take on the kit fox as a subject. I have talked with ranchers who have kit foxes on their properties who have welcomed me to come and look around for them—if I can find their burrows! I’m looking forward to that.

News: What do you expect to see in the future for Hope Ryden?
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Many people find an older dog suits their lifestyles better than a puppy ever could.

It was a hot day in August when Frances Traylor visited the Montgomery County (Maryland) Humane Society to look for a dog. Recently widowed and living on a disability pension, Mrs. Traylor knew she couldn’t cope with the demands of a new puppy but still wanted a pet to keep her company. She didn’t have to look far.

“It was love at first sight,” she said later of her first meeting with a two-year-old mixed terrier that workers had named MacTavish. “I took one look and said, ‘Oh, there’s my dog!’”

A stray with no known background, Mac seemed to fit right in with Mrs. Traylor’s lifestyle. “I wouldn’t trade him for a million dollars,” she says. Mrs. Traylor is one of a growing number of prospective pet owners who are discovering that adopting the full-grown dog gives them all the satisfaction and pleasures of dog ownership without the inconveniences of housebreaking, obedience training, shots, and worming.

The most immediate advantage to adopting a dog past puppyhood is the elimination of most of the guesswork. Said John Innocenti, who last summer adopted a one-year-old mixed terrier from the Montgomery County Humane Society, “One of the reasons we were drawn to her was that we knew she wouldn’t be getting any bigger. Right now we live in an apartment and we didn’t want a puppy that would, all of a sudden, shoot up into something huge.”

If you adopt a full-grown dog, not only will you know its ultimate dimensions, but you may also know something about its personality, feeding habits, exercise needs, and medical problems.

Another plus: more and more people who want dogs but don’t have time to cope with a puppy are finding that an adult dog can fit their lifestyle quite comfortably.

Betsy Gutman, The HSUS’s public relations director, recently joined the ranks of this new breed of dog owner. On a visit to the Arlington (Virginia) Animal Welfare League, she fell for Finchley, a six-year-old English Setter who had had two previous owners.

Gutman brought her husband, a wire-service reporter, out to the shelter to meet the dog. It was not an auspicious start.

“We took him outside so we could spend a few minutes getting to know him. He was so nervous that he turned around a few times, gulped some grass, and promptly threw up at my husband’s feet,” she remembers.

Despite Finchley’s faux pas, the Gutmans installed a fence in their backyard and took him home. After they arranged for a neighborhood teenager to exercise Finchley during the day, the Gutmans found him fitting perfectly into their household routine.

The Gutmans’ success story, according to a member of shelter officials, is not unique.

“We’ve been encouraging people to adopt older dogs,” said Sharon Kessler, adoptions director for the Montgomery County Humane Society. “With so many families having both adults working outside the home, it’s hard to find the time to bring up a puppy.”

The Innocentis agree. “Both my wife and I work,” John Innocenti explained, “but we’re right across the street, so one of us goes home at lunchtime to take the dog out and play with her. She’s never alone for more than a few hours at a time.”

While the Montgomery County shelter continues to place more puppies than full-grown dogs (13 percent of the grown dogs and 40 percent of the puppies brought in between July, 1980 and June, 1981), Kessler points out that fewer adult dogs are eventually returned to the shelter. The statistics are misleading, too, because so many of the dogs surrendered (she estimates some 30 to 40 percent) are too old, too sick, or too difficult to be offered for adoption.

“Of course, there are potential pitfalls in adopting a previously-owned dog. For one thing, says Wright, a dog over the age of five may have become so indoctrinated in its previous way of life that it will have trouble adapting to a new routine. Some people, especially retired people who are home all day, might do better with these older animals since they can give them the extra reassurance and supervision they need.

Another problem, according to animal behaviorist Dr. Michael Fox, is that there’s no way to know the real reason a dog was turned in to a shelter. “It may have phobias about cars, storms, or being walked on a leash.”

Wright recalls a year-old Basenji surrendered because it became destructive whenever it was left in a
room with the door closed. Wright took the dog with her on a local television show and explained its problem. "Just after the show I got a call from a psychologist who said she wanted the dog and would hang de­vices on all the doorknobs to keep the doors from closing accidentally. Everything worked out fine and the dog ended up with a marvelous home," Wright says.

Sometimes, dogs available for adoption have no known background—they are lost or stray. Don't write these off, cautions Wright. If you're considering adopting a lost or stray animal, visit it at the shelter more than once to get a better idea of its personality. (Inset) To maximize your chances for success, view the animal with an adult dog, look for the one that's bright and alert.

To maximize your chances for success with an adult dog, recommends Wright, look for the one that's bright and alert, cocks its head when spoken to or when you snap your fingers, or rushes to the kennel fence and offers you its paw. This fellow will probably be eager to get in the back of your station wagon and start a new life.

Like any new dog, your older adoptee needs a leash, collar, and ID tags, its own food dish, and a private place where it can sleep without being bothered. A folded blanket will do if you don't have a dog bed.

Dr. Fox advises keeping the house quiet for the first few days and tak­ing the dog for long walks around the neighborhood (keeping it on the leash) to get it acquainted with its new surroundings. You can expect it to take up to eight weeks for the ani­mal to adjust fully to its new home.

It's not true that you can't teach an old dog new tricks; it may, in fact, be easier to train the full-grown dog, since its attention span is longer than a puppy's. "Just remember to be consistent," Wright counsels.

"If the dog isn't going to be allowed on the furniture, be sure to stress that from the moment you get it home."

Weeks later, while at work at The HSUS, I receive a phone call from Dr. Geza Teleki, Associate Pro­fessor of Primatology at George Washington University, asking me to attend a meeting for the following evening by Alex Pacheco, a student at George Washington and participant in the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). I agree. I am told I will learn the meeting's purpose at the meeting.

At Dr. Teleki's home, I meet Alex and Ingrid New-kirk, a Maryland state humane offi­cer and member of PETA. Alex and Ingrid ask that we keep confidential the purpose of the meeting. We agree. They tell us that Alex has been working as a volunteer at the Institute for Behavioral Research (IBR) in Silver Spring, Maryland, for three months. Alex wanted to gain lab experience in his work with animals and had chosen this lab from a list of USDA-regis­tered research facilities because it was close to his home. The prime research is funded by the National Institutes of Health.

Fri., Aug. 21 (P.M.): At Dr. Teleki's home, I meet Alex and Ingrid New-kirk, a Maryland state humane offi­cer and member of PETA. Alex and Ingrid ask that we keep confidential the purpose of the meeting. We agree. They tell us that Alex has been working as a volunteer at the Institute for Behavioral Research (IBR) in Silver Spring, Maryland, for three months. Alex wanted to gain lab experience in his work with animals and had chosen this lab from a list of USDA-regis­tered research facilities because it was close to his home. The prime research is funded by the National Institutes of Health.

Once in the lab, he became con­cerned about the conditions there and the lack of veterinary treatment given the monkeys used in IBR's research. Of the 17 macaques, 16 were raised in one room. Ten of these had lost the afferent nerves leading to one or both forelimbs severed in order to eliminate sensation in the limb. The procedure is known as de-afferentation. The other seven ani­mals have been used as controls. All were subjected to tests to determine how and to what extent they could recover the use of the deafferented limbs. In theory, this research is sup­posed to have application in treat­ment of human stroke victims.

Alex shows us slides he has taken during his tenure at IBR. The first slides depict small, antiquated cages in poor condition, with chipping paint and broken and rusted wires visible. I am unable to speak for several minutes. I ask Alex how he has been able to bear working in such a place day after day. "I want to make sure they get out of there," he replies.

Ingrid explains that only recently has PETA realized that legal action against the lab could be taken in Maryland, one of the few states that do not exempt laboratories from their anti-cruelty codes.

Alex is documenting a case to pre­sent to the Montgomery County po­lice, as an employee of the lab, he is...
issues a warrant for the search-and- seizure actions. A judge must be available to issue a warrant. Filling out the affidavit and preparing the warrant takes several hours.

Sat., Sept. 5: We meet to discuss a temporary home for the monkeys before the police inspection, he also signs an affidavit on the warrant for the search-and- seize action at IBR.

Mon., Sept. 7: Taub and Swain review the warrant for the search-and- seize action at IBR.

Mon., Sept. 8: Taub and Swain review the warrant for the search-and- seize action at IBR.

Mon., Sept. 14: Veterinarians Phillip Robinson and Janis Oitt, both with extensive experience in veterinary medicine and radiology, receive a call from Swain to examine the monkeys at IBR.

Mon., Sept. 21: Fitzpatrick and Swain request a reconsideration of Taub's decision based on the veterinarian's report. The hearing is set for the next day.

Tues., Sept. 29: Dr. Fox, who is prepared to testify about conditions at the lab and the court house, arrives at the court house just as the monkeys are released. Fitzpatrick asks the judge to return the monkeys to the lab. The judge denies the request.

Wed., Sept. 30: Taub holds a press conference announcing the discovery of cruelty at IBR. The media report the story extensively.

This was the normal condition of the refrigerator in the room adjacent to the monkey-colony room. The dark mass at left is rotationally and said to have been fed the monkeys at IBR.
Sun., Sept. 27: Swain, Teleki, and I inspect the monkeys at Beall Ave. The animals appear to be in good condition, responsive, and calm. Billy still guards his bit of moss.

(10:30 A.M.): Swain organizes a meeting of The HSUS, the Animal Welfare Institute, and Washington Humane Society to help the state and PETA locate a temporary facility for the monkeys that will be more acceptable to the judge and defense.

Tues., Sept. 29: Since the custody case is to reconvene at 9 A.M., I meet with Swain, Fitzpatrick, and Teleki at 8 to discuss IBR’s violations of the Animal Welfare Act (AWA). Crucial to Taub’s request for custody is IBR’s consistent passing of USDA inspections, so the prosecution must show that those inspections were inadequate.

(9:00 A.M.): Fitzpatrick calls as his first witness Dr. Arthur Swain, a USDA inspector for IBR, who testifies about the conditions he found at the lab in July.

Wed., Sept. 30 (2 P.M.): We learn from Fitzpatrick that the judge has decided an independent veterinarian acceptable to defense and prosecution is to assess whether IBR is acting made in private, leaves us little hope of alternative action.

(5:30 P.M.): Swain, Fox, Teleki, Pacheco, Newkirk and her attorney Edward Genn, Goldbergen and her attorney James Cromwell, and I meet with Fitzpatrick. We agree that we will not negotiate for the return of the monkeys to IBR, since if we compromise the experts’ original findings that IBR is not an acceptable facility, we shall seriously weaken our position for the upcoming cruelty trial. Swain says that, as the animals’ custodian, he cannot condone the return of the monkeys to IBR but, if the court orders the return, we must comply. He states we may have to sacrifice these 17 animals for the greater good stemming from Taub’s conviction. Though the monkeys’ welfare is uppermost in their minds, their agreement.

Sat., Oct. 3 (1 P.M.): I learn a truck may arrive today to pick up the monkeys at Beall Ave. At Swain’s direction, no one is to enter the basement without his permission.

(2 P.M.): A U-Haul and two cars pull up outside. The press also arrives. Taub, a psychologist, wears a veterinarian’s smock and a stethoscope around his neck; his helpers are in white medical coats. After Swain is notified, Stunkard is permitted to examine the monkeys. Taub and his attorneys drive off, returning

The only freezer in the lab was packed with ice and the body of Herbie, a monkey that had been killed. Alex Pacheco began working at IBR. Rat poison is in the dishes on the floor.

ing with Caohoon’s permission to remove the monkeys immediately. While preparations for their removal go on outside, we go to each cage to feed the monkeys pieces of fruit. I walk over to Billy, who sits silently as everyone else is resting, and touch the last bits of dead moss still littering his fur. I had heard that he was capable of feeling but I cannot have felt my touch. As the animals are removed, each cage is inspected, with the exception of those conditions by accusing the lab. The symbolism isn’t lost on those of us watching.

Wed., Oct. 7: Stunkard meets with the judge again. Stunkard states that he believes IBR cannot be cleaned adequately and that the monkeys should be moved.

(3 P.M.): The NIH report is made public. The findings state that NIH机构 cannot be made responsible for what happened on the scientific accomplishments and expenditures of the lab to NIH but that we have failed to comply with the NIH Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals. NIH failure must be corrected immediately.

Although we have maintained all along that we were complying in continuing to fund a subsantial lab, we are pleased that NIH has acknowledged this fact.

Thurs., Oct. 8: Swain and Assistant State’s Attorney Roger Galvin meet with The HSUS, PETA, and the Animal Welfare Institute. Galvin has just assigned prosecution of the cruelty charges. I am impressed by Galvin’s knowledge of the case. He requests the assistance of The HSUS General Counsel in preparing for the criminal proceedings to commence on October 27. The HSUS and AWI agree to cooperate in the defense of the monkeys for if they are not returned to IBR.

Fri., Oct. 9: Galvin is notified to appear before Caohoon, who is testifying. Stunkard’s Wednesday statement.

Postscript: The monkeys remain temporarily at the Poolsville facility. If the court doesn’t return custody, IBR must return them to the state to underwrite the expenses of prosecution witnesses in a misdemeanor trial, but the proceedings against psychologist Edward Taub and his assistant John Kunz were stayed.

Each was charged under Maryland law with 17 counts of inflicting unnecessary pain and suffering on the primates in their Silver Spring laboratory, one of the few times researchers have ever been charged with cruelty to the animals involved in their experiments.

Expert witnesses testified on both sides during the October trial. Because Maryland law doesn’t allow the state to underwrite the expenses of prosecution witnesses in a misdemeanor trial, the HSUS paid most of the travel and lodging expenses of the experts who testified for the prosecution.

The 17 crab-eating macaques and rhesus macaque under Taub’s care.

The Second Great Monkey Trial: Science Defends Its Treatment of Laboratory Primates

It isn’t often that media people, scientists, and animal-welfare advocates jam a small courtroom for a nuisance trial, but the proceedings against psychologist Edward Taub and his assistant John Kunz were stayed.
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The lab in July. Perry maintains all animal-research scientists are responsible people and admits he does not write up every violation of the Animal Welfare Act he sees. Fitzpatrick’s examination takes too long; Cahoon calls all attorneys to the bench. After court has been recessed, Fitzpatrick tells us that the judge wants us to negotiate the return of the monkeys to IBR. We are discouraged and disheartened. Fox, Teleki, and Swain are to expect the monkeys’ return. We tell Fitzpatrick we stand on the findings of Ott and Robinson as definite. Fitzpatrick agrees not to negotiate.
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Lesions, there was great debate over care from other research primates that caged, deafferentated monkeys-how or if-those lesions should be. Those animals didn't need toys because "a deafferentated [sic] monkey uses its deafferentated [sic] limb as a toy."

It was clear the research scientists considered this case an attack on research per se. Taub tried to defend his treatment of the monkeys on the grounds that if he could continue to benefit mankind. "I think we have to find a way to human beings who have not been tested on animals is the height of inhumanity," he said.

On Monday, November 23, Judge Stanley Klawon found Taub guilty of six counts of cruelty to animals by not providing adequate veterinary care. Even the defense witnesses, under cross-examination by Galvin, admitted Taub's monkeys were checked by a veterinarian twice a year for routine tuberculin testing. Taub admitted on the stand Dr. Paul Hildebrandt, listed with USDA and NIH as his attending veterinarian, had not visited the colony since 1979. Taub disagreed with the findings of the two veterinarians who examined the monkeys at the time they were seized, arguing none of the animals was in need of immediate veterinary care. Taub (who is not a veterinarian nor a medical doctor) did admit, however, he could not have diagnosed the osteomyelitis that one animal had developed in his broken and deafferentated arm.

The prosecution's witnesses were troubled by the fact that the monkeys did not have food dishes, perches, or toys to play with while locked in their cages. Toys, they felt, would have relieved the animals' stress and, perhaps, reduced self-mutilation.

The prosecution's other witnesses, led by HSUS Scientific Director Dr. Michael Fox, argued the animals deserved adequate nutrition and veterinary care. Fox testified that all the monkeys were left with motor skills intact, but with no feeling in the affected limbs.

At Taub's cruelty trial, were from left, Sergeant Richard Swain, Dr. Geza Teleki, a primatologist who had worked with Taub, protested that no one except other researchers — veterinarians included—is qualified to set standards for the care of deafferentated animals because of those animals' "special needs." Dr. Geza Teleki, a primatologist at George Washington University, disagreed: "You don't have to have had specific experience with [deafferentated monkeys] to know when something is suffering."

The suit further maintains that USDA officials "have tolerated and sanctioned multiple, serious, and patent violations" of the act. The suit asks that IBR and all other research facilities under Dr. Perry's charge be immediately re­visited. It also asks that a special committee, including at least three experts in veterinary medicine, behavioral and anthropological grounds his research had and would continue to benefit mankind. "I think we have to find a way to make sure both adequate nutrition and veterinary care are provided," he said.

The Animal Welfare Act, first passed in 1966 as the Laboratory Animals Act, requires research facilities to register with USDA and to submit to periodic inspections to verify compliance with regulations. The suit charges evidence collected by PETA Director Alex Pacheco demonstrated that "multiple, serious, and patent violations of the animal care standards were present at IBR." On the same day that USDA Inspectors were conducting their in­spections on that day last July, Dr. Perry reported that he found no defi­ciencies under the Animal Welfare Act in Taub's care of his monkeys. According to the suit, those viola­tions included the presence of open and moist wounds and lacerations on several monkeys, broken and ex­posed bones protruding into the cages, and layers of encrusted rodent feces, monkey feces, dirt and urine stains.
Cruelty in 1981 Proved Canadian Hunt Inhumane

The Canadian seal hunt traditionally begins in March, with the harvest taking place off the coast of Labrador, and, to the south, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. In order to minimize hunt publicity and ease the job of the sealers, the Canadian government strictly restricted access to information about the hunt, including press releases, and sealers allowed to go to the clubbing sites. Last year, because of freakish weather conditions, officials could not keep the Gulf site off limits. A lack of ice caused the harp seal herd to land right on the beaches of Prince Edward Island, a phenomenon that had not occurred for 12 years. After a hasty training session, clubbing permits were issued to a number of inexperienced islanders. Animal welfarists expected trouble, but not of the magnitude that developed that day in March.

The London Daily Telegraph reported that “The situation was aggravated because some fishermen with little or no experience were allowed to kill the seals and at times had to hit them several times before they died. Attempts were also made to skin seals that were still alive, and some were seen saw patches of ice red with flesh and blood.” Embarrassed officials, sensing a loss of control and a public relations bungle of the highest order, immediately revoked the licenses and the Gulf hunt was ended after only one day. None of the sealers, however, has been brought on cruelty charges.

John Walsh, Regional Director of the World Society for the Protection of Animals and longtime observer of the hunt, witnessed numerous violations of the Canadian government’s own sealing regulations during the 1981 hunt at the Front. “The deliberate violation of Federal Fisheries regulations in the view of those [Fishe­ rie] officers empowered to enforce them causes one to question the sincerity and ability of the Minis­ try of Fisheries to take punitive measures against an industry they are trying to protect and develop,” stated Walsh after the hunt. “The question now being asked by a growing number of organizations is whether the cruelty which occurred is typical of that which takes place annually during regu­ lar sealing operations. The only difference is that, this year, observers did not need permits or helicopters [in the Gulf] to be able to witness it.”
Mid-Atlantic

Rental Housing Pets

For more than six years, The HSUS has worked on regional legislation that would allow responsible pet owners to keep pets in rental housing. Landlords could keep parts of rental units for non-pet-owning tenants or levy increased security deposits to guard against damage caused by pets. The New Jersey “Pets in Apartments” bill with State Assemblyman William Gormley at a Trenton hearing last fall.

The HSUS supports The Humane Transportation of Horses Bill for Ohio, The New England Regional Office is seeking passage of legislation requiring ra-

On the Same Side

Speaker of the House Christopher Jackman and released from com-

Law Update

Legislative activity led the list of animal-welfare concerns this fall. In Ohio, the Great Lakes Regional Office is seeking passage of legislation requiring ra-

Bullfights Go On

Flying in the face of a recent opinion by the California At-

torney General, bloodless bullfight promoters continue to hold their spectacles because of a loophole in the state law. Although these Portuguese-style fights are prohibited, an exemp-

New England

Rodeos Come and Go

In September, the New England office, in cooperation with the Connecticut Federation of Animal Welfare Organizations, the Maine Federation of Humane Soci-

ties, and the Massachusetts SPCA, spearheaded a media cam-

Pests-for-Elderly Parties

After intense effort by The HSUS and other animal welfare organizations, California’s SB 1047, which allows elderly public housing residents to keep as many as two pets, was signed into law by Governor Brown in October (See Around the Re-

Spay/Neuter News

The New England Regional Office, in cooperation with the Con-

Gulf States

Going to the Dogs

Oklahoma state senator Mike Combs has introduced Senate bill 350 to make dogfighting a felony in that state. The bill, based on a model furnished by The HSUS, would upgrade the penalty for dogfighting from the puny misde-

Puppy-Mill Woes

The HSUS continues to monitor conditions in puppy mills across the country (see The HSUS News, Fall 1981 issue). Investigator Bernie Weller inspected an Ar-

Kansas puppy mill in September and found 165 Chows, malamutes, poodles, and terriers being kept in extremely unsanitary conditions. Weller filed a complaint with the local USDA office against the owner of the kennels, who has had a number of years of Animal Wel-

from surroundings states. Senator Combs received a letter from dogfighters opposed to the bill; he is counting on Ok-

c loosening the loophole to make way for the legislation.

"A W A standards.

The HSUS and other animal welfare organizations, California’s SB 1047, which allows elderly public housing residents to keep as many as two pets, was signed into law by Governor Brown in October (See Around the Regions, The HSUS News, Fall 1981 issue). More than 20,000 people signed petitions in support of the bill and a number of horses and mules have been seized on its behalf in legislative hearings. Dogs, cats, birds, and fish are also on the list of pets allowed in public ly financed projects. The HSUS will continue to monitor legislative activity that would allow any pet in public housing, and will ask for the amendments and to organize tenants’ support of the legislation.

Horses High Priority

Great Lakes investigator Tim Greyhavens has been attending horse auctions throughout the region to document the hardships suffered by horses during their transport to slaughter. There are no federal standards for the care of these animals (although The HSUS supports The Humane Transportation of Horses Bill for Ohio, The New England Regional Office is seeking passage of legislation requiring ra-

the battle is to make dogfighting a felony rather than a misdemeanor under state laws. In Michigan, animal protectionists are seeking to establish a commit-

tee to determine which devices are the most humane for the trap-

Western Pennsylvania Pet Protection League is one of the groups involved in these efforts. In the absence of federal legislation, Greyhavens continues to work with local organ-

izations for passage of state laws regulating horse transportation.

Gulf States

Going to the Dogs

Oklahoma state senator Mike Combs has introduced Senate bill 350 to make dogfighting a felony in that state. The bill, based on a model furnished by The HSUS, would upgrade the penalty for dogfighting from the puny misde-

West Coast (continued)

bull with bra and wig, was part of the show. One horse ridden by a matador was apparently so ag-

New England

Rodeos Come and Go

In September, the New England office, in cooperation with the Connecticut Federation of Animal Welfare Organizations, the Maine Federation of Humane Societies, and the Massachusetts SPCA, spearheaded a media campaign to make the public aware of our opposition to the animal suffering inherent in rodeo. Numerous television, radio, and newspaper interviews carried the mes-

Welfare Organizations, is distributing 500 postcards bearing the mes-

Observing rodeo events at September’s Eastern States Exposition in Massa-

The event was far from a religious experience. A teasing, performed by a bull with bra and wig, was part of the show. One horse ridden by a matador was apparently so ag-

the campaign to make the public aware of our opposition to the animal suffering inherent in rodeo. Numerous television, radio, and newspaper interviews carried the mes-

horses during their transport to slaughter. There are no federal standards for the care of these animals (although The HSUS supports The Humane Transpor-

Western Pennsylvania Pet Protection League is one of the groups involved in these efforts. In the absence of federal legislation, Greyhavens continues to work with local organ-

ization for passage of state laws regulating horse transportation.

law Update

Legislative activity led the list of animal-welfare concerns this fall. In Ohio, the Great Lakes Regional Office is seeking passage of legislation requiring raids on backyard dog houses in new legislative initiatives and to organize tenants’ groups in support of pet owners.

On the Same Side

In recent years, The HSUS and pro-hunting groups have found lit-

tle on which they can agree: consensus for passage of state laws to keep parts of rental units for non-pet-owning tenants or levy increased security deposits to guard against damage caused by pets. The New Jersey “Pets in Apartments” bill with State Assemblyman William Gormley at a Trenton hearing last fall.

The HSUS supports The Humane Transportation of Horses Bill for Ohio, The New England Regional Office is seeking passage of legislation requiring raids on backyard dog houses in new legislative initiatives and to organize tenants’ groups in support of pet owners.
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The HSUS supports The Humane Transportation of Horses Bill for Ohio, The New England Regional Office is seeking passage of legislation requiring raids on backyard dog houses in new legislative initiatives and to organize tenants’ groups in support of pet owners.

On the Same Side

In recent years, The HSUS and pro-hunting groups have found lit-

tle on which they can agree: consensus for passage of state laws to keep parts of rental units for non-pet-owning tenants or levy increased security deposits to guard against damage caused by pets. The New Jersey “Pets in Apartments” bill with State Assemblyman William Gormley at a Trenton hearing last fall.
Local Society Sued

The Chemung County Humane Society (CCHS) in Elmira, New York, was recently sued by Pauline and Thomas Morrell who adopted a dalmatian from CCHS in 1980. The Morrells claimed that, sometime after they took the dog home, it attacked and bit Mrs. Morrell. As a result, Mrs. Morrell sued CCHS for $150,000 for the various injuries she allegedly sustained; Mr. Morrell claimed an additional $25,000 for loss of his wife’s services.

Since the case has yet to be tried and since there are several difficult factual issues (for example, whether Mrs. Morrell may have provoked the attack), CCHS’s ultimate liability has yet to be determined. However, there are a few steps humane societies and shelters can take to avoid such suits.

First, adoption contracts should contain language making clear that the society or shelter makes no representations or guarantees about an animal’s temperament. Such contracts should also release the society or shelter from any liability for future injuries caused by the animal. Alternately, a document of release, separate from the adoption contract, can be prepared for the adopting party to sign.

Second, once that provision has been added to the adoption contract or a separate document is in use, shelter employees should avoid making any oral claims about an animal that might contradict or qualify the written release, waiver, and disclosure. Third, even with these documents in use, the staff should make every effort to be sure that animals offered for adoption have sound medical backgrounds.

CCHS’s insurance company denied its liability coverage on the incident, a denial upheld by a New York court. As a result, CCHS will not only have to pay, out of its own assets, any damages awarded to the Morrells but has also had to hire its own attorneys to defend the case instead of being able to rely upon the insurance company’s legal resources.

The HSUS recommends that local societies and shelters seek written clarification from their liability-insurance carriers if they aren’t certain their current policies would cover similar claims.

For further information on this case and on how to avoid similar problems, consult the December, 1981, issue of Shelter Sense, published by The HSUS.

Turtle-Sale Alert

Readers of The HSUS News know that, since 1975, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration has banned the retail sale of all turtles with a shell length of less than four inches. These turtles have been found to be carriers of Salmonella bacteria and are disease hazards to children. The HSUS supports the ban because it deplores the inhumane aspects of marketing and keeping reptiles and other exotic animals requiring specialized care.

In the past year or so, pet stores in several states have been discovered selling these small turtles in violation of the ban (see Winter 1981 and Summer 1981 issues of The HSUS News).

It is illegal for turtles with a shell length of less than four inches to be sold, held for sale, or offered for any other commercial or public distribution.

The law applies to all species of turtles, tortoises, or terrapins. Sales of deep-sea species and noncommercial sales by hobbyists and scientific suppliers are excepted.

If you discover such turtles for sale in pet shops or elsewhere, you should contact the nearest Regional or District Office of the Food and Drug Administration and The HSUS General Counsel’s office. Please be prepared to provide name and address of the vendor and the approximate number of turtles involved. Be sure to check the size of the turtles’ shells.

If you report illegal sales, you will, normally, not be required to act as a witness or to become further involved. The fact that the turtles are offered for commercial sale will be sufficient evidence of a violation.

HSUS Gives Pre-Trial Aid

In October, HSUS attorneys and law clerks provided close support for Maryland State Prosecutor Roger Galvin’s well-publicized efforts to convict officials at the Institute for Behavioral Research of cruelty to several monkeys used in stroke research (see the article on the trial in this issue.) As part of this support, The HSUS was able to gain assurances from the USDA that it would willingly cooperate with Galvin in providing officials needed as witnesses for the state. In addition, extensive research into court decisions on the cruelty laws of all fifty states and the District of Columbia and into the question of whether the federal Animal Welfare Act preempted Maryland’s anti-cruelty statute was undertaken on a crash schedule in preparation for pre-trial hearings.

The court ruled in Galvin’s favor on the preemption issue and on other pretrial matters. The five-day trial of IBR scientists ended on October 31, 1981.

Compiled by Murilda Stuart Mad­den, HSUS General Counsel, and Roger Kindler, Associate Counsel.
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"...I give, devise, and bequeath to The Humane Society of the United States..."

There is implicit hope for animals in these words.

The unspoken hope of animals is depicted in the shelter puppy "wagging" to be adopted, or the last great whale sounding to escape the harpoon's fatal thrust. The desperate hope of the shelter animal and the great sea leviathan is in our hands.

There is only one way to make sure you can help animals after you're gone. Make a will and provide for them.

Write for: YOUR WILL TO HELP ANIMALS
To: Donald K. Coburn
HSUS 2100 L St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20037

WE HOPE IT IS YOUR WILL TO HELP ANIMALS.