Conflict over “Talking” Chimps

Animals' Status in Society

Horse Racing Hearings
Joint Rodeo Policy Statement

During the past several years, The Humane Society of the United States and the American Humane Association have differed widely in their respective policies regarding rodeos and the ways in which each approached the rodeo issue. Indeed, so apparent were these differences that the rodeo industry exploited them to their own advantage, using the name and position of the AHA to neutralize the protests and objections to rodeo being advanced by The HSUS. It is with much enthusiasm that I tell you this difference no longer exists.

On March 3, 1982, officers of both organizations met together and adopted the following position statement on rodeo, a statement formally approved by The HSUS Board of Directors at its May 5 meeting:

"The Humane Society of the United States and the American Humane Association are opposed to rodeos because they result in torment, harassment, and stress being inflicted upon the participating animals and expose rodeo stock to the probability of pain, injury, or death. We denounce this type of unnecessary exploitation and the use of devices such as electric prods, sharpened sticks, spurs, flank straps, and other rodeo tack which cause animals to react violently. We find these abuses cannot be justified.

"We have determined that professionally sanctioned rodeos often ignore the established guidelines intended to prevent cruelty. Furthermore, we have determined that abuse and suffering occur during non-sanctioned or amateur competitions and especially when animals are used repetitively for practice. Therefore, we believe that a program of official humane supervision cannot effectively prevent the cruelties inherent in rodeos.

"The HSUS and the AHA contend that rodeos are not an accurate or harmless portrayal of ranching skills; rather, they display and encourage an insensitivity to and acceptance of brutal treatment of animals in the name of sport. Such callous disregard of our moral obligations toward other living creatures has a negative impact on society as a whole and on impressionable children in particular. It is, therefore, our mutual policy to oppose all rodeos, to educate the public about our humane objections, and to encourage like-minded individuals and groups to seek the elimination of rodeo cruelties through programs of local activism."

Copies of this statement have been mailed to 2,187 animal-welfare organizations and animal-control agencies throughout the United States inviting them to adopt this statement as their own rodeo policy. Further, The HSUS is in the process of launching a major campaign opposing rodeos.

This landmark event, bringing together the American Humane Association and The Humane Society of the United States on this important issue, has the potential for dealing rodeo in this country a very damaging blow.

John A. Hoyt

president's perspective
Second Chance for Chimps

Due to the intervention of The HSUS, two famous chimpanzees taught to communicate with people through sign language have been spared years of isolation in a laboratory as part of human hepatitis-vaccine research. The "talking" chimps, Nim Chimpsky and Ally, are owned by the University of Oklahoma, and in their younger days were used in celebrated studies on the capacity of non-human primates to learn language. Both spent years undergoing intensive sessions with human researchers learning to communicate through the sign language used by deaf people. When budget cutbacks forced Oklahomans to dispose of the chimps, New York University's Laboratory for Experimental Medicine and Surgery in Primates (LEMSIP), arranged to take the animals for ongoing hepatitis research.

The specter of chimps used to a regimen of benevolent human care being confined for years to the sterile environment of a lab was unacceptable to The HSUS and the thousands of people who learned of the chimps' plight on CBS television. We immediately began our search for a suitable permanent facility for the chimps, operating under an agreement with LEMSiP Director J. Moor-Jankowski that he would release Ally and Nim as soon as such a place could be found. Within a matter of days, The HSUS had located a private facility in Texas willing to accept, the animals and a donor who was willing to provide funds for the construction of a spacious outdoor enclosure for Nim and Ally.

By that time, Moor-Jankowski had changed his mind and refused to release the animals before a study already in progress was completed—nine months to a year from then. He did agree to spare Ally and Nim from a planned four-year study but said he needed them to test a new vaccine. The HSUS continued to press for the chimps' immediate release.

Events, however, overtook Moor-Jankowski's plans. The public furor resulting from the publicity prompted New York University to send the chimps back to Oklahoma only two weeks after their arrival at LEMSIP. Nim and Ally, according to The New York Times, were sent by truck back to Oklahoma in late June, where they reportedly will be used in a breeding program.

Pounds of Trouble

More and more people in both the animal-welfare and research communities are turning their attention to the practice of releasing dogs and cats from public and private shelters for use in research. In the past few years, several states, including New York and Connecticut, have repealed laws that required pound managers to turn over unclaimed pets to laboratories. Legislation to make the practice illegal is currently under consideration in California (see "Around the Regions"). Researchers, however, are building up this easy access to research subjects without a fight. In response to successful court action initiated by The HSUS's Great Lakes Regional Office last fall, a veterinarian member of the state legislature introduced a bill to make it easier for animal dealers to acquire dogs and cats to sell for research.

In light of all this activity, The HSUS has made the abolition of pound seizure a priority. We have hired a law student to spend the summer developing materials on the issue in preparation for next year's state legislative battles. The first of those materials, "Questions and Answers about the Release of Pound and Shelter Animals for Experimentation," is now available from The HSUS for $2.50 for 50 copies. This fact sheet will be particularly useful if your town or county government is currently wrestling with this issue.

"Don't Buoy Here"

Apparantly, The HSUS Close-Up Report on puppy mills published last year is having wide-ranging repercussions in the pet shop business. Listen to this report from Pet Business magazine:

"According to the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council (PIJAC), Big Brother and some of his cousins are watching pet shops. It is the result of The Humane Society of the U.S. Close-Up Report on "puppy mills" that news teams in some cities have visited pet shops to see if the report is accurate and the result seems to be a press highly critical of stores in some cases. Several states are even considering laws to restrict pet shop sales of a number of animals including dogs.

"In a recent newsletter to the industry, PIJAC's General Counsel, Marshall Meyers said, 'It appears that the threat of reducing government regulation and the possible elimination of certain jobs have caused several enforcement agents to indulge in what must be characterized as over-zealous activities. A number of local inspectors have posed as FBI agents; have threatened person [sic] with 200 years in jail if they do not cooperate; urged people to lie; advised people they do not need a lawyer because all that was involved was a misdemeanor and no jail; brandished guns; publicly stated that all persons involved in the wildlife trade are 'crooks'; announced to store customers, with guns drawn, 'Don't buy here, this store is under investigation'; conducted warrantless searches; confiscated dogs, cats, wildlife, and records; claimed that a number of foreign government officials are corrupt; stated that it is not proper to sell animals for profit; interrogated people at odd hours of the night without warrant; advised people not to take the advice of their lawyers; and all the while running around like Batman and Robin teams. If only a small percentage of the allegations are true, it is a sad commentary on the law enforcement policies of Federal and state officials. But in any event, it is a situation which the pet industry must accept as real: certain of these law enforcement activities are justified due to the actions of a few.'"

Pet Shop Blues

And in another puppy-mill campaign development, Pet Age magazine reports a number of pet shops have discontinued selling purebred puppies in the Cincinnatia area, at least partially as a result of the negative publicity The HSUS has given the puppy-mill problem. In an article in the April, 1982, issue, several pet-shop owners gave reasons for dropping purebred pups from their inventories:

"...a number one on the list was 'negative publicity from The Humane Society of the United States.' Also cited were 'poor quality of 'puppy-mill' animals, the higher price of puppies, the overall state of the U.S. economy, and increased competition.'

"There were a lot of reasons why our dog business had to be dropped. One of the big things was all of the negative publicity pet-shop dogs received from the so-called 'animal-welfare' groups," reported one shop owner.

"Puppy mills do exist, and they are giving the entire industry a bad image," reported another.

That pet-industry publications themselves are admitting the HSUS puppy-mill campaign is influencing consumers is good news for everyone who wants to end puppy mills part of ancient history.

No Bad Dogs

This spring, the renowned British dog trainer and television star Barbara Woodhouse toured the U.S. promoting her new book No Bad Dogs and answering the questions of thousands of perplexed dog owners nationwide.

Does she prefer to work with purebred dogs or mongrels? asked The HSUS News. "I love a mutt just as much as I love a purebred," assured Woodhouse. "A dog is a dog to me—I don't care what it is. Any dog can be trained so long as..."
Cruelty For A “Good Cause”

When Guy Wharton, Executive Director of the Easter Seal Society of Central California, first looked at plans for his 1982 spring carnival, he didn’t stop to consider whether the proposed greased-pig contest might pose any problems.

“You know how it is,” he said later. “I was always ‘an hour late and a dime short.’ The whole event was really being put together by our volunteers. It didn’t dawn on me that there might be anything wrong with it.”

However, a letter from The HSUS’s West Coast Regional Office warning of the cruelty and stress involved in covering a pig with grease and having it chased by dozens of children got Wharton’s attention. “Of course, I immediately called the event off,” he said. “I really appreciated being told. These things are just a matter of education, and I was guilty of not starting to think that it might hurt the animal.”

This story had a happy ending. The carnival went off as planned—without the greased pig—and at least one more charity group discovered it’s a good idea to use live-animal events to raise money. Unfortunately, for every Guy Wharton, there are dozens of other well-intentioned administrators of charitable organizations who “don’t stop to think” or are lured with promises of big money by slick promoters into using events such as donkey basketball, armadillo races, and ratatouille roundups to raise money for their worthy causes. When humane societies or private citizens rightly object to the exploitation and potential for cruelty involved, one nonprofit group ends up fighting another in an ugly media battle.

Consider the case of the Paint Branch High School of Montgomery County, Maryland. In 1981, it held a donkey-basketball game to raise funds for the drama department. (Donkey basketball uses “trained” donkeys provided by a commercial promoter as mounts for human volunteers who try to dribble and shoot the basketball from donkey-back in a gymnasium or other facility.)

“I know of some other high schools that had [donkey-basketball] games, and they made a lot of money from them,” said Paint Branch Principal Steven Dickoff. “I didn’t know there was any problem in the community about cruelty to animals, but, after we began to publicize it, I started getting complaints.”

By then, Dickoff explained, it was “too late” to cancel the event; the contract with the promoters had already been signed, and the money promised. Despite pickets from a local animal-protection group, the game was held. Although no negative publicity occurred, the negative publicity, the cost of hiring the promoter, or just a general lack of interest, the event lost money. Dickoff reported. Would he twice about allowing such an event to be held in his school again? “I’d think half a dozen times. Now I know there’s a segment of the community that finds this wrong.” This year, a student talent show raised several hundred dollars for the drama department.

Greased-pig contests and donkey basketball are only two events in the myriad popular as fund-raisers for church groups, Jaycees, chambers of commerce, and other charities. It’s easy for humane societies to object to a rodeo exploiting animals for profit, but it can be uncomfortable for anyone to dissuade people from participating in an event to help crippled children or feed the poor.

It’s not hard to see why live-animal events are so popular as fund-raisers. As Judy Rodgers, Director of the Wichita Falls (Texas) chapter of the Muscular Dystrophy Association pointed out, “Animals attract attention. You need to bring people out to raise money. It’s just a fact of life. The armadillo is real popular around here.” Her group sponsored an armadillo race as a fund-raiser.

Events involving a professional fund-raiser selling services to a charity are common because “they are heavily promoted by animal exploiters looking to make money,” said HSUS Director of Field Services and Investigations Frantz Dantzler, who estimates The HSUS and various other organizations in the United States do not fund-raise annually. “These are events that wouldn’t be tremendouslv popular by themselves, but, if you get a group that can draw on the community to support a good cause, you can draw quite a crowd.”

According to Dantzler, charities like the animal events because “the promoters do all the work. All they have to do is make a few posters and show up.”

In the vast majority of cases, there is no desire on the part of the charities to inflict suffering. “The organizations that sponsor these things are good-intentioned and working for good causes,” said David Wheeler, Director of Animal Control for Montgomery County. “They wouldn’t want to harm animals. They just don’t realize what they are doing.”

That view was confirmed by Wichita Falls MDA Director Rodgers. “I’m an animal lover,” she protested. “But I didn’t feel [her armadillo race] was going to be harmful to the armadillos. These particular animals are raised to be raced, and we had very strict rules about how they should be treated.”

According to Dantzler, an animal doesn’t have to be severely injured or killed for these unnecessary events to be labeled cruel. “People normally think of cruelty as blood dripping off an animal or other visual sign of anguish. But if these signs aren’t evident, that doesn’t mean cruelty isn’t involved.”

The worst, he believes, are commercial enterprises such as donkey-basketball games and armadillo races because the animals are stressed not only during the performances, but also during transit. Animals frequently must perform more than once a day; they may be fed and watered infrequently or at odd times to prevent “accidents” in school buildings or auditoriums; and they may end up living in inappropriate cages or trucks. Last May, nine basketball donkeys were killed when their truck caught fire; they burned to death because the owner had a trailer attached to the back of the truck and could not open the tail gate to free the animals.

Recognizing that live-animal events may be cruel and actually stopping them are two very different things. Sometimes, a little quiet persuasion can do the trick. “Indicate to the group sponsoring the activity that what they view as wholesome and humorous entertainment is not viewed that way by everyone,” advises Dantzler. “You may convince them that the negative publicity will do them more harm than good.”

“There are some limitations on what we can do,” said Animal Control Director Wheeler. “You can’t, legally, assume something’s going to go wrong, although something usually does. You just can’t put animals in that type of situation.
Rattlesnake roundups, where snakes are dug out of burrows during hibernation and displayed, are popular as fund-raisers in the southeast. Although they are dug out of burrows during hibernation, they want to keep a school from making money for things that may really be essential. On the other hand, you don't want people raising money at the expense of some poor critter that has no choice in the matter.

Tired of "putting out brushfires," her organization finally approached the city's school board to have donkey-basketball banned once and for all.

"At first they just snickered," she said, "but when we explained the cruelty involved with the event, how the animals were pulled, pushed, and beaten during the games, and showed them our documented cases of kids who'd been bitten and kicked and donkeys hurt," they began to take notice. It took several months and a lot of pressure to get the board to act, but it finally voted not to allow any more donkey basketball in the public schools.

One consolation for animal protectionists is that people who truly don't want to hurt animals don't make the same mistake twice. And, advises Animal-Control Director Wheeler, a little prevention can alleviate a lot of cruelty. "The key is education," he said, "Get the word out that events like these aren't a good idea. Show what's happened in the past."

If you're part of a group that's planning a fund-raiser, be sure to discourage the use of live-animal events. Suggest car washes, bake sales, bike races—anything that doesn't exploit animals. If you encounter a group that really wants to use animals in some way, suggest a fun pet show, where kids can bring their own pets to compete for prizes. The biggest or smallest pet, the dog with the longest tail or the cutest face can be big winners. No one gets hurt, everyone has a good time, and the same amount of money is raised.

If you encounter an event involving animal exploitation "for a good cause," don't assume the sponsor has cruel intentions. Said Guy Wharton, of Easter Seals, "Our groups are both in the helping profession, and trying to prevent needless pain. We should be working together, not against each other."

The Mobile SPCA uses dedication and ingenuity to meet The HSUS's rigorous standards for accreditation.

Ever since The HSUS created its accreditation program in 1978, it has tried to inspire animal-control agencies and humane societies to improve their services to animals and to their communities. Standards for accreditation are high—only 20 agencies have earned that distinction—but, in Mobile, Alabama, the Mobile SPCA has demonstrated that a small agency making concerted efforts in the right directions can pass The HSUS tests with flying colors.

The HSUS began its accreditation program to recognize formally those animal agencies providing quality animal care, operating effective programs, and utilizing responsible administrative practices in their communities. The agencies must have some mechanism for resolving individual animal problems, but they must also be working toward long-range solutions to problems such as pet overpopulation.

This can be a challenge even for a large, well-funded agency, but Mobile SPCA shows that it isn't just dollars and cents that make a quality humane organization. The SPCA has met the accreditation standards with a staff that is all volunteer and an annual budget of only $10,000.

An "unsheltered" agency, the SPCA is the product of a 1976 merger of two humane groups and serves a community of 964,000 people in Mobile and Mobile County.

Five volunteers maintain regular hours in a rented, two-room office, and 20 additional volunteers are available for special assignments.

A Chance for Self-Examination

The director of the Mobile SPCA is Joan Richardson, whose interest in animal welfare was sparked one day several years ago when she saw another driver deliberately hit a dog on a highway. Shocked and concerned at first by this kind of intentional cruelty, Richardson later expanded her interest to include wider-ranging issues such as pet overpopulation. She began attending HSUS-sponsored conferences and workshops. Eventually, she was able to join the humane movement as a full-time volunteer. "It got more rewarding as I became more involved," she says.

Susan Bury Stauffer • Summer 1982

One day, Joan Richardson received a phone call with the report that a Nubian goat was wandering behind a Ramada Inn near busy I-65. "With the assistance of the residents of a nearby apartment complex, I captured Katie. She is now in a rural community north of Mobile with her new triplets." Rescue efforts aren't commonplace, but Mobile volunteers must be prepared for any animal-related emergency.
Richardson learned about the accreditation program from HSUS staff members traveling in the Mobile area. “The chance for self-examination is the main reason Mobile SPCA applied for accreditation,” she says. “I stress to all volunteers in the very beginning that, even if we did not become accredited, the self-examination would be worth it.”

To be accredited, humane agencies without shelters must serve as resources for their communities; conduct humane education programs; conduct cruelty investigation and animal rescue programs (unless these sources for their communities; conduct cruelty investigation and animal rescue programs (unless these

is influenced by the state of institutional life for Mobile’s elderly.

Of the elective standards is “continuing activity designed to promote an effective animal-control program within the community.”

The Mobile SPCA has developed a good working relationship with the city animal-control facility. Shelter Director Ed Marchand points out that the SPCA has worked together on a number of projects. At the SPCA’s urging, Animal Control Officer Richard Dunklin attended The HSUS’s Animal Control Academy; there are plans to send other shelter employees to the Academy for training. “This has been a wonderful experience to tell the public that we are doing something right and are making progress,” Dunklin says.

The SPCA’s “Pet a Friend” program brings explorers, pets, and nursing home residents together to ease the loneliness of institutional life for Mobile’s elderly. “It is trying to help. SPCA volunteers are trained to screen prospective owners carefully and often make home inspections before placing animals. Each week, they advertise an animal that is available for adoption as a “Pet of the Week.”

One of her best volunteers has been people who got acquainted with the SPCA when they had animal-related problems themselves. “We have found it does take a special person to listen to all the terrible stories that they have and make home inspections before placing animals. Each week, they advertise an animal that is available for adoption as a “Pet of the Week.”

Every One a Volunteer
When you ask Joan Richardson if her staff is entirely volunteer, she answers proudly, “Every one of us!” Some of her best volunteers have been people who got acquainted with the SPCA when they had animal-related problems themselves. “We have found it does take a special person to listen to all the terrible stories that they have and make home inspections before placing animals. Each week, they advertise an animal that is available for adoption as a “Pet of the Week.”

Sue Bury Stauffer is editor of Shelter Sense, published by The HSUS.

Mobile’s fundraising “Run for Animals” attracted more than 250 competitors and earned SPCA press coverage as well as revenue.

The SPCA’s “Pet a Friend” program brings explorers, pets, and nursing home residents together to ease the loneliness of institutional life for Mobile’s elderly. “It is trying to help. SPCA volunteers are trained to screen prospective owners carefully and often make home inspections before placing animals. Each week, they advertise an animal that is available for adoption as a “Pet of the Week.”

In discussing mandatory standards for accreditation, The HSUS also has elective standards organizations can strive to meet as an extra measure of success. For unsheltered humane organizations, one of the elective standards is “continuing activity designed to promote an effective animal-control program within the community.”

The Mobile SPCA has developed a good working relationship with the city animal-control facility. Shelter Director Ed Marchand points out that the SPCA has worked together on a number of projects. At the SPCA’s urging, Animal Control Officer Richard Dunklin attended The HSUS’s Animal Control Academy; there are plans to send other shelter employees to the Academy for training. “This has been a wonderful experience to tell the public that we are doing something right and are making progress,” Dunklin says.

The SPCA’s “Pet a Friend” program brings explorers, pets, and nursing home residents together to ease the loneliness of institutional life for Mobile’s elderly. “It is trying to help. SPCA volunteers are trained to screen prospective owners carefully and often make home inspections before placing animals. Each week, they advertise an animal that is available for adoption as a “Pet of the Week.”

Every One a Volunteer
When you ask Joan Richardson if her staff is entirely volunteer, she answers proudly, “Every one of us!” Some of her best volunteers have been people who got acquainted with the SPCA when they had animal-related problems themselves. “We have found it does take a special person to listen to all the terrible stories that they have and make home inspections before placing animals. Each week, they advertise an animal that is available for adoption as a “Pet of the Week.”

In November, 1980, the SPCA held its first “Run for the Animals,” raising money from entry fees paid by more than 200 runners. The run attracted good press coverage and was such a success that it is now an annual event for the SPCA.

Positive Changes
Phyllis Wright, Director of The HSUS’s Animal Sheltering and Control Department, oversees the accreditation program. She comments, “We’re especially pleased to have the Mobile SPCA in our family of accredited organizations. A million dollars does not necessarily make a great humane agency. What we look for in agencies applying for accreditation is how they’re using what resources they have. We try to find out if they’re solving and preventing problems, not just reacting to animal problems, and Mobile SPCA is certainly doing that.”

Richardson says the accreditation process has helped the SPCA improve its programs. “It will be a wonderful experience to tell the public that we are accredited, but I see the greatest benefit to be internal. We will find out what that need is, that need improving and do an even better job at the programs we have been doing well.”
The 1982 Annual Conference of The Humane Society of the United States

Protecting Animals In Today’s World

November 3-6, 1982
Radisson Ferncroft Hotel
Ferncroft Village
Danvers, Massachusetts

Birthplace of the American humane movement, the Northeast will host The HSUS’s Annual Conference in an eventful year. Our conference theme, “Protecting Animals in Today’s World,” has particular significance in light of the opposition we face from the scientific community, the horse racing establishment, and many others.

This year, in addition to its useful selection of workshops and membership events, The HSUS offers unique and provocative activities that address several of animal welfare’s most volatile issues. Senior HSUS staff members and distinguished guest panelists will grapple with the future of laboratory animals and farm animals in strategy forums and a head-on debate over the trapping issue. In response to special requests, we have planned an animal-welfare administrators’ symposium for those associated professionally with animal-welfare organizations to meet and exchange ideas. The HSUS’s West Coast Regional Director Char Drennon will moderate this first-time offering.

Internationally known speaker and commentator Roger Caras will serve as The HSUS’s program moderator. The HSUS’s highly respected Dr. Amy Freeman Lee will provide her own special brand of inspiration and insight in her keynote address. President John Hoyt will deliver his annual report to the membership.

The Institute for the Study of Animal Problems will host a provocative and informative one-day symposium, “Animal Mind—Human Perceptions: Implications for Animal Welfare,” on Wednesday, November 3. During this meeting, experts will explore the moral status of animals, the subject of impassioned debate since the time of Pythagoras, through discussion of various aspects of animal awareness and human perceptions of animals. HSUS conference participants will receive a special discount if they choose to attend this separate program; check the conference registration form for details.

As always, the conference’s final highlight will be the annual Awards Banquet, capped by presentation of the Joseph Wood Krutch Medal to an outstanding humanitarian for his or her significant contribution toward the improvement of life and the environment.

An inspirational program and an historic setting are two good reasons why The HSUS’s Annual Conference is an important event on your calendar. Make plans to join us in November, won’t you?

1982 HSUS ANNUAL CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

Tuesday, November 2
7:30-9:00 p.m. Registration
8:30 a.m. ISAP Symposium Registration
9:15 a.m.-10:30 a.m. ISAP Symposium: Animal Mind—Human Perceptions: Implications for Animal Welfare
9:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m. Visit to MSPCA’s Macomber Farm: An Education Center (includes lunch and transportation)
4:00-6:30 p.m. Evening Registration
8:30 p.m. HSUS Reception/Get-Acquainted

Wednesday, November 3
8:30 a.m. Coffee Break
12:00-2:00 p.m. Book Sale
2:00-5:30 p.m. Workshops
1. National Campaign for Laboratory Animals—Achievements and Goals Patricia Forkan, Dr. Andrew Rowan
2. Euthanasia: Dealing with the Dilemma Bill Smith, Dr. Alfred Jackson
3. Investigating Cruelty: A Systematic Approach Frantz Dantler
4. Protecting Wildlife in Refuges Guy Hodge, Wendy Smith
5. Successful Legislative Campaigning Martha Hamby
3:30-4:00 p.m. Coffee Break
4:00-5:30 p.m. Workshops
1. How Your Society’s Policies Affect Animal Welfare Sandy Rowland, Phyllis Wright
2. Evaluating Your Zoo Sue Pressman, Jeannie Roush
3. Resources for Animal Advocates Guy Hodge, Peter Lovenheim
4. Protecting Laboratory Animals in Your Community (Case Studies on Pound Seizure and State Anti-Cruelty Statutes) Heather McGiffin, Julie Rovner
5. Designing Evaluation Criteria for Humane Education Programs Kathy Savsky
8:30-10:00 p.m. Film Festival
Dr. John W. Grandy, HSUS Vice President/Wildlife and Environment
Third participant to be announced
Moderator: John A. Hoyt, HSUS President
10:30-11:00 a.m. Coffee Break
11:00 a.m. Strategies for Advancing Farm Animal Welfare Dudley Giehl, author of Vegetarianism
Dr. Michael W. Fox, HSUS Scientific Director and Director, Institute for the Study of Animal Problems
Third participant to be announced
Moderator: Paul G. Irwin, HSUS Vice President/Treasurer
12:00-2:00 p.m. Book Sale
2:00 p.m. Visit to the New England Aquarium and Boston
It is anticipated the visit to the New England Aquarium will take place between 3:00-5:00 p.m. Buses are scheduled to return to the hotel at 6:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. (the latter time for persons desiring to remain in Boston for dinner). This is an optional event and requires an advance registration and bus fee of $6.
2:00-5:30 p.m. Animal-Welfare Administrators Symposium
Moderator: Char Drennon
For humane society executives, shelter managers, and animal-control directors.
“You and Your Board of Directors”—John A. Hoyt
“The Humane Society and Full-service Veterinary Clinics”—Phyllis Wright and guest veterinarians
“Copying with Stress in Your Job”—Dr. Alfred Jackson
7:30-9:30 p.m. Humane Education Programs and Materials: A Sharing Session Kathy Savsky

Thursday, November 4
8:00 a.m. HSUS Conference Registration
9:00 a.m. Voices of the Wild: A Sound Presentation by Roger Caras
Opening Remarks John A. Hoyt, President Roger Caras, Program Moderator Coleman Burke, Chairman, Board of Directors
9:30 a.m. Keynote Address “Design for Rainbows” Dr. Amy Freeman Lee
10:15 a.m. Coffee Break
10:45 a.m. Strategies for Advancing Laboratory Animal Welfare Dr. Franklin Loew, Dean, School of Veterinary Medicine, Tufts University
Dr. Andrew Rowan, HSUS Director of Laboratory Animal Welfare New England Antiv. Society rep. Moderator: Patricia Forkan, HSUS Vice President/Program and Communications

Friday, November 5
8:00 a.m. Conference Registration
9:00 a.m. Trapping: Ethics, Management, and Economics Stephen S. Boynton, Washington Counsel, American Fur Resources Institute
9:30 a.m. Coffee Break
10:00 a.m. Tactics to Combat Animal Cruelty Statutes Heather McGiffin, Julie Rovner
10:30 a.m. How Your Society’s Policies Affect Animal Welfare Sandy Rowland, Phyllis Wright
11:00 a.m. Protecting Wildlife in Refuges Guy Hodge, Wendy Smith
11:30 a.m. Successful Legislative Campaigning Martha Hamby
12:00-2:00 p.m. Lunch and Transportation
3:00-5:00 p.m. Coffee Break
3:30-4:30 p.m. Workshops
1. How Your Society’s Policies Affect Animal Welfare Sandy Rowland, Phyllis Wright
2. Evaluating Your Zoo Sue Pressman, Jeannie Roush
3. Resources for Animal Advocates Guy Hodge, Peter Lovenheim
4. Protecting Laboratory Animals in Your Community (Case Studies on Pound Seizure and State Anti-Cruelty Statutes) Heather McGiffin, Julie Rovner
5. Designing Evaluation Criteria for Humane Education Programs Kathy Savsky
8:30-10:00 p.m. Film Festival
Dr. John W. Grandy, HSUS Vice President/Wildlife and Environment
Third participant to be announced
Moderator: John A. Hoyt, HSUS President
10:30-11:00 a.m. Coffee Break
11:00 a.m. Strategies for Advancing Farm Animal Welfare Dudley Giehl, author of Vegetarianism
Dr. Michael W. Fox, HSUS Scientific Director and Director, Institute for the Study of Animal Problems
Third participant to be announced
Moderator: Paul G. Irwin, HSUS Vice President/Treasurer
12:00-2:00 p.m. Book Sale
2:00 p.m. Visit to the New England Aquarium and Boston
3:30-5:30 p.m. Animal-Welfare Administrators Symposium
Moderator: Char Drennon
For humane society executives, shelter managers, and animal-control directors.
“You and Your Board of Directors”—John A. Hoyt
“The Humane Society and Full-service Veterinary Clinics”—Phyllis Wright and guest veterinarians
“Copying with Stress in Your Job”—Dr. Alfred Jackson
7:30-9:30 p.m. Humane Education Programs and Materials: A Sharing Session Kathy Savsky

Saturday, November 6
9:00-10:30 a.m. resolutions Committee Report
10:30-11:00 a.m. Coffee Break
11:00 a.m. President’s Address
11:30 a.m. Annual Meeting of HSUS Members
Treasurer’s Report Elections Committee Report Elections to Nominating Committee
12:00-2:00 p.m. Book Sale
2:00-4:00 p.m. Hospitality Room Open
2:00-4:00 p.m. Workshops
1. Open Forum John A. Hoyt, Frantz Dantler, Sue Pressman, Kathy Savsky, Phyllis Wright
2. Tactics to Combat Animal Cruelty Statutes Bill Meade, Marc Paulhus
3. Trapping: Questions, Answers, and Strategy Dr. John W. Grandy
4. Factory Farming: How It Affects Us—What We Can Do Dr. Michael W. Fox, Peter Lovenheim
5. Public Relations for the Local Society Janet Huling
6:30-9:00 p.m. Reception (cash bar)
7:30 p.m. Annual Awards Banquet John A. Hoyt, Master of Ceremonies Presentation of Joseph Wood Krutch Medal

HSUS ANNUAL CONFERENCE REGISTRATION

Name ___________________________ (please print)
Address ________________________________________________
City ___________________ State __ Zip __________

☐ Registration Fee for Entire Conference* (includes Saturday banquet)
Period: Person Total
HSUS Member $40 $ __________
Non-Member $50 $ __________
1-Day Registration
Thurs., Nov. 4 $15 $ __________
Fri., Nov. 5 $15 $ __________
Sat., Nov. 6 $15 $ __________

☐ Banquet only (Saturday evening) $20 $ __________

☐ Vegetarian meal at banquet

☐ ISAP Symposium (not included in fees above)
Wed., Nov. 3 HSUS Conference $10 $ __________
attendee
Symposium only $20 $ __________
Full-time student $10 $ __________

☐ Visit to MSPCA’s Macomber Farm
9:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m. (Open only to persons registering for entire HSUS Conference; includes lunch)
Wed., Nov. 3 $6 $ __________

☐ Visit to the New England Aquarium and Boston
(no meals included)
Fri., Nov. 5 $6 $ __________
2:00-6:00 p.m.
2:00-10:00 p.m. $6 $ __________

Total Enclosed $ __________
(Make checks payable to HSUS)

Complete and return this form to:
HSUS Conference, 2100 L. St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037

*Persons sending their registration prior to September 15 may deduct $5 from the full registration fee. No refunds will be made after October 15, 1982.

Please complete a separate form for each group member registering. A hotel registration form will be mailed upon receipt of this form. You must make reservations directly with the hotel prior to October 13.
The HSUS Testifies for Federal Restrictions on Racehorse Drugging

On Wednesday, May 26, 1982, at 9:40 a.m., Thoroughbred racehorses in training at 37 tracks across the country had finished their morning gallops. On 37 shed rows from Belmont Park to Louisiana Downs, aching legs were hosed, tubbed, iced, rubbed, and wrapped to help ward off the pain and stiffness that are the inevitable consequences of pounding day after day on track surfaces either rock-hard or fetlock-deep.

On many of those 37 shed rows, horses scheduled to race were being injected—either legally with analgesics or illegally with stimulants or depressants—to get them through the day.

On one shed row, Real Ivor, a five-year-old bay stallion entered in the ninth race at Pennsylvania's Keystone Race Track, was waiting for his 4:11 p.m. start. He had raced well just 11 days earlier, finishing fourth, but suffered from chronic leg problems, a common ailment in racehorses with deep footing like that at Keystone that day.

At the same moment, in the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C., Senator Charles Mathias, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, banged the gavel, bringing to order hearings on Senator David Pryor's bill (S. 1043), designed to prevent the drugging of racehorses.

The HSUS had worked for four long years for that day (see sidebar on page 17). Field Investigator Marc Paulhus and Lobbyist Martha Hamby had spent months convincing congressmen federal legislation was the only practical, humane answer to racing's drug woes.

Sen. Mathias had warned state racing commissioners in 1981 that, if they did not act quickly to bring about strict compliance with the National Association of State Racing Commissioners' (NASRC) guidelines, he would have to hold hearings on S. 1043. He was now ready to determine why the racing industry hadn't made more progress in cleaning up racing on a state-by-state basis. To defend the industry's efforts and oppose the legislation was an impressive array of racing's most prestigious and influential officials: The NASRC's First Vice President Dr. Joe O'Dea; The Jockey Club's August Belmont; The Thoroughbred Owners and Breeders Association's President Penny Ringquist; The Thoroughbred Racing Association's (and Churchill Downs President) Lynn Stone; and The Horsermen's Benevolent and Protective Association's Anthony Chamlin. There were others as well.

Speaking for The HSUS was Marc Paulhus. The only other invited witness were Russell Gaspar of the American Horse Protection Association (AHPA) and New York state chemist Dr. George Maylin of Cornell University, who spoke specifically on his state's drug-testing program.

The first witness was Sen. Pryor, who explained why he believed S. 1043 deserved passage.

"State and industry efforts to check the abuse of drugs have been slow in coming. It was a month before I first introduced this legislation in 1980 that the National Association of State Racing Commissioners issued a set of guidelines severely restricting the use of formally permitted drugs. With the specter of federal legislation, most of the racing states adopted these guidelines and the even stricter ones which followed a few months later. Yet today, under pressure, most of those states have lapsed back into old rules or have adopted strict rules with little or no enforcement to back them up. Today, according to figures compiled from industry publications, not a single state is in full compliance with the NASRC guidelines, and only three are even close.

"It concerns me that some actions have been superficial. During debate over such a medication rule in 1980, the only estimated tens of thousands of chemical substances which could be illegally administered to race horses—according to Paulhus, and because "even the best testing laboratories are not capable of identifying all of these substances," freezing samples for later analysis (see sidebar for a comprehensive testing system.)

"Establish uniform civil and criminal penalties for drug violations.

"Allow any state which implements a program meeting minimum federal standards to apply for exemption from federal administration and allow a two-year period for states to implement programs to qualify for exemption.

What S. 1043 Would Do

"If this legislation is allowed to die, then racing will go back to its previous practices...."

-Sen. David Pryor
The racing industry has had more than sufficient time to address the problems associated with permitted medications. For years, horse racing officials have been aware of the difficulties faced by horses and the industry as a whole due to the use of illegal and legal medications. The use of illegal and legal medications has had a negative impact on the racing industry's image and profitability, and the industry has been struggling to address these issues adequately.

The Thoroughbred industry needs more time to get its house in order, stated Belmont. "The industry has not yet met its objective but it is moving. "I don't feel that it is appropriate to raise federal taxes or to divert from our present budgetary allocation for Social Security to regulate..." traditionally funded by the cost borne by each individual state."

Sen. Pryor was strong allies of the race horses standing mute and patient on the shed rows. Said Martha Hamby, the HSUS's lobbyist, "We were greatly encouraged by the day's events. Now we must wait for the Senate subcommittee's report on the bill. We can say 'Hurray for today,' and continue our efforts to keep the bill moving in the Senate, but now we must forge ahead and fight for hearings in the House of Representatives. With an advocate as articulate, committed, and passionate as Sen. Pryor, we then,Choop our chances of enactment of the federal horse racing bill. By four o'clock, the hearings were long over. Real Irv was in the paddock, waiting for the post parade to begin. The state veterinarian knew the horse, best for the tracks, and against the horses had a vote, if the betting was on the program. Twenty of the 96 horses entered were scratched because of only one test, for one drug, on one day. No other action was taken by track officials. No track charges were levied.

"The horse racing industry has had more than sufficient time to adequately deal with these medication problems and clearly has not shown itself up to the task." —Marc Paulhus

The racing industry has been aware of the difficulties faced by horses and the industry as a whole due to the use of illegal and legal medications.
The year 1981 was a period of extraordinary challenge for The Humane Society of the United States. Intensifying threats to the welfare of animals were confronted. Farm animals, laboratory animals, marine mammals, and puppy-mill dogs were the subjects of major campaign efforts. Responding to the problems facing these animals, while maintaining aggressive programs combating cruelty in numerous other areas, was the Society's most important challenge of the year.

Threats to animals were more visible in 1981 than in previous years because of the extensive media attention given to the plight of harp seals, confinement-reared veal calves, and "puppy-mill" puppies. The HSUS initiated several major efforts to counter those threats. In the courts, in the halls of Congress and state legislatures, and perhaps most importantly, in America's classrooms, we were able to bring vital animal-welfare issues to the attention of millions of people, many for the first time.

Of course, there were setbacks along with the triumphs. Budget reductions at all levels of government threatened to erase important victories the Society had worked years to achieve. Several crucial laws faced attack by those who would prey upon, rather than protect, animals.

Uniting against adversity only strengthens our—and your—resolve. The groundwork we have so carefully laid in 1981 will prove indispensable as we move into 1982.
Society played an active and substantial role in the trial of researcher Dr. mark in establishing the responsibility which dogs are bred to produce and General.

Public Information

| Department of Animal \n| Control \n| \n| \n| The Department of Animal Control expanded its crucial programs to assist local animal care and control workers in becoming more professional and effective in their jobs and communities. Phyliss Wright, Department Director, contended with approximately 300 local animal agencies in 1981. Wright also taught the HSUS’s Animal Control Academy, which issued 72 certificates to students successfully completing a 16-week course in animal control and techniques in euthanasia. The Animal Control Department produced a training videotape, “Attitudes on Euthanasia,” to aid those workers unable to attend the academy. The HSUS added three new agencies to its Accreditation Program in 1981, bringing the total number accredited to 250. The HSUS’s government-relations staff, keeping our programs constant before members of the U.S. Congress, their staffs, and other government officials, provided information and expertise on legislative matters dealing with animals. The department drafted measures that would prevent the use of drugs in racetracks, alleviate the suffering of laboratory animals, and create a farm animal husbandry committee.

KIND Program

KIND, our youth publication, the most significant humane education resource for America’s young people, led the way in 1981 designing activities to challenge and excite youth. KIND encouraged its readers to write to their members of Congress regarding changes in the Animal Welfare Act (AWA), the Canadian harbor seal hunt, the contemplated changes in laws affecting endangered species, and laws affecting predator control through the use of poisons.

Investigations and Field Services

HSUS investigators experienced a banner year in their crackdown on illegal dogfighting and cockfighting, helping regional law enforcement officials organize raids in Georgia, Michigan, Minnesota, and Ohio. Their efforts resulted in more than 100 arrests and numerous convictions. In Georgia, NBC television newsmen taped a raid as part of a national segment appearing on “NBC Magazine.” Efforts continued to halt the use of drugs in horse racing. Valuable aid was provided by The HSUS to a UPI reporter in his five-part series on racing’s drug scandals. Our investigator also acted to halt the cruelties of rodeo and the threat to wild-horse populations from the Department of the Interior’s Bureau of Land Management.

Ligation and Legal Services

The HSUS Office of the General Counsel initiated a major new lawsuit and filed an appeal to another in 1981. The new suit accused the U.S. Department of Agriculture of failing to enforce the portions of the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) pertaining to the inspection of research facilities and puppy mills. The Office of the General Counsel also continued its fight against USDA, charging that it failed to enforce animal-fighting provisions of the AWA. The department inter-departmental regulations which would weaken the Endangered Species Act. We pressured the Department of Commerce to accept a unilateral reduction of our government’s quota of seal “harvests” under certain international treaty provisions. We prodded the Food and Drug Administration to continue the ban against the sale of pet turtles and stepped up pressure against the USDA to close substandard roadside zoos.

Regional Programs and Services

The HSUS’s regional programs serve as a critical vehicle extending to distressed animals throughout the country. In 1981, our programs were expanded to include a fifth region. The former HSUS New Jersey Branch officially became the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, their directorship of Nina Austenberg. The staff of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office concentrated on the protection of endangered species. One of their primary objectives in 1981 was the drafting of a law requiring Los Angeles animal-control facilities to surrender animals for experimentation.

The New England Regional Office staff, in cooperation with the Department of Animal Law Enforcement, drafted a major new law to improve zoos in the region. The New England Regional Office continued its work on the cruelties of rodeo. The office urged the governor of Maine to cancel an open season on eastern moose, and challenged the state’s official animal.

Special Projects

To reinforce our pledge to end the world’s seal hunts, The Humane Society led other national and international organizations in proclaiming March 1 International Day of the Seal. A major public awareness campaign was created and implemented which focused on the plight of milk-fed seal calves in the United States. The campaign was strengthened with billboards in The New York Times and six national magazines. We created and distributed branded business cards with the “NO VEAL THIS MEAL” announcements to be left in restaurants serving milk-fed veal.

Gifts to Other Societies

While many of the activities and programs of The Humane Society are focused in the United States, our commitment to animals all over the world was strengthened. The HSUS substantially contributed to The World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA). The WSPA’s field offices provided invaluable assistance to slaughterhouse workers in humane slaughter techniques; investigating the smuggling of endangered species; inspecting the exotic bird markets of
Asia; and observing the Canadian harp seal hunt. To assist us in our work in the United States, The HSUS also contributed to Monitor, Inc., a consortium of animal-welfare and conservation groups designed to assist in the development of coordinated positions on marine mammals and endangered species.

**Fund-raising**

In 1981, The Humane Society of the United States funded its programs through direct-mail solicitations describing our humane efforts, public service announcements in large national magazines, and the issuance of Close-Up Reports to members and others.


The Humane Society of the United States meets the standards of the National Information Bureau. W.G.S. (M) 182 Contributions to The HSUS are tax-deductible.

---

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Management</td>
<td>$199,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations and Field Services</td>
<td>$329,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising</td>
<td>$2,872,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td>$227,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIND Program</td>
<td>$25,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation and Legal Services</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,872,403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership and General Public Information</td>
<td>$358,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td>$172,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Activities and Services</td>
<td>$831,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind Program</td>
<td>$257,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations and Field Services</td>
<td>$142,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Programs and Services</td>
<td>$329,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects</td>
<td>$35,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts to Other Societies</td>
<td>$18,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,323,864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Income over Expenditure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$451,461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Operating Income and Expenditures**

| Expenditures                      | $2,872,403|

When is a rabbit not a rabbit? When it is a laboratory subject, a hunter's prey or a dinner entree. Then, according to law and custom, it is a completely different animal.

*by Dr. M.W. Fox*

In our society, an individual's status is defined either as his condition in the eyes of the law or his rank in relation to others. I believe the legal and social status of animals in human society is not based on any objective, scientific criteria or ethical rationale but rather upon their individual value to that society. This value has its roots in tradition (how a species has historically been viewed or treated); utility (how vital or profitable is its role in our lives); and emotion (how appealing or beautiful it is). The use of these arbitrary criteria has caused tremendous and illogical variations in how different species are treated. Consider, for example, the disparities between the way we view the coyote and his cousin, the domestic dog. Despite their close biological relationship, the two species couldn't be treated more differently. Our tradition has condemned coyotes as "varmints" or pests, our need has been for their pelts or as recreational targets for sportmen, and our emotional reaction to them has rarely included compassion. As a result, anyone who systematically traps, starves, burns, gasses, shoots, or poisons coyotes is condoned (on the false and unethical premise of economic necessity) but anyone who treats a stray dog the same way would violate state and federal anti-cruelty laws and—rightly—bring down society's opprobrium upon his head.

To take another example, farm animals, because they are producers of food and products and are, according to some, not "real" animals (in the sense pets are "real") can be kept five to a cage two feet square, tied up continuously by a two-foot-long tether, castrated without anesthesia, or branded with a hot iron. A pet owner would be prosecuted for treating his companion animal in such a manner, but these are common practices in farm-animal husbandry, despite those animals' great biological and psychological similarities to species kept as pets.

Is it logical, ethically tenable, and scientifically valid for society and the law to condone the treatment of wildlife and farm animals with fewer conditional restraints than pet animals and prosecute a pet owner for doing to a pet what, with impunity, a state predator-control officer does to coyotes or a farmer to a sow? Such social and legal inconsistencies do not stand up philosophically, in terms of logic and reason, nor do they stand scientific scrutiny, since the physiological and psychological similarities are greater among rats, cats, and pigs than are the differences, thus demonstrating that there is no scientific basis for such discriminatory treatment. The philosophical argument—that such animals are sentient, have needs, interests, and intrinsic worth—is supported by scientific evidence.

An even more obvious example is how laboratory animals can be experimented upon by supposedly qualified researchers, while the pet owner may not inflict such treatment on his own pet. The pet owner may be liable for prosecution and the researcher spared because the latter is presumed (rightly or wrongly) to be trained and qualified and his/her exploitation of animals is assumed to be of ultimate value to society. As a consequence, the rights of laboratory animals are accorded less standing than those of pets because of their presumably greater usefulness to man.

These socially and legally accepted inconsistencies need to be scrutinized closely. Practices or customs that benefit society should stand philosophical and objective (scientific) scrutiny, otherwise how are we to be sure that what is socially acceptable is ethically justifiable? The fact that farm, laboratory, and companion animals are kept for different purposes does not logically justify such inconsistencies. Why should an animal that is to be killed and
eaten, or made to suffer and sacrificed for knowledge's sake, or harvested or exterminated (as is the case with many wild species) have less protection in society than do pets? The difference lies here in the greater emotional value that is placed upon pets, a valuation that unconditional supporters of biomedical research, hunting, trapping, predator control, and "factory" farming criticize as being anthropomorphic. It might be argued that, for the sake of consistency, society should not prosecute someone for burning his cat with a branding iron, keeping a dog permanently held by a short tether, or destroying a litter of pups with a fire bomb. That would eliminate inconsistencies all right, but pet owners—because of their emotional attachment—and animal protectionists would rightly press for reinstatement and strengthening of federal and state animal-welfare and protection laws for all animals.

It may be argued that farm animals should be treated with as much respect and care—if not more—than pets, since it is we who will ultimately kill and consume them. The same may be said for the care given laboratory animals, whose suffering and death benefit society through the knowledge gained to alleviate human sickness and suffering. And, it may be argued, since it is we who intrude upon wildlife's world and create "pest" and "predator" problems, we should rectify those problems only by the most humane and ecologically sound means. It is neither rational nor ethical to allow pets to enjoy greater social status and legal protection than others simply because they satisfy our sentimental, emotional, and traditional needs.

It is to be applauded that, at long last, farm animals are being brought within the scope of societal concern for their well-being. U.S. agribusiness publications have stated, "Farm animal welfare is the issue of the eighties; and it's not going to go away." They also recognize that it is an "emotional issue" and while it may be argued that public concern over the welfare of farm animals may be highly emotional and to some extent anthropomorphic, the final decision on farm-animal welfare will be made by the general public if democracy and justice prevail.

The ultimate choice of which predator control and farm husbandry practices and other treatments are acceptable cannot be based upon sentimentalism on the one hand and economic justifications on the other, but upon scientific study, ethics, and commonsense morality.

As a final illustration, consider the rabbit. A rabbit can be perceived (and therefore treated in a variety of ways that will influence its social and legal standing: It could be a beloved pet, a subject for high school dissection or research, a menu item, or the source of a pair of fur mittens. It could be a farmer's pest, a sportsman's "worthy adversary," or a greyhound trainer's lure. But nowhere is the rabbit valued intrinsically, in and for itself. Our own perceptions and underlying needs, values, and projections create a spectrum of attitudes that determine the rabbit's ultimate social and legal standing. But doesn't the rabbit suffer equally whether it is a pet, a laboratory animal, or a "pest"? Isn't it just as cruel, given the rabbit's ability to experience pain, to torture it in a laboratory or in an open field as it is in a home? Not according to the law!

Surely, we must insist, so long as society continues to accept that animals may be exploited and a means to human ends, an ethical contract be made to balance our need to exploit by interposing a moral obligation with respect to and for the animal's intrinsic nature and worth. Such an ethical contract has its foundations in the Judeo-Christian traditions of justice and mercy, and in compassion, understanding, respect, benevolence, and love; and also in the merging philosophy of animal rights. These humane tenets provide the necessary balance to the intrinsic limitations of employing the scientific method per se to determine animal welfare, humane codes, assessment of animal sentience, suffering, emotional states, etc. And when such balances are made, the conditional exploitation of animals may be socially, legally, and ethically justifiable, rather than based upon unfeeling and unthinking utility, self-centered emotional and perceptual inconsistencies, and intellectual rationalizations.

Dr. M.W. Fox is scientific director of The HSUS and director of The HSUS's Institute for the Study of Animal Problems.
A Legislator Speaks Out
A conversation with Rep. Tom Lantos

Serving only his first term as a U.S. Congressman from the 11th District of California, Tom Lantos has already established a reputation as a crusader for animal welfare. After hearing the controversial debates over legislation to protect the care of and promote alternatives to laboratory animals, Rep. Lantos—not even a member of the committee considering the legislation—created a working group for all interested parties to air their views. During laboratory-animal hearings, Rep. Lantos came out strongly for effective legislation to solve the myriad problems associated with the issue. He has also been an articulate opponent of the budget cuts in Animal Welfare Act enforcement proposed by the administration.

News: Since you have been in Congress, you have gained a reputation as one of the leaders in the fight for animal protection. How did you become involved in this issue?

Lantos: I grew up in a family of animal lovers. We always had all kinds of animals around the house, and I have a passionate concern for all living creatures. Of all the things I do, few give me the sense of personal joy or satisfaction I get from trying to protect animals. They need a spoken person. They have so few! It’s a matter of deep, personal commitment.

News: What are the most important things we need to address when protecting animals?

Lantos: Unfortunately, there are a lot of issues which require attention. I think the problems of lab animals are the most pressing and the most immediate. We need to improve dramatically their use and treatment. We must find alternatives to using animals in research and other areas. The protection of wildlife habitats—that’s important. There must be an upgrading of the conditions under which factory-farm animals are raised.

The population-control issue is a very serious one for pets. We must improve shelters and animal-placement programs. I think we have not yet begun to scratch the surface of how we can integrate animals into a more civilized and feeling society.

News: Do you ever worry about being typecast as “pro-animal” and not “pro-people”?

Lantos: There is a phony dichotomy between those who are labeled “animal people” and those labeled “people people.” I am concerned about all sentient beings.

News: In these days of budget-cutting, it seems programs that protect animals are the first to go. Both from economic and moral viewpoints, do you think that is wise?

Lantos: Speaking as a professional economist, I can assure you the amount of money that goes for this issue is peanuts. The annual budget is an infinitesimal amount. The notion that it is budgetary stringency that is forcing these cuts is false. From both an economic and humane point of view, this is an area where we must not yield. Far too many of those of us who feel strongly about animals should suffer. I will fight it.

News: What can our members do to influence both the passage and effective enforcement of federal animal-protection laws?

Lantos: Practically all organizations concerned with legislation create their own political action committees and become active in campaigns. To the best of my knowledge, animal-welfare groups have considered themselves above the fray. There are those of us who fight for animals because we believe in it, but I think we could get many more allies if it would be important and useful for legislators to see how really I’m being stoned—or legislated—as every legislator is day—and night on a million issues, and animal-welfare groups must get themselves up-to-date. I see no reason why those of us who feel strongly about animal issues shouldn’t have our own list of preferred and not-preferred candidates.

News: Do you think HSUS members could accomplish anything by informing their representatives of their views on animal issues?

Lantos: Unequivocally, yes! Letters for and against animal issues pour into my office. They come from my Congressional district, from the rest of the country, and from other nations. It is impossible for a Representative to ignore the feelings of the nation, nor would one want to. The barrage of phone calls, telegrams, letters, and all forms of legislation sent to Senators and Representatives was largely responsible for the President’s success in passing the tax cut last year. Writing your Representative is not, alone, enough, but it is an absolutely essential element in any campaign.

News: Is a political solution to animal problems the best solution, or do law enforcement, community involvement, and other activities play more important roles?

Lantos: Community involvement and education are key elements in any campaign to bring about real change. As a legislator, I emphasize effective legislative strategy and working within the system. But legislation alone will not work. A comprehensive, well-coordinated approach is the best and only way of achieving effective change.

News: Is there one goal or achievement you would like to see during your tenure in Congress?

Lantos: For the next five years from now, I could feel there are animals that have a more human and less burdensome, less painful life because of our efforts, the years of service will have been worth it. I think an increased emphasis on animals is really at the core of everything we are trying to accomplish. Far more than passing legislation, the key to动物 protection is stopping a specific abuse, the goal is to make society look at animals in a different way.

Your intentions are good….

Recently, I received a letter from a law office. The first paragraph states, “This office represents the administrator of the estate of (the person’s name). (Name) died on (date) without a will.”

The letter is regarding a communication from me regarding an earlier request by the deceased for information on naming The HSUS as a beneficiary.

You have heard the often-quoted statistic: seven out of eight Americans die without a will. This statistic has unfortunate implications for our intentions. We want our estate (whatever size) to be distributed, as we wish. Without a will, our intentions may be modified or possibly, totally disregarded.

It is the intention of this message to urge your decision and action regarding your will. If you have considered the welfare of animals as one of your primary concerns, The HSUS frankly invites you to remember animals in your will through the Society.

We are pleased to send our booklet, free of charge, on your request: Write: YOUR WILL TO HELP ANIMALS, The HSUS, Donald K. Coburn, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20007.
Election Alert

This year is a special one for all 435 members of the House of Representatives and one-third of all Senators: it’s re-election year. Some politicians start heading back to their home states or districts in the late summer; others wait until closer to the November 2 elections. Find out from your legislators’ local offices when they will be home, then schedule a visit. Mention specific issues of concern to you so that they know animal legislation should have a high priority in the time remaining to this Congress. Time is running out for the bills described below.

On Hold

HSUS Director of Investigations Frantz Dantzer and Director of Legislation Martha Hamby testified before both the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Agriculture to keep 1983 funding for the USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) at its current levels. A cut in funding would mean even the minimal protection now offered animals by the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) would be eliminated, and countless animals would suffer the consequences. The administration’s budget, prepared by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), has proposed a 70 percent reduction in APHIS funding for fiscal 1983. If this budget item were adopted in this form, the programs for enforcement of the AWA would end.

APHIS staff admitted to appropriations subcommittee members that, with a budget cut from 4.9 million dollars to 1.5 million dollars, they could no longer afford regular inspections of pet shops, zoos, and other facilities now covered by the AWA. Predictably, they parroted the administration’s belief that AWA enforcement could be left up to individual states or private groups.

Dantzer and Hamby told the subcommittee that OMB’s proposed budget was tantamount to executive repeal of one of America’s most popular laws.

The HSUS is continuing its pressure on appropriations committee members to restore the 3.4 million dollars that OMB has “removed” from the APHIS budget. We have contacted many HSUS members whose senator or representative is one of these two subcommittees and we would be particularly interested in receiving mail from their constituents supporting full APHIS funding.

Absence of a federal budget has halted congressional efforts to appropriate any money for federal programs in fiscal 1983. Until Congress passes a budget in some form, a top HSUS priority—APHIS funding—is on hold.

Trap Trials

Never have there been hearings in the Senate on federal legislation to ban the steel-jaw leghold trap. Only once, in 1975, have hearings ever been held in the House of Representatives. Now, The HSUS is gathering its forces to organize Republican support for the bill and for parrying the growing opposition to it.

On a decision by Rep. William H. Archer to limit debate on the bill, the Senate Subcommittee on Environment and the House, the House versions of S. 1043, the bill a favorable report and now decide whether or not to give the bill a favorable report. Write them and for expertly countering the opposition’s arguments during the hearings.

• Sen. John Chafee, for sponsoring S. H.R. 6245, for helping to organize Republican support for the bill, and for writing him at 2906 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

Thank You All!

These members of Congress and their hardworking staffs have spent hours giving animal-welfare legislation the attention it deserves. They have faced strong opposition. Please write them and convey your thanks for their courageous foresight and leadership.

• Sen. John Chafee for spearheading a strong Endangered Species Act through Congress.

• Sen. David Pryor for introducing S. 1043, the horse racing bill, and for expertly countering the opposition’s arguments during the hearings.

• Rep. Margaret Heckler, for co-sponsoring H.R. 6245, for helping to organize Republican support for the bill, and for writing him at 2344 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Horse Racing Realities

In the article on page 14 is a complete report on the Senate hearings held in Chairman Mathis’s Criminal Law Subcommittee on Sen. Pryor’s bill to ban the use of drugs in horse racing (S. 1043). The subcommittee must now decide whether or not to give the bill a favorable report and send it on for review by the full committee. It is very important that HSUS members let Mathias know that we want S. 1043 to receive that favorable report. Write Sen. Mathias at 358 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

Despite The HSUS’s early hopes that this important legislation would receive hearings in the Senate and the House, the House version, S. 1043, H.R. 2351, sponsored by Rep. Bruce Vento, seems to be going nowhere in the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Chair-

Pressure From Farm Front

Over a dozen farm-industry groups have contacted Rep. Ronald Mottil to express their dislike of H.R. 305, the bill to create a farm-animal husbandry committee (see Fall 1981 HSUS News). Although the bill now has 15 committed co-sponsors in the House of Representatives, a crucial cosponsor, Rep. Fred Richmond of New York, member of the powerful Agricultural committee, was convinced to withdraw his sponsorship after a visit in February from the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Pork Producers Council. Farm groups convinced Rich­mond his sponsorship ‘was premature’ following the congressman’s legislative assis­tants, and told him they feared the negative publicity generated by animal-welfare groups about farm animal practices would create a “backlash” against agribusiness.

At this moment, no other co­sponsors have withdrawn their support from Rep. Mottil’s bill, but the pressure from national farm groups—from the National Meat Association to the United Egg Producers—will continue.

Agribusiness can’t afford to lose animal-welfare organizations like The HSUS be perceived as too in­fluential or too successful in pleading their case for farm animals. The agriculture lobby has inten­sified its pressure on Rep. Tom Harkin, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry, not to hold hearings on the bill. These hearings could be the first major step toward ending the suffering of farm animals which have been excluded consist­ently from every piece of animal­protection legislation ever to come before Congress.

Let Harkin know you want hear­ings for H.R. 305; write him at 2411 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

We will watch the course of this bill, and write back to you.”
man John Conyers (2313 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515) also urged to hold hearings on this bill as soon as possible. Additional co-sponsors are also asked to write your representative (at the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515) and ask him/her to add his/her name to Rep. Vento’s as sponsors of H.R. 2331.

ES A Triumph

Good news: the Endangered Species Act (ESA) has been reauthorized for three years despite the best efforts of Interior Secretary James Watt, trappers, furriers, and other exploiters who require a requirement for not get everything we wanted. Support for provisions protecting species protected by the act of 1982 sponsors are also needed: write soon as possible. Additional for killing bobcats. But, the Congress removed the absolute ent for Wildlife and list an animal for protection. Essential protection for the bobcat from destructive exploitation, the new protection for laboratory animals being added by H.R. 6245, passed the House to co-sponsor and vote for H.R. 6245 and fight any further weakening amendments.

Lab Animals

The long awaited compromise bill to help laboratory animals, H.R. 6245, passed the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology on June 9th, just eliminating yet another obstacle in the difficult task of realizing new protection for laboratory animals in the final days of the 97th Congress. Next, the bill, introduced by Subcommittee Chairman Doug Walgren, must be passed by the full committee and then by the entire House of Representatives. As written, H.R. 6245 would provide some important new protection for animals currently in labs as well as initiate research into the use of non-animal alternatives. Although the legislation does not go as far as The HSUS would have liked, we believe that, with some modifications, it could prove to be the most effective piece of legislation to help laboratory animals in many years. Among other things, H.R. 6245 recognizes that alternatives to the use of animals in laboratories should be part of the research and development of non-animal methods.

For those animals still in research, H.R. 6245 requires that no federal dollars be spent unless the use and care is raised to much higher standards than current law requires. It also mandates the establishment of an Animal Studies Committee in each research facility to inspect facilities and report deficiencies. That committee will be required to evaluate research methods and experimental design and set up training in alternatives. One member of the committee must come from outside the scientific community and be charged specifically with representing the welfare of animals.

There were two weakening amendments to the bill passed by the subcommittee, one to exempt farm-animal research into food and fibre and another removed by the authorization for 45 million dollars to be appropriated over the next three years to develop alternatives. Proponents of the amendments argued that, in the first case, the powerful agricultural community would see that the bill did not pass if farm animals were not left out, and, in the second, that congressional Republicans, given the current budget climate, would not vote for any bill that authorized any new money to be added to the federal budget.

The amendment to remove the 45 million dollar, three-year appropriation was replaced with language that stipulates that National Institutes of Health would allocate "adequate" funds from its budget for alternatives research. The HSUS is lobbying for a change that would direct the Department of Health and Human Services to spend an amount equal to the new funds the bill originally authorized, over and above the amount currently being spent to find alternatives. We are also working to get the new protective measures into force as quickly as possible.

HSUS members should immediately ask their representatives in the House to co-sponsor and vote for H.R. 6245 and fight any further weakening amendments.

it has four legs, nice brown eyes, and a wagging tail.

"I think a shelter dog or pup that has perhaps had some neglect early on would be as good or better a candidate for a training as a well-cared-for puppy because they are all so pleased to be handled. I trained six dogs on live television— all shelter dogs—in about ten minutes! The next day, 300 shelter dogs [across Great Britain] found good homes. People could see what we could do with shelter dogs. At home, I never handle pedigreed dogs, always shelter dogs. After all, those are the dogs we want to prove to people can be nice dogs.

And what about cats—can they be trained?

"No, not the way dogs can be," says Woodhouse firmly. "I always say, 'A tin of sardines and a cat and you've got it.'"

Teachers Cited

The teachers, parents, and students of St. Michael's School, in Levelland, Texas, have convinced The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education that their principal Arlene Brooks is a very special teacher. Dr. Brooks has been named NAAHE's 1982 Teacher of the Year. "Once again," said NAAHE Director Kathy Savesky, "we were astounded by the extensive activities and exceptional credentials of the nominees." Finalists in the prestigious competition inaugurated last year were Suzanne Glencer of Pittsburgh, PA, Kenneth Hub­ ris of Pittsford, NY, Sue Schwartz of Brooklyn, NY, and Diane Wiet of Cicero, IL.

Shirt Success

We've sold thousands of our "Club Sandwiches, Not Seals" T-shirts over the past months, but we have a limited quantity still available. Why not order a shirt or two for the summer? Use this coupon for your order.

Shirts are royal blue with white print. The front reads: CLUB SAND­ WICHES, NOT SEALS: on the back is a picture of a harp seal pup inside the HSUS logo. Shirts are made in M (for a small woman or large child), S are $6 (each), for 4-9 shirts and $5 each (for 10 or more). Please send shirt, size, and number and shirts at the same time, with each.

I need__small__medium__large__extra large.

My check (made payable to The HSUS) for $ is enclosed.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP

Please return this coupon with full payment to SEAL SHIRTS, HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20037. Please allow 3 weeks for delivery.

 Tracking (continued from page 1)
A lot of people don’t necessarily like snakes. But few sensible, humane people would deny them the right to their bit of territory in the isolated woods, fields, and valleys of the southeast. Fewer still would go out into the hinterlands looking for them, drag them out of gopher tortoise burrows, build a whole festival around their display, and torment them. Unfortunately, there are folks in Texas, Oklahoma, Alabama, and Georgia* who do just that. This spring, HSUS investigator Bob Baker observed one of the biggest rattlesnake roundups.

The Evans County (Georgia) Rattlesnake Roundup, held this year on March 13 and 14, has been a staple of the region’s social calendar since 1967, when a local youth was bitten by an eastern diamondback rattlesnake on his parents’ farm. The incident convinced the community there was a large and dangerous rattlesnake population that needed rounding up. Over the years, the roundup has evolved into a major event, including 200 arts and crafts exhibits, variety shows, collectables and antiques exhibit, parade, beauty pageant, a full day of gospel singing, and street dancing. To obtain snakes, hunters begin collecting snakes in late fall or early winter and continue until the warm weather comes to Georgia. Rattlesnakes hibernating in gopher tortoise burrows are flushed out by hunters who blow jet fumes into a rubber tube inserted in the hole. If the snake doesn’t appear, the hunter simply digs right down to row to get it. The snakes are held for months at a time, without food or water, in the mistaken belief that they will continue their hibernation in the storage sheds or barns the hunter uses to house his collection before the big event. Once disturbed by the hunter, however, a snake will often not return to proper hibernation in captivity, and the resulting stress increases its metabolic rate and depletes its fat reserves. The snake will become emaciated, dehydrated, and often dies.

Once at the roundup, the snakes are milked of their venom— their glands squeezed with severe pressure to obtain as much venom as possible—and, finally, after all the fun, “disposed of.” The snakes are, report­edly, sold to individuals for meat and skins.

According to Georgia’s hunting regulations, it is unlawful to “dis­urb, or destroy the dens, holes, or home of wildlife, to blind wildlife with lights, or to use explosives, chemicals, electrical or mechanical devices or smokers, in order to drive them out of their dens, holes or homes.”

The Evans County method of capturing snakes clearly violates those regulations. When The HSUS’s Franz Dantzler brought this fact to the attention of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, however, Commissioner Joe Tanner informed him the Georgia General Assembly had just exempted poisonous snakes from the regulation’s protection. Undeterred, Dantzler pointed out hunters are destroying the homes of gopher tortoises, not exempted from the law, in their attempts to get at the snakes. So far, no reply has come from Tanner.

The roundups are over for this year. The HSUS will continue to pursue legal angles in all four southern roundup states to convince officials they would be better off without spring-time rattler extravaganzas.

Snakes Don’t Rate Southern Hospitality

New England

Mass Seizure

The regional office has joined several state humane organizations in calling for the repeal of Massachusetts’s pound seizure law. The Bay State and Minnesota are the only two states that require animal-control facilities to give up pound animals for research.

Blow for Elderly

Despite a successful committee hearing and unanimous approval in the state senate, a bill would have permitted elderly residents of public housing in Connecti­cut to keep a cat, dog, bird, or fish as a pet was scrapped and re­committed to the Planning and De­velopment Committee, ending its chances for passage this year. Re­gional Director Dommers observ­ed, “We will launch another ma­jor effort next year. We’ve seen success along these lines in elder­ly units in Maine, and the Califor­nia bill (see Around the Regions, Winter 1982 HSUS News) has set a precedent. This bill wouldn’t have cost the taxpayers a cent, and it would have brought joy to so many of our elderly citizens.”

Moose Game

Despite the strong objections of The HSUS and several other ani­mal-protection groups, Maine has changed the status of its official state animal, the moose, from a protected, non-game animal to a game animal. Letters of protest have been sent to Governor Joseph Brennan and other state officials, and efforts are underway to force a referendum on the question dur­ing this fall’s state elections.

Exotic IIs

The regional office has fought for a number of years against the practice of keeping wild animals as pets, but several recent news events have made the campaign more urgent. In April, a family’s pet raccoon mauled a sleeping infant in Connecticut. Elsewhere, a two-year-old, 60 lb. cougar is the focal point of its owner’s attempts to obtain a local permit to keep the animal. Regional Director John Dommers has initiated action to make state laws regarding keeping potentially dangerous wild ani­mals in domestic settings, at the very least, more stringent.

Mid-Atlantic

Workshop Wows New York

For 12 years, The HSUS has taken its expertise—in the form of its nationally experienced staff—to animal-control professionals all across the country in a unique series of workshops. On May 6, over 100 animal welfarists heard seven HSUS national staff mem­bers, including HSUS President John Hoyt and Scientific Director Dr. Michael Fox, speak at a two­day workshop entitled “Solving Animal Problems in Your Com­munity,” in Newburgh, New York. Charles Herrmann III, Sue Press­man, Marc Paulhus, Nina Austen­berg, and Phyllis Wright rounded out the HSUS delegation to the session, sponsored jointly by The HSUS’s Mid-Atlantic Regional Office and the New York State Humane Association.

…and New Jersey

On April 27, participants in an animal-control seminar in Trent­on, New Jersey, heard Phyllis Wright, Marc Paulhus, and Region­al Director Nina Austen­berg speak on topics as varied as how to catch a stray dog, document a cruelty case, promote a humane society, and euthanize a former pet without guilt. “Information received from those who attended indicated that this was one of the most informative and practical seminars that has been conducted over the past several years,” stated Dr. Robert Goldsboro of the New Jersey Department of Health, co­sponsor with the Mid-Atlantic of­ice of the event.

Field Investigator Marc Paulhus (center) discusses the program for the Trenton (NJ) animal-control training workshop. Left to right: Anthony LaMarr Wingo, left; Ashbury Park and Norman Billings, Jr., of East Windsor.
Gulf States

On Safari

Another substandard animal roadshow has been spotted by Gulf States Investigator Bernie Weller, but the “African Safari Zoo” seems to have disappeared into the wilds of Louisiana before Weller could catch up with it. Weller first inspected the facility, festooned with empty soda bottles. He found poor caging, thin vegetation, and primates, ferrets, and raccoons (no doubt genuine African residents) without adequate protection from the elements. A jaguar provides a stimulating educational experience for a shopping mall visitor in Texas. The Gulf States office continues to track down the “African Safari Zoo” of which this animal is a part.

Ohio

Peninsula Humane Society’s Humane Education Center in San Mateo, California, in February. Forty students from five states, including Alaska, attended.

The HSUS’s Animal Control Academy opened its doors in October, 1979, in partnership with the University of Alabama’s Law Enforcement Academy to answer a critical need for professional training in animal control. It continues to attract a wide variety of animal control workers in every part of the country.

West Coast

Dogfighting Gets Serious

A new law goes into effect July 10, 1982, which upgrades dogfighting from a misdemeanor to gross misdemeanor level in Washington State. HB 621 originally called for felony penalties, but unfortunately, State Senate Newhouse had it reclassified on the basis that “felony penalties belong only on crimes against people, not animals.” West Coast Regional Director Char Drennon stated, “Dogfighting is a particularly heinous crime, and we are forwarding some examples of felony penalties involving cruelty to animals to Senator Newhouse.” We will continue to seek felony status for dogfighting in the state’s next legislative session.

Staying in Control

The HSUS’s Animal Control Academy held its 100-hour Animal Control certification program at the University of Alabama’s Law Enforcement Academy in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Some of the 98 participants, who received 100 hours of animal behavior, first aid and disease recognition, investigation, chemical capture, exotica techniques, and communications, take notes in the foreground.

Wisconsin Fights Back

In response to the public outcry against dogfighting following the very successful raid by the Wisconsin Humane Society and The HSUS (see Spring 1982 HSUS News), Wisconsin recently enacted a tough new felony law against all forms of animal fighting. The law, which also requires veterinarians who treat animals involved in fighting to report the owners’ names to law enforcement officers, and makes taking part in or allowing a place to be used for animal fighting a felony punishable by a fine of up to $10,000 and up to 2 years in prison.
Clinic Memorandum Available

In late 1981, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) ruled the operation of a full-service veterinary clinic by a humane society was a business activity whose income was fully taxable (see the Spring 1982 HSUS News). The HSUS General Counsel’s Office now has copies of that IRS Technical Advice Memorandum covering the operation of full-service clinics by humane organizations. This IRS ruling focused solely on the income-tax status of the specific society involved.

A Virginia state court, in a separate case, has now ruled that the operation of another organization’s clinic must be halted because it falls outside proper charitable activities as described in its Virginia state charter. The court also held that the organization was in violation of the Virginia drug-control act and was ineligible for a license to practice veterinary medicine under state law.

Since there have now been two rulings against humane societies operating full-service clinics for two different reasons, any expansion of a humane organization’s clinic beyond spay/neuter operations must be carefully considered. That decision should be based upon legal advice relating not only to the Internal Revenue Code but also to laws governing charitable corporations and veterinary practice in individual states.

HSUS Suit Dismissed

On April 7, 1982, Judge Gerhard Gesell dismissed the HSUS’s lawsuit brought against the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) for failure to enforce the humane-care requirements of the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) at the Institute for Behavioral Research and other research labs (see “The HSUS Files Suit Against USDA,” Winter 1982 HSUS News). The court reasoned the AWA gives the USDA broad discretion in enforcing its humane-care requirements and the USDA cannot be compelled to enforce the act against any particular violators.

The court decided not to rule upon whether animal-protection organizations may assert the rights of animals which have been mistreated. Instead, it determined there was no clear statutory obligation to enforce the AWA in the manner described in the suit.

The decision underscored the federal court’s view that Congress, in drafting the AWA, did not hold the USDA to a standard of good administration that is clear, exact, or stringent enough to be enforceable in the courts by third parties such as The HSUS.

The HSUS is considering whether to appeal this ruling. We are also currently actively involved in a suit in federal court in Baltimore, Maryland, which urges the court to invoke its powers to protect the IBR monkeys from further abuse. The suit alleges criminal statutes are completely inadequate to protect these animals and asks that the National Institutes of Health be prohibited from ever returning the monkeys to IBR. Instead, we ask we be named their “next friends” or “guardians” in order to “assure their safety, health, protection, and humane treatment.”

Court Affirms License Check

A recent decision by the Supreme Court has confirmed the importance of local animal-licensing regulations. The court declined to hear a case brought by a Louisiana couple who argued the early-morning inspection of their property for compliance with local animal-licensing and -vaccination requirements and the subsequent arrest by sheriff’s deputies were unconstitutional. The couple challenged the conduct on the grounds that the deputy entered their house without a warrant (and, thus, the arrest was illegal); and that the animal ordinance was unconstitutional because it permitted searches-and-seizures in violation of the Fourth Amendment. Prosecutors argued warrantless inspections are legal in emergency situations, and that an emergency situation could arise from having an unvaccinated dog on the premises. The Court, by refusing to hear the case, left the couple’s conviction standing and, therefore, agreed that an unvaccinated dog could potentially create an emergency situation for the community.

“Waiting for Santa”

Just in time for Christmas are two of the most appealing pets ever. The HSUS’s new Christmas card is now ready for pre-holiday ordering. Artist Paul M. Breedon has created in green, gold, and black a scene sure to be repeated in household after household this holiday season. Perched on a gift bound to be for her is a dozing kitten, with one eye peeled for the Old Gent, while her companion guards the brightly decorated tree.

Inside is the greeting, “May this season bring Peace to all living creatures.”

The HSUS Christmas card is an annual sellout, so don’t delay—order plenty. There are 25 cards, with envelopes, in each box. The price is $7 a box, $6 for each you order 4 or more boxes.

| Please send me 1_________2_________3_________ boxes of HSUS Christmas cards at $7 each per box. |
| OR |
| Please send me 4_________5_________6_________ boxes of HSUS Christmas cards at $6 each per box. |

Compiled by HSUS General Counsel Murlaugh Stuart Madden and Associate Counsel Roger Kindler.
**GRRREAT Calendars**

For People Who Love Animals!

Bo-Tree's 12" x 12", full-color wall calendars have lots of room for writing. . . . and they benefit the Humane Society of the United States.

Order 3 or more calendars and receive 10% discount!

**Order Now**

Name ____________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________

City ___________________________ State __________ Zip ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whales &amp; Friends</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bless the Beasts</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birds of a Feather</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company of Cats</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doggone!</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Animals To Love</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shipping Charges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First calendar add $1.00. Additional calendars, add 50¢ each.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mail To:

Bo-Tree Productions
Dept. HSUS
1137 San Antonio Road
Suite E
Palo Alto, CA 94303
(415) 967-1817

**JULY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Order**

10% Discount 3 or more Subtotal
Calif. residents add 6% tax Shipping/Handling

Amount Enclosed

**The Humane Society**

National Headquarters
2100 L Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037
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