A Strategy of Silence

A recent memorandum to the California Veterinary Medical Association's Animal Welfare Committee from Jeri A. Semer, CVMA executive director, makes for very interesting reading. Reporting on the California Farm Bureau Federation's Animal Welfare Committee (seems everyone has an animal–welfare committee these days), Ms. Semer reports on the Farm Bureau Federation's strategies for responding to the activities and programs of various animal–welfare/rights groups seeking to eliminate the abuse and suffering of farm animals resulting from certain aspects of rearing, handling, transportation, and slaughter.

Not surprisingly, the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF) has engaged a public relations firm "to develop an action outline," presumably for the purpose of responding to animal activists and animal–welfare/rights groups. The representative of that firm, Mr. Pat Jackson, made some interesting observations:

1. "Specieism" (i.e., "We shouldn't be biased against other species because they are not human.") does not have broad appeal.
2. Opposition to use of animals in research does have appeal to the public due to emotional pictures which can be produced.
3. Vegetarianism probably doesn't appeal to a broad spectrum of the public.
4. "Sense of fairness" has some appeal.
5. Fear of chemicals in food ("due to use in livestock production") definitely has broad appeal.

It is reported that Mr. Jackson's conclusion was that "the cumulative effects of these components could raise the emotional level of rights to a point where the public would react favorably to the movement." So far, so good.

Mr. Jackson then proceeds to advise his listeners, representing seventeen different associations or organizations, not to respond by attacking the "animal rightsists" because such "would amplify the issue in the public's mind and help the other side." He also stressed that "the key objective at this time is to avoid stimulating a public debate in the media, to keep this from becoming a hot issue," noting that the Farm Animal Welfare Coalition formed by the AFBF at the national level has decided to adopt a "wait and see" attitude. Again, Mr. Jackson confirms that efforts such as those being promoted by The HSUS to bring this issue to the public's attention are both important and useful in generating broad support for changes within the industry.

What is most interesting, however, is what he advised should be done at the state level, two points of which are worth noting. The first is that "local farm people join the county humane societies... and attempt to focus their activities on 'stray dogs and cats.'" How do you like that one, friends? From reading Mr. Jackson's analysis of the movement generally, one might have concluded he had done some homework. But he more than betrays his ignorance of the animal–welfare movement when he advises his would-be infiltrators "to focus their activities on 'stray dogs and cats.'" What does he think this movement has been doing for the last one hundred years in this country? Obviously, he doesn't understand that we're tired of "cleaning up the messes" other people make, and that the battle is now engaged to change attitudes, systems, and practices that continue to treat animals as little more than commodities or things. Thank you, Mr. Jackson, but we'll spot your infiltrators the first time they open their mouths.

The second recommendation is to form coalitions with veterinary medical and scientific groups because the AFBF is aware of the damage that would be done to its cause if "veterinarians speak out in favor of animal–rightist groups." Certainly a logical, and not unexpected, strategy. But veterinary associations are a bit in the middle of this issue aren't they? and know, as well as do we, that they too have a moral and ethical obligation toward all animals—farm animals as well as pets. We, also, are awaiting their response to this important concern.

president's perspective

John A. Hoyt
A “Frontline” First

Documentaries and news specials by the major media on the use of animals in biomedical research or on the testing of products on animals have been rare. The message obviously reached a receptive audience, since “Frontline” has received more positive mail on this broadcast than for any other program it has done. Perhaps equally predictable was the negative response of the biomedical research establishment, since the existence of an informed and knowledgeable public is its biggest fear and our greatest strength.

The HSUS was involved in the production of “Man’s Best Friends,” from the beginning. Dr. John McArdle, director of laboratory animal welfare, provided technical expertise, suggestions on areas to investigate, and some of the documentation and photographs. Dr. Michael Fox was featured in several segments of the program, as was Dr. McArdle.

The fact that this program was conceived, produced, and broadcast with such a positive perspective on animal concerns clearly shows that animal-rights proponents have finally made an acceptable case to the media. Our message is being heard, and both the media and the public are listening.

Oh Boy, Soy!

“The Record Stockman,” “the business weekly for the successful livestock man,” has criticized the folks at Ralston Purina for introducing a dogfood that is twenty-five percent beef. “We believe... they are admiring in so many words, ‘that beef may be fat, high in calories and unhealthful, but here’s a way to eat a little of it with less guilt,’ ” says the Stockman. They're putting fillers in your cigarettes — it’s still damaging to your health, but maybe you won’t get cancer or emphysema quite as quick this way.”

Looking to the Future

In June, The HSUS participated in a week-long conference on the future, held in Washington, D.C., “World View ’84,” sponsored by the World Future Society. The conference brought together more than 3,000 people from all over the world to discuss forecasts, trends, and ideas for living in the twenty-first century.

Although global economics, electronics, and computers were, understandably, important topics for discussion in many of the sessions, the role animals will play in the decades ahead was not overlooked. HSUS staff attended seminars on genetic engineering, agro-technology, saving threatened species for future generations, and the world environmental crisis.

The HSUS prepared a top-notch exhibit for the conference. Our staff distributed literature to forward thinkers on those days that the exhibit hall was open. In this way, conference participants were made aware of the fact that humane concerns should be part of the world’s future.

New Home for Gina

In May, The HSUS learned that a chimp had been confiscated by the New York State Department of Environmental Resources on the grounds that its importation violated state endangered species regulations. We offered our assistance to the agency in trying to unravel how the chimp had arrived in New York. From our investigation, it seemed that the animal was the unfortunate victim of a complex web of dealings among local authorities, who had kept the animal as a pet, licensed and regulated dealers, and breeders of exotic animals. The chimp, named Gina, had been transported from Texas to New York, heavily drugged, in a rented van, and authorities had been called in when it became unmanageable as a result of the drugs. The HSUS convinced the New York authorities to transfer Gina to Primarily Primates, a rehabilitation center in San Antonio, Texas. We worked with an airline to secure free passage for the center’s director, Wally Swett, on a roundtrip from Texas to New York so that he could accompany the animal to San Antonio. After protracted delays and questions about its identity, Gina was flown to Primarily Primates, where it is being provided continuing care.

HSUS Challenges Greyhound Industry

In August, HSUS President John A. Hoyt called upon the greyhound industry to eliminate the use of live lures, the “wholesale destruction” of greyhounds unsuitable for racing, and the sale of cast-off greyhounds for research. In a speech before the American Greyhound Track Owners Association, Mr. Hoyt said that there is “no social, spiritual, physical, or even economic value to justify this degree of cruelty in the greyhound racing industry.” More than 100,000 animals, mostly rabbits, suffer and die each year when they are torn apart as live bait in the training of greyhounds. Despite limited efforts on the part of the industry to promote the use of artificial lures, ninety percent of greyhound trainers still contend that the use of live animals is necessary to teach their dogs to chase a mechanical lure used during an actual race.

He also criticized the annual destruction of at least 30,000-50,000 old, injured, or uncompetitive to race. Usually these dogs are shot because they are no longer marketable for their owners and trainers.

Noting an increase in the number of dog dealers who are buying unwanted racing dogs from trainers and selling them to medical research institutions, Mr. Hoyt warned the greyhound track owners that “nothing will generate greater opposition to greyhound racing than to discover that excess or injured old dogs are being victims of research.”

Mr. Hoyt warned the greyhound racing industry that as now practiced it will generate more and more opposition and that the greyhound racing as now practiced will never be approved or endorsed by the animal-welfare movement, and that there is “a developing ethical consciousness within our society — kind of an increased responsibility and obligation to prevent the exploitation of animals for any purpose as wholly inappropriate.”
This summer, when disastrous conditions at the Atlanta Zoo exploded into a controversy reported nationwide, The HSUS was not surprised. For more than a year, our captive wildlife department had tried to work with the zoo’s staff to ameliorate problems we had identified at the facility, including its woefully outdated physical plant and lack of enough qualified employees to provide proper, humane care for its animals. Other zoos facing similar difficulties either improved or closed, but Atlanta did neither. Instead, without sufficient community support, the zoo deteriorated even further.

Jeanne Roush, director of The HSUS’s Captive Wildlife Protection Department, and Marc Paulhus, director of the HSUS National Regional Office, had already scheduled a visit to Atlanta in May to meet with Commissioner of Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Affairs Carolyn Hatchet and other city officials when reports about the mysterious disappearance of Twinkles, one of the zoo’s elephants, were first received. Bill Garrett, director of the Atlanta Humane Society, issued a press release to inform the public that Twinkles had “unruly behavior.” The city had first reported that Twinkles had died peacefully there (or so it said it had died peacefully there). The keepers were shot to death for “unruly behavior.”

A parks employee had been criticized for not recording the death could be found on record, and the Bronx Zoo had never been notified of the loss.

The zoo’s veterinarian had been put on probation by the state veterinary board for allowing a non-veterinarian to operate on a dog being treated at his private clinic.

City maintenance workers had mistakenly poured concrete into the burrows of hibernating prairie dogs at the zoo.

A watch employee had been buying rabbits from the children’s zoo to slaughter and eat at home.

Union employees at the zoo issued a petition to inform the public and the media that “the wholesale system of corruption, incompetence, and dishonesty imposed upon the zoo by the city administration.” It stated, “The control of the zoo lay in the hands of a series of appointees who were unsanctioned by the public and zoo employees. Twinkles had not been sent to a Georgia farm to recuperate from some medical problems, as the city had first reported (the account was later refuted; the day it was said it had died peacefully there). The animal had, in fact, died in the back of a truck while on the road with a traveling circus.

This was just the first in a series of revelations that would point to a pattern of gross mismanagement and animal abuse at the zoo.

A zoo professional from the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums had found the facility so poor that he had labeled the Atlanta Zoo “an indictment against zoos” and suspended its membership in that organization.

Two Kodiak bears had been sent to a North Carolina roadside menagerie where they were shot to death for “unruly behavior.”

A rare monkey on loan from the Audubon Zoo in New Orleans (USDA [a professor at Georgia Tech and former assistant director of the Audubon Zoo in New Orleans] as interim director. The meeting was really no more than an appeasement gesture; even though he never solicited suggestions or opinions I suggested a time to reconvene, Mayor Young held a press conference to report on his meeting with me in his new ‘crisis management team.’ I quickly set the press straight on that deception,” Ms. Roush recounted.

With the exception of work accomplished by a grand jury convened in response to the crisis, the city’s handling of the zoo situation amounted to little more than window dressing. After the June meeting, no further contact with humane groups was made.

The HSUS contends that the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) contributed to and allowed the conditions at the Atlanta Zoo to persist as the animal rights movement grew and became a national issue.

No sooner had Ms. Roush and Mr. Paulhus left Atlanta on Friday, June 1, than Mayor Andrew Young invited them to a meeting on June 4 with representatives from The Atlanta Humane Society and other agencies and institutions.

Encouragingly, there have been some positive developments. Dr. Maple has instituted procedures designating chains of command and communications. He meets with Ms. Hatchet at least once a week, and more often when a crisis arises. He has also set in place humane, professional humane groups to be consulted and given some voice to their concerns.

The Atlanta Zoo’s problems did not materialize overnight. Yet, judging from their reports, USDA inspectors dwelled on mundane housekeeping matters like overgrown grass and cobwebs. Even more alarming was the USDA’s support for the idea that the deficiencies with respect to number of keepers, drainage, sanitation, and aerial photography was in “minor.”

Some people outside the city government are trying to improve the conditions at the zoo. Many feel that the large scientific community available at local universities and the Yerkes Primate Research Center will prove to be a valuable resource for the zoo. During our meeting with the staff, all efforts were made to extend this environment.

The HSUS, however, does not share this favorable opinion of Yerkes. It is one of the seven regional primate centers, facilities we have demanded be closed.

Willy B., one of the facility’s most famous attractions, was oblivious to the controversy surrounding the Atlanta zoo.
Getting The Most For Your Convention Dollars

by Georganne Keppler

HSUS member Georganne Keppler of Charleston, Tennessee, wrote this article because she "thought other members might benefit from some of the things I learned about getting the most from any conventions they might attend." We're happy to share it with all of you and other members might benefit from it. Georganne has been revised and enriched. Examine these, along with any products on display, to take home free materials (be sure they are free) and keep in mind those of your group who could attend the convention. Thousands of dollars and many man-hours go into these materials to provide ideas—many of which may not have the information you need. Go where you can get the most help for the task set before you. If there are several attending from your humane group, divide up for various workshops, symposia, or seminars. You will have more to take home this way.

BRING AN OPEN MIND. We are often quite opinionated and set in our traditions. Listen to the speakers' ideas—they may be just what you've needed. Check ideas such as "It won't work in our group." "We never did it that way," and "That's okay for a big-city humane society" at the door. Negative reactions often obstruct progress—give each idea some serious consideration.

VISIT THE EXHIBITS. Look at everything around you. The entire convention has been planned with you in mind! Good conventions do not just happen—neither do good humane societies. Watch and listen to all that goes on around you. What ideas can be copied to make your humane society better? Make the most of everything. There are new materials available and others have been revised and enriched. Examine these, along with any products on display, to take home free materials (be sure they are free) and keep in mind those of your group who could attend the convention. Thousands of dollars and many man-hours go into these materials to provide ideas—many of which may not have the information you need. Go where you can get the most help for the task set before you. If there are several attending from your humane group, divide up for various workshops, symposia, or seminars. You will have more to take home this way.

REMEMBER WHAT YOU CAME FOR—BE INVOLVED. Don't miss any of the sessions. Someone one may invite you for coffee or want to go sightseeing, or you may be tempted to sleep in—and you could miss the very session that would have benefited you most.

TAKE NOTES. Write down startling or challenging statements and ideas, as well as notes to yourself "Talk to Jim about this," or "Fry this at the next meeting," etc.). That story, striking remark, or rich idea—write it down, along with who said it! Take it home-use it! Oh, those convention notes that end up filed away and forgotten—so jumbled up you can't recognize your own handwriting! Be sure you are making every effort to make the material you glean at a convention usable and sharable.

ASK QUESTIONS! Your questions will help you and others better see the point the workshop leader is trying to make and may provoke others to share for your benefit. jot your questions down as the session goes along so that you can collect your thoughts and ask your questions during the discussion time.

The convention leaders and speakers give their lives to the subjects they are talking about and have lots more information to share with you on a personal basis. They want to talk to you.

DON'T FORGET YOUR CAMERA. Sit up front for picture-taking but don't disturb the session.

FOLLOW THROUGH WHEN YOU GET HOME. Offer to make reports to your group's meetings. Share the freebies you gathered and show those snapshots or slides. Order review copies of any books, manuals, and magazines mentioned in the convention sessions. Write an article or series of articles for your newsletter. Write that letter you promised to the new contact you met at the convention: such people can be valuable "pen pals." Humane society conventions are interesting and eye-opening, and they can "recharge" your enthusiasm. They are chances to meet a lot of people who have the same passion for working for and with animals as you have. They are chances to discover that your humane group isn't the only one with problems and to find solutions for those problems.

Take advantage of any opportunity you are given to attend a humane society convention or conference and take advantage of all the convention or conference has to offer.
Livestock Transportation:

Too Much Cruelty, Too Little Industry Concern

In 1884, George T. Angell, founder of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, wrote, “Livestock transportation as it is now conducted is probably the greatest cruelty inflicted on animals in this country. It has been conclusively shown that hundreds of thousands have annually died on the passage.”

One hundred years later, technology has sent men and women into space, conquered diseases, and split atoms, yet hundreds of thousands of cattle, sheep, pigs, chickens, turkeys, and other livestock animals still die in this country annually as a result of their journeys from farm to slaughterhouse.

Of the over 100 million animals federally inspected for slaughter every year (122 million in 1982 alone), untold multitudes suffer and die while being hauled from farm to feedlot, from feedlot to auction yard, from auction yard to finishing lot, and from finishing lot to slaughterhouse. The numbers are staggering, the reality all too graphic, as The HSUS verified in its comprehensive investigation of modern livestock transportation.

HSUS investigators documented the fact that animals are criss-crossing the U.S. packed in trucks on trips as long as sixty hours under conditions that are often intolerable and inhumane. Each leg of this arduous journey will have had its own hardships and have taken its toll on the animals unable to make it to the next stage. Callous and often inexperienced handlers, overcrowded or underloaded trucks, badly designed truck and auction yard facilities, and bad weather will have contributed to “shrinkage” of the meat Americans eventually put on their dinner tables.

Where, specifically, do problems occur?

The British Veterinary Journal has described five different stages of the farm-to-slaughter journey during which injury, death, and stress to farm animals take their toll. They are:

1. the original environment, where the animal was born and raised (pre-shipment care and preparation of the animal: the animal’s condition; the kind of handling)
2. loading (the quality and kind of physical facilities in which the animal is loaded and the handling techniques used)
3. the journey itself (the physical condition and appropriateness of the vehicle used; weather and road conditions; driver proficiency; distance traveled)
4. unloading (same criteria as applied to loading)
5. the new environment (the facilities used to hold the animal; the quality of veterinary attention available; the social environment for the animal; handling techniques used)

Many animals repeat the five-stage cycle two or three times, multiplying the opportunities for injury, death or disease. Many animals are exposed to this gamut of conditions and handling techniques in a very short period of time. This requires great adaptability, a quality many slaughter-bound animals are too young, old, lame, sick, or inexperienced to possess.

What, specifically, are the problems associated with each stage?

The investigators learned, both through personal observation and research into published material, that there are problems associated with each stage of the travel process.

The Original Environment

Calves, because they are moved at such very young ages (sometimes as early as one day old) are particularly affected by their treatment prior to leaving the farm. Industry studies have shown that if calves have been weaned at least three weeks prior to shipping, are able to eat from a feed trough, and have been dehorned, castrated, and treated for parasites, they are much more likely to withstand the rigors of their trips. Newly weaned calves are vulnerable to malfunction of the digestive system when stressed, making them prone to disease and infection. “Shipping fever,” or hemorrhagic septicemia, is one of the four leading causes of cattle death and, although it is associated with fatigue, hunger, anxiety, climatic changes, and infectious bacteria, it is also strongly linked to the physical condition of calves at the outset of their journey.

Loading

Herding livestock onto a truck is a dangerous, often frustrating activity. Range cattle, out of sight of human beings for months, are loaded into holding pens, where they may fight for hours to re-establish a normal order of social dominance. Poorly maintained facilities, with broken ramps and gates, loose side rails in chutes or fences, rotten wood, broken and jagged boards, and protruding nails, cause injuries to all species. Confinement hogs, which have spent their entire lifetimes in the same pen with their litter mates, are suddenly required to negotiate loading ramps, fences, and gates at high speed. Confused, overweight, and unused to physical activity, they are not athletic enough to negotiate steep ramps. Cuts, bruises, and leg injuries are the result.

All species are loaded onto semi-trailers, and, in some trucks, have to negotiate ninety-degree turns, steep, slippery ramps, and narrow doorways. If a lead animal becomes confused or resists the pell-mell rush into the blackness and turns back to escape, the following animals, pressed by a handler from behind, are cut, bruised, panicked, and injured.

The Journey

The journey itself probably causes more stress, according to experts, than any other stage of an animal’s life. Animals can be crowded or poorly loaded, thrown around by the movement of the truck, deprived of food and/or water for long periods of time, and exposed to the extremes of temperature. The combination makes the trip a seemingly never-ending nightmare.

Although it looks as though this handler is trying to twist the head off a steer, he is really trying to drug the animal from a loading ramp onto a truck whose back gate opens at a height different from the ramp’s. Backing vehicles up to loading docks of unequal heights forces animals to jump from one place to the other. Injuries are often the result.

Pigs travel to an auction yard in an open trailer. Animals sometimes pass through several local auctions over a period of weeks or months.
The only federal law affecting the transportation of livestock by land is the so-called Twenty-Eight-Hour Law, passed in 1956. Although this legislation uses the term “common carrier” which, by modern definition, would include trucks (by far, the most common manner of transport), it has been interpreted as applying only to rail and water transportation. Legislation to include interstate motor carriers (trucks) in its language has been introduced on several occasions but has never been passed by Congress.

The Animal Welfare Act (AWA) specifically excludes livestock to be used for food or fiber from its regulations covering humane handling, housing, and transporting of animals. In 1975, an attempt was made to bring these animals under the AWA, but the law’s enforcement agency, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, argued that it did not have the manpower or funding to enforce any additional regulations.

The Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 does address generally the “handling of livestock to prevent waste of feed, shrinkage, injury, death, or other loss, but its intention was to assure fair trade rather than humane handling.

State laws affecting livestock vary and are not effective. Four states have specific equine transport regulations; five have humane handling regulations; four have poultry transport regulations; one has conveyance-construction regulations; and forty-two have general prohibitions against carrying an animal in or upon a vehicle in a cruel or inhumane manner. A number of these latter might be used to protect food animals on a state-by-state basis, but, when we began our research on state laws protecting livestock during transport, we found a number of state officials themselves were confused. Several told us that the AWA protects livestock (it doesn’t—as shown above) and others told us that no problem existed in their state(s) because the agriculture industry has the best interest of the animals at heart.

Why have these conditions been allowed to exist for so long? Both the livestock industry and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) have, for decades, published reams of material describing how livestock should be handled and transported to avoid costly injury and death. The meat industry readily agrees that abuse of livestock is not in the best interests of the animals or of the many middlemen through whose hands they pass. However, the meat industry tolerates a certain amount of death, injury, and abuse because that amount is built into its profit system and can be absorbed without economic hardship. That tens of thousands of animals still endure abusive handling, untreated injuries, and trips in miserable or dangerous vehicles seems to be a fact the meat industry can live with.

I alone has been allowed to determine—arbitrarily—how much suffering is enough, since no federal or state law describes in detail how livestock in transit is to be treated (see sidebar) and because the general public has never demanded that food animals be transported humanely.

What can the meat industry do to improve conditions? Where appropriate, animals should be prepared for shipping so that they will be in the best possible condition to endure the stress of transport. In the case of calves, weaning, castration, vaccination, and other health maintenance should be performed enough in advance of shipping to ensure that the animals have a chance to recover.

Animals previously segregated should be allowed to interact prior to being shipped so that territorial and dominance disputes can be settled before the close confinement on the road. Sick or obviously diseased animals should never be shipped with healthy stock unless all are going to slaughter. This will prevent the spread of disease among highly stressed animals during transit.

Loading facilities should be kept well-lit and in good repair. Vehicles should have suitable flooring materials, adequate ventilation, food, water, and experienced drivers.

Animals must be updated and repaired to a standard safer for both animals and human beings. Many can be redesigned to eliminate confusing or misleading chutes, gates, or ramps. This would aid animals in navigating through the stockyard and pens.

The New Environment

Incredible overcrowding in auction yard pens often results in fighting among livestock unused to being kept in close confinement with strange animals. The cost of livestock is not in the best interests of the animals or of the many middlemen through whose hands they pass. However, the meat industry tolerates a certain amount of death, injury, and abuse because that amount is built into its profit system and can be absorbed without economic hardship. That tens of thousands of animals still endure abusive handling, untreated injuries, and trips in miserable or dangerous vehicles seems to be a fact the meat industry can live with.

I alone has been allowed to determine—arbitrarily—how much suffering is enough, since no federal or state law describes in detail how livestock in transit is to be treated (see sidebar) and because the general public has never demanded that food animals be transported humanely.

Livestock Transportation: A Legislative Review

The only federal law affecting the transportation of livestock by land is the so-called Twenty-Eight-Hour Law, passed in 1956. Although this legislation uses the term “common carrier” which, by modern definition, would include trucks (by far, the most common manner of transport), it has been interpreted as applying only to rail and water transportation. Legislation to include interstate motor carriers (trucks) in its language has been introduced on several occasions but has never been passed by Congress.

The Animal Welfare Act (AWA) specifically excludes livestock to be used for food or fiber from its regulations covering humane handling, housing, and transporting of animals. In 1975, an attempt was made to bring these animals under the AWA, but the law’s enforcement agency, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, argued that it did not have the manpower or funding to enforce any additional regulations.
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State laws affecting livestock vary and are not effective. Four states have specific equine transport regulations; five have humane handling regulations; four have poultry transport regulations; one has conveyance-construction regulations; and forty-two have general prohibitions against carrying an animal in or upon a vehicle in a cruel or inhumane manner. A number of these latter might be used to protect food animals on a state-by-state basis, but, when we began our research on state laws protecting livestock during transport, we found a number of state officials themselves were confused. Several told us that the AWA protects livestock (it doesn’t—as shown above) and others told us that no problem existed in their state(s) because the agriculture industry has the best interest of the animals at heart.
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I alone has been allowed to determine—arbitrarily—how much suffering is enough, since no federal or state law describes in detail how livestock in transit is to be treated (see sidebar) and because the general public has never demanded that food animals be transported humanely.

What can the meat industry do to improve conditions? Where appropriate, animals should be prepared for shipping so that they will be in the best possible condition to endure the stress of transport. In the case of calves, weaning, castration, vaccination, and other health maintenance should be performed enough in advance of shipping to ensure that the animals have a chance to recover.

Animals previously segregated should be allowed to interact prior to being shipped so that territorial and dominance disputes can be settled before the close confinement on the road. Sick or obviously diseased animals should never be shipped with healthy stock unless all are going to slaughter. This will prevent the spread of disease among highly stressed animals during transit.

Loading facilities should be kept well-lit and in good repair. Vehicles should have suitable flooring materials, adequate ventilation, food, water, and experienced drivers.

Animals must be updated and repaired to a standard safer for both animals and human beings. Many can be redesigned to eliminate confusing or misleading chutes, gates, or ramps. This would aid animals in navigating through the stockyard and pens.
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Loading facilities should be kept well-lit and in good repair. Vehicles should have suitable flooring materials, adequate ventilation, food, water, and experienced drivers.

Animals must be updated and repaired to a standard safer for both animals and human beings. Many can be redesigned to eliminate confusing or misleading chutes, gates, or ramps. This would aid animals in navigating through the stockyard and pens.

The New Environment

Incredible overcrowding in auction yard pens often results in fighting among livestock unused to being kept in close confinement with strange animals. The cost of livestock is not in the best interests of the animals or of the many middlemen through whose hands they pass. However, the meat industry tolerates a certain amount of death, injury, and abuse because that amount is built into its profit system and can be absorbed without economic hardship. That tens of thousands of animals still endure abusive handling, untreated injuries, and trips in miserable or dangerous vehicles seems to be a fact the meat industry can live with.

I alone has been allowed to determine—arbitrarily—how much suffering is enough, since no federal or state law describes in detail how livestock in transit is to be treated (see sidebar) and because the general public has never demanded that food animals be transported humanely.
Dead animals are a common sight wherever animals are unloaded. Usually, they are dumped behind auction yards or markets, out of sight of the general public.

Most importantly, humane, knowledgeable handling will greatly reduce stress and abuse endured by livestock. Capable, quiet, efficient help will aid the livestock industry and the animals. It can be added immediately to all levels and stages of the handling and shipping process. The HSUS knows all too well that suggesting humane handling be "useless" is a cut and dry effort to pressure the livestock industry to improve its performance in this crucial area of animal handling. Investigative staff will continue to monitor conditions and on the roads and provide expert assistance to humane organizations wishing to improve conditions at their local facilities. Our state legislative office will work with those interested in its suppliers—all of whom depend upon that public's goodwill for their livelihoods—then that will have a greater impact on transported animals than anything The HSUS could do alone.

One of the most effective ways of improving the lives of animals raised for food is to decrease the number of animals used for that purpose. To that end, the HSUS has advocated eating less meat and purchasing meat products derived from animals locally raised, transported, and slaughtered.

You Can Eat Humanely

Consumers may unknowingly contribute to the suffering endured by livestock in long-distance transport every time they buy meat products without determining the origins of those products. However, consumers can make decisions on what they buy and verify to their satisfaction exactly where and how that meat is raised, transported, and slaughtered.

The HSUS decided to put that advice to the test. One of our staff members conducted a search in her community in northern Virginia, wishing to improve conditions at her community in northern Kansas, and two carried ground beef from local farms. Since the beef was locally raised and transported, our staff member inspected both of these stores to price their food items. One pound of locally raised ground beef cost sixty to seventy cents more than the ground beef bought the week before in the major supermarket stores. Although more expensive, this beef had a much better flavor. It was also cooking with contained no chemicals, hormones, or feed additives. In addition, there were other health food products available, such as brown eggs and raw milk cheese. However, one of the stores only reported in one-pound packages—moose, venison, antelope, reindeer, moose, reineck, and hippopotamus. When asked the reason for selling exotic meat, the manager replied, "Many customers who are allergic to beef find they can eat the other organically raised meat." The HSUS firmly opposes the sale of exotic meat, so our staff member eliminated this store from her list.

Our staff member then expressed her concerns for the animals' living conditions and inquired about humane husbandry on the farms. Each farm reassured her that the animals were well taken care of. She asked to be placed on their mailing lists and, within days, received brochures from all four farms.

Two of the farms were eliminated because they were serving all from the same warehouse. One farm was too far away. Natural Beef Farms in Berryville, Virginia, was only a sixty-mile drive, so our staff member made arrangements to visit the farm and verify its claims of humaneness.

The proprietor, Victor Kennedey, introduced her to twelve bulls, two cows, three calves, and several sheep, free-ranging chickens, and turkeys. He explained that he bought his calves from other local farmers. "This way I know they're raised on their mother's milk for the first six to seven months; I won't buy them at an auction because I don't know what kind of diet they've been on." He feeds his bulls corn, alfalfa and mixed grass hay, kelp, and minerals. He sells their beef, así there are no additives or chemicals in their diet. The bulls are neither castrated nor deboned as are other meat products.

The young bulls mature, Mr. Kennedy keeps them together in a shaded indoor shelter with easy access to a large, fenced-in outdoor area. They have the freedom and comfort to lie down, move around for exercise, and socialize with each other. During the visit, our staff member saw plenty of fresh water available and straw on the ground. The indoor shelter had a large working fan to keep the air cool and circulating during hot summer months as well as several long strips of flypaper to help combat the fly problem.

When the bulls have reached market weight, they are transported to a processing house in Front Royal, Virginia, a short distance away. Mr. Kennedy seemed pleased with the time and effort he put into his animals' 'comfort and care. At the same time, he was pragmatic about the reality of his business and the way in which he operated his farm. Finding locally raised, transported, and slaughtered meat is not an impossible task. Consumers needn't pay more, go farther, or buy meat products in quantities they don't want. Instead, they can encourage local farmers with their business—farmers who historically have a better record of animal husbandry than their factory-farmed counterparts. The most important of all, consumers can begin to put their humane philosophy into practice by refusing to purchase meat obtained from animals that have been made to suffer needlessly.

Visiting a local farm is a good way to make sure animals raised there for food are treated humanely.
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The Year Before "The Moratorium"

by Patricia Forkan

This was supposed to be the quiet year in international whale protection. In 1982, when the International Whaling Commission (IWC) imposed a moratorium on commercial whaling to begin in 1985/86, animal-welfare proponents knew that they would have to hold the line for each of the intervening three seasons. We hoped to move steadily toward the commercial whaling moratorium with increasingly lower quotas for every species. As it turns out, 1984 may have been the turning point for the largest whales, Japan and the USSR—not 1985/86. At the IWC meeting in June, Japanese and Russian whale quotas were reduced to such low levels that many observers believed whaling might no longer be a viable industry in those countries. It is possible that neither Japan nor the Soviet Union will be able to conduct profitably their largest whaling operations, in the Antarctic. If this proves to be the case, the Japanese and Russian whaling nations have already lost 1984 quotas on minke whales and, beginning late this fall, kill more of this small species than they are allowed under IWC quota restrictions.

This year, for the first time, the IWC prohibited all killing of sperm whales. Although Japan had objected to having its 1984 quota of sperm whales reduced to zero back in 1982 and had asked for 400 sperm whales at this year's meeting, its request was denied. If Japan kills even one sperm whale this fall, it will have violated the IWC's nonbinding restrictions on sperm whale slaughter.

The third major whaling nation, Norway, fared better than Japan and the USSR at this year's meeting. Last year, in minke whale quota was slashed by two thirds to 635, causing tremendous consternation among Norwegian whalers. This year, an attempt to cut the Norwegian quota to 300 failed, so Norway will be allowed to harvest 450 minke whales. Overall, the number of whales to be killed commercially this year has been reduced by about one third from 1983 totals, from nearly 9,400 to about 6,600. These continuing quota reductions reflect the ever-growing evidence that the exploited whale population with declining and only a complete end to the killing will save them. Two hundred and sixteen whales are scheduled for aboriginal subsistence hunting, including 179 grays, 21 bowheads, 8 humpbacks, and 8 fin whales.

If Japan and the USSR violate their quotas, the U.S. government will have to determine whether action should be taken against them under the Packwood-Magnuson Amendment, a U.S. law requiring that any nation diminishing the effectiveness of the IWC automatically lose at least fifty percent of its fish allocations within the U.S. 200-mile zone. The Japanese, who rely heavily on fish, probably wouldn't continue to whale if no one else did.

We are still a year away from the moratorium, and the fireworks may not be over yet.

Patricia Forkan is vice president for program and communications for The HSUS. She has attended meetings of the IWC for eleven years.

Reflect for a moment...

how can I help animals even when I no longer share their world...

By your bequest for animal protection to The Humane Society of the United States.

Your will can provide for animals in need. Naming The HSUS demonstrates your lasting commitment to animal-welfare causes and strengthens the Society for this task. We will be happy to send information about our animal programs and material which will assist in planning a will.

Please send: Will Information

Name ____________________________

Address __________________________

City ___________________ State __ Zip.

Mail in confidence to: Murdahh S. Madden, Vice President/General Counsel, The Humane Society of the United States, 200 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.
USDA “Launders” Study Showing Calves Suffer on Factory Farms
by M. W. Fox

seems as though the USDA released a report providing bleached and laundered version of Prof. Friend’s critical findings rather than an accurate assessment.

Ironically, evidence of the cover-up has come from the veal industry itself. In a letter to the secretary of agriculture, Rep. James J. Howard, June 14, 1984, Rep. Howard writes, “I am aware of an April 2, 1984, meeting between Prof. Scher and Chy and suggest that they are compared with the hatch- and yard-reared calves.

The final interpretive summary report on the USDA veal study, as was already documented by that commercialized veal calves are raised in a manner that promotes stress, drive frustration, lameness, and increased incidence of disease. These statements clearly support the HSUS’s position. Approval of the USDA is what might be expected from the United States Department of Agriculture, whose prime task is to protect the interests of agribusiness industries. This cover-up illustrates only one of many means by which agribusiness and agribusiness are working in concert to squash public concern over the welfare of farm animals and how the government under the present administration is being directed to serve private interests rather than the public interest. It is surely in the public interest to ensure that those animals that are raised for human consumption are handled reasonably. This is as much a right of the concerned consumer as it is a right of all animals under our dominion. To discount the findings of objective scientific evidence in order to protect the interests of a private industry (in this case, the veal industry) is unethical and contrary to the principles of our democracy.

The farm animal welfare coalition mentioned in the Vealer article cited earlier has more to do with agribusiness’s welfare than farm animal welfare and is financed and directed by various state producer associations. Berliner and Marx (Beatrice Foods) is matching dollar-for-dollar all donations from veal producers to this coalition. The public relations firm of Jackson, Jackson, and Wagner has been hired to work for the farm animal welfare coalition, which aims at maintaining the status quo of veal production regardless of scientific documentation of its inhumane treatment of veal calves.

Beatrice Foods, one of the world’s largest multinational agribusiness corporations, markets over 9,000 products, and owns dairies all over the U.S., producing milk, cream, cheese, butter, yogurt, and ice cream under a variety of brand names.

If you share our concerns over the wellbeing of veal calves and all other animals subjected to unnecessary stress, frustration, and deprivation for decades, carefully read the additional research, and write to your congressional representative urging support of Rep. James J. Howard and Bill H.R. 5559 to establish a commission to investigate honestly, objectively, and in depth the inhumane welfare of farm animals in modern, intensive “factory farming” systems. Write also to The Honorable John R. Block, Secretary of Agriculture, 14th Street and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250, to express your outrage over the USDA cover-up. Urge him to act responsibly as a public servant and to put public interest over the veal industry’s inhumane practices, and convince him to support measures to ensure humane veal farming practices.

Write veal companies and Vealer magazine and let them know you believe the crate system in which most veal calves are raised is unsanctioned and abusive. Encourage them to research and adopt humane alternatives, such as the straw yard system. For more information and an up-to-date list of companies and organizations endorsed by the farm animal welfare coalition, contact Michael W. Fox, scientific director, The HSUS.

Michael W. Fox is scientific director for The HSUS.
An Eyewitness Report

The Pribilof Seal Hunt: An Eyewitness Report

by John W. Grandy

On July 9, 1984, I was exactly where I had hoped not to be—witnessing the North Pacific fur seal hunt on the Pribilof Islands, off the coast of Alaska. For weeks, The HSUS had used every weapon legally available to halt the massacre, but we had failed. Now, I was on St. Paul Island as an observer of the slaughter of over 22,000 young male seals.

It was a gruesome sight. With each swing of the Aleut sealer’s club, there was an eruption of steam and saliva from the mouth of a battered seal. The stunned animals were then dragged to a group of “stickers,” sealers who poked at the hearts and all the internal organs of the creatures until the once vital blood and body fluids were expelled. Finally, all that was left was the stench of death.

The seals were skinned and the skins put aside to be used for fur coats. The carcasses of most of the seals would be thrown in a dump or used for dog food or crab bait. The reproductive organs would be retrieved by children and tossed into buckets, to be sold as aphrodisiacs in the Orient.

I was aghast and sickened by the horrible waste and brutality I saw. Although it was the first Pribilof seal hunt I had ever witnessed, I hoped it would be the last ever to take place.

I was on St. Paul Island to watch this brutality because, as reported on page 35, The HSUS has filed a lawsuit to stop the seal killing and asked for emergency relief. We filed the suit on June 15, as soon as possible after the government made the decision to go forward with this year’s killing. The district court judge ruled against us on June 28. Immediately, we filed an emergency appeal in the U.S. Court of Appeals, to give the seals one last opportunity to live. The appeal was denied on June 30. The killing began on July 2. I went to watch and protest the slaughter firsthand, on behalf of you and all of the millions of Americans who care about seals. I also went to meet with the Aleut Indian leaders, to view their island and see their problems; and, most importantly, to express our view that the commercial destruction of these animals has to stop—now!

I came away from that experience aghast at the blood, gore, and waste, and more committed than ever to ending the destruction now, once and for all.

In summary, the hunt is morally and ethnically repugnant. The hunt is ecologically destructive, in that these seals may well be threatened under the Endangered Species Act. The hunt contributes to the decline of a population that is decreasing so fast that it may be cut in half every seven years.

Finally, the hunt is an economic disaster as well. It now costs as much to process a seal skin as it brings at sale. This summer, the Commerce Department paid eighty Aleut natives, by contract, $500,000 and 30,000 seal skins (from seals killed in 1981-1983) to kill 22,078 more seals. Obviously, the commercial killing of these seals is only thinly veiled social welfare.

Despite this fact, islanders have deluded themselves into believing that killing these seals is useful and helpful, even to the seals. In my meetings with the Aleut leaders, I repeatedly told them that we believe that the commercial destruction of these seals had to end, that we were prepared to take necessary actions before Congress and this Administration to end the destruction of these animals. Aleut leaders responded with their view that the killing of these animals provides useful, productive work for the people and, besides, the people need the money.

It was difficult for me to evaluate the natives’ needs. However, if the claims are valid, Congress should provide the Aleuts with useful and productive work (or relief) that will meet their needs and help them achieve economic self-sufficiency. Clearly, useful work is not massacring seals, the skins of which cannot even be profitably sold. Productive work is not learning how to club or skin seals or pick their reproductive organs from their bodies.

If the Aleuts need productive work, they can find it in vigorous pursuit of their desire to develop a fishing industry. They need not continue the wasteful brutality represented by the commercial clubbing of seals.

And now we have a chance to stop the killing, once and for all and forever. In our lawsuit, the judge ruled against us because he said the treaty under which these seals were managed, The Interim Convention on the Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals, “contemplates” the killing of the seals. In other words, the judge believes the treaty allows and encourages the slaughter of the seals.

As we have told our members on several occasions, the treaty must be approved by the Senate and the president by October 14, 1984, if it is not to expire. If it expires, it will have to be re-ratified, with the consent of the U.S. Senate, by the president. We do not want the Senate to approve or consent to any treaty that allows the killing of seals. By the time you read this, the October 14 expiration date will be upon us; however, we are nearly certain that the treaty will not have been considered by the Senate at that time. Thus, if you have not yet done so, write your United States senator and ask them to vote against any new treaty if it comes before them. This treaty is renewed, the death and destruction of the Pribilof seals will go on for at least another four years. We can’t let that happen.

John Grandy is The HSUS’s vice president for wildlife and the environment.
New Investigator Proves Valuable to Mid-Atlantic Region

The addition of an investigator to the staff of the HSUS Mid-Atlantic Regional Office has yielded tangible results for communities in at least three states. Mr. Paul Miller of the HSUS Washington, D.C., office has been assigned to the Mid-Atlantic office on a part-time basis to work on problems in New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania.

Mr. Miller’s first months in the region have been busy ones. In late March, the New Jersey newspaper The Daily Advance alerted Mid-Atlantic Regional Director Nina Austenberg to the decision of the Mt. Arlington (New Jersey) borough council to shoot “a pack of about twenty wild and possibly rabid dogs” that had been spotted near a landfill behind an elementary school. Residents and town officials, afraid that the dogs would attack the small children in the schoolyard, let their emotions run high. “If the dogs are hungry enough, they will eat [a] child,” Mt. Arlington Mayor Roger Maler told The Advance. Police Chief William Morgan agreed. “We are faced with a life-threatening emergency.” The Morris County SPCA reluctantly convinced the plan to use sharpshooters to kill the dogs as a last resort, but the decision made headlines and generated criticism throughout the region.

Calling the borough’s plan “a tragic commentary on the area’s poor animal control,” Mr. Austenberg offered Mr. Miller’s help to the borough council. Mr. Miller spent a day checking the woods behind the school, interviewing residents, observing the tracks left by the dogs, and following up on reports of pack sightings in tř rural county. His findings were somewhat at odds with the hysterical reports of officials. “These are not... killer dogs,” he said. “Just strays that have started to fend for themselves.” He determined that the actual number of ownerless dogs running in the pack was closer to six or eight than twenty and that they didn’t pose an immediate threat to the community because their territory was so large. He found that publicity about the dog-shooting alerted residents to keep their pets at home. As a result, the number of dogs in the pack dwindled.

It became clear to Mr. Miller that humanely trapping the few truly ownerless strays was the best solution to the Mt. Arlington problem. The Morris County SPCA borrowed humane box traps from neighboring townships and Mr. Miller set them in the dogs’ known territory. He checked the traps frequently each day. Although town officials were skeptical of the trapping’s chances for success, within a few days, two young mixed breeds had been caught. Neither dog was rabid. The furor began to die down, and discussions of long-range, effective, and humane solutions to the animal-control problems in the community took its place. Within a month, area officials began exploring funding sources for a new, centrally located animal shelter. Regional Director Austenberg offered HSUS assistance in the improvement of animal-control in the area.

Hardly had the dust settled in Mt. Arlington than a problem with a pet store owner doing business in New York State and New Jersey began to make headlines in both places. The Mid-Atlantic office again became involved. A tip from an anonymous source had led members of the Morris County SPCA to a kennel in Harriman, New York, leased by a Marc Stern. There, they found more than one hundred dogs of various breeds and ages housed without food, water, or shade, in filthy conditions. According to newspaper reports, more than six dogs were being kept in one cage. “It was utter horror,” said Mr. Miller. “The dogs were sick and STARVING.” The chief of police told a local newspaper after inspecting the kennels. A judge would not let the Monroe Humane Society members remove the dogs from the kennels, so many humane society volunteers worked long hours cleaning the kennel premises. Once cruelty charges had been filed, the little humane society found itself overwhelmed by the logistics of the case.

The Mid-Atlantic office offered help. Mr. Miller counseled the Morris Humane Society on preparing its case against Mr. Stern, who already had been issued 226 cruelty summons. Once the New York story broke, information on a New Jersey business owned by Mr. Stern became public as well. His pet shop in Hoxbury Township, New Jersey, was found to have a number of record-keeping and health code violations associated with its operation. Mr. Stern’s Chester, New Jersey, kennel had also been under investigation. When a dead dog was found there, additional charges were filed by the Morris County SPCA. Since a number of the dogs found in Mr. Stern’s New York kennel had come from his New Jersey operations, officials in both states pursued simultaneously their investigations of health code and cruelty statutes. A number of pet owners who responded to Mrs. Austenberg’s call for information on Mr. Stern found that the pets they had sold or traded to him with the understanding that the animals were to go to good homes had endured terrible conditions while in Mr. Stern’s care.

After several weeks, more than 1,400 charges had been filed against Mr. Stern in New York. Of these, 1,300 were related to cruelty to animals. His trial was held on August 20. Mr. Stern pleaded guilty to ten counts of transporting exotic animals into New Jersey without a permit and was fined $1,000. Cruelty charges related to his New Jersey kennel operations were pending at press time. In the midst of the furor, Mr. Stern was evicted from his New Jersey pet store, and officials contemplated filing additional charges.

Finally, in late July, HSUS investigators Paul Miller and Bob Baker provided assistance to the Chester County SPCA in a Pennsylvania cockfight raid that netted thirty-five gamecocks and led to the arrest of twenty people, one of the largest raids of its kind in the Mid-Atlantic region in recent years. David Stewart, administrator and chief agent for the Chester County SPCA, had asked for assistance from The HSUS after extensive surveillance had revealed the existence of a cockfight ring in rural Willis-town Township. Mr. Miller and Mr. Baker joined local law enforcement and SPCA officials and the Humane Enforcement League of Pennsylvania in the midnight raid. Cockfighting participants were cited for disorderly conduct and cruelty to animals.

Each was fined $300 and court costs by a district judge. Police seized a variety of weapons, including guns, whips, knives, and razors, a scale used to weigh fighting birds, and several first-aid kits. Also recovered were many bone, plastic, and metal spurs used by cockfighters to increase the seriousness of injuries inflicted by the birds during the fights.

Many of the birds seized in the raids were found in cars and kept in large cloth bags. All were destroyed. HSUS investigators have found on a number of occasions that local police officials feel comfortable in arresting the human participants in animal fights but wish the expert assistance The HSUS can provide in handling the animals themselves—many of which are injured and frightened—and in identifying fight paraphernalia to be used as evidence in prosecutions related to raids.

Providing expert assistance to humane societies and communities in need of help with animal-control techniques, investigative and complaint reporting, and specialized knowledge of animal fighting are part of every regional office’s responsibility.

As these successful investigations prove, The HSUS’s continued expansion of its regional services to help solve local animal problems is both needed and welcomed.
Toronto “Festival for the Animals” Attracts Crowds

On August 25, Toronto, Canada, was the site of the largest ani­mal-rights demonstration held to date in that country. Organized by the Canadian Animal Rights Net­work and Ark II and supported by the HSUS, the “Festival for the Animals” was held in Nathan Phillips Square at the Toronto City Hall to protest the misuse and abuse in laboratories. The HSUS’s Direc­tor of Laboratory Animal Welfare John McArinle (nearly) spoke to rally participants.

While some APA members have accepted the concept that there are some forms of research they deem “intrinsically objectionable” and should not be pursued regardless of human benefit, this view has yet to become part of the official APA platform. In the meantime, the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies has set up meetings with the Canadian Psychological Association, the HSUS, and laboratory animal researchers to discuss establishing a system of categorizing psychology experiment procedures on animals based on the amount of physical and psychological pain caused to the animal. This “scale of invasiveness” could be used by experts to evaluate similar, sepa­rately conducted studies and compare how much suffering each proj­ect entails. Such a scale might be the first step in the scientific commu­nity’s acknowledging that laboratory animals do, in fact, experience suffer­ing due to research.

Psychologists for the Ethical Treat­ment of Animals, which claims 350 members, is working very hard to promote the cause of laboratory animal welfare within the psychol­ogy community and to become a rec­ognized division within the APA. This year at the convention, it cited the HSUS’s Dr. Lockwood for his exceptional contribution to the ad­vancement of animal welfare, values, and philosophy.

The festival itself was an outstand­ing tribute to everyone who worked so hard to make the “festival for the animals” a complete success.
The summer of 1984 was one celebrated for its quadrennial meeting of the world’s athletes, but it also marked the gathering of the world’s experts on animal welfare for the first World Congress on Animal Protection.

The week-long Congress, sponsored by the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) and held in Boston in May, admirably fulfilled its purpose: to promote knowledge, education, and action on issues affecting animals throughout the world.

Under the able direction of WSPA’s Western Hemisphere Regional Director John C. Walsh, this international Congress brought together more than 400 people from thirty-seven nations for a week of sharing, inspiration, and intense debate about how to best stop cruelties inflicted on animals.

At the week’s end, Congress participants had passed ten resolutions calling for action, including ending the Pribilof fur seal hunt, eliminating the use of strychnine to control rabbits in Latin American countries, and observing an immediate moratorium on all commercial killing of kangaroos.

The Congress provided an opportunity to learn about the triumphs and defeats experienced by animal protectionists around the world, but it performed another valuable function as well. It became clear that there were many individuals representing groups with precious few members or resources to draw upon, especially in third world countries. It became equally obvious that WSPA could supply a much-needed international support network, and observing an immediate moratorium on all commercial killing of kangaroos.

The Congress provided an opportunity to learn about the triumphs and defeats experienced by animal protectionists around the world, but it performed another valuable function as well. It became clear that there were many individuals representing groups with precious few members or resources to draw upon, especially in third world countries. It became equally obvious that WSPA could supply a much-needed international support network, and observing an immediate moratorium on all commercial killing of kangaroos.

The Congress provided an opportunity to learn about the triumphs and defeats experienced by animal protectionists around the world, but it performed another valuable function as well. It became clear that there were many individuals representing groups with precious few members or resources to draw upon, especially in third world countries. It became equally obvious that WSPA could supply a much-needed international support network, and observing an immediate moratorium on all commercial killing of kangaroos.
Another Hunt Allowed on Loxahatchee Refuge?

Despite the furor it caused last year (see the Fall 1983 HSUS News), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) is planning a deer hunt this September on the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge in south Florida in November. The HSUS has been working through both Congress and the Interior Department, FWS's parent agency, to stop the hunt. When FWS recently announced regulations to govern the hunt, we protested, saying the hunt was illegal, and cited several federal laws. We also expressed our strong opposition to the hunt earlier this summer to the staff of Secretary of the Interior William P. Clark.

In June, as the result of the combined encouragement of The HSUS and other organizations, Florida congressman Larry Smith sent a strongly worded letter of protest about the hunt to Sec. Clark, asking him to cancel the hunt once and for all. Because of dedicated effort on the part of Rep. Smith and his staff, four other members of Congress from Florida also signed the letter: Sen. Lawton Chiles, and Reps. Dan Mica, Dante Fascell, and William Lehman.

To date, the legislators have received from Sec. Clark only the answer that no final decision has been made and that their views will be considered.

Congressman Smith has also inserted language into the Department of Interior's appropriations bill to forbid the FWS from spending any money on the hunt. Such a provision would, effectively, cancel the 1984 hunt.

Congress will have decided upon the final version of the appropriations bill soon after Labor Day. If that bill does not prohibit expenditures for the hunt, and FWS decides to hold the hunt, The HSUS is prepared to file suit to save the Loxahatchee deer.

Outcry Against Experimental Psychology Intensifies

The HSUS efforts to abolish the use of laboratory animals in experimental psychology continue to expand. We have discussed the issue with members of Congress and prepared specific legislative actions as part of our long-term strategy. We have been gratified by the thousands of postcards sent to Congress by readers of our Close-Up Report. These clearly showed the legislators that experimental psychology concerns their constituents.

Letters sent by our Close-Up Report readers to Dr. Frederick King, chairman of the American Psychological Association (APA) Committee on Animal Research and Experimentation, received a form letter reply that repeated a traditional litany of supposed benefits from animal research and invalid animal models and the claims that all is well in experimental psychology laboratories. Labeling our campaign a "scurrilous attempt upon behavioral research," experimental psychologists have retaliated with a series of emotional or unscientific articles promoting obviously biased studies of current research projects and numbers of animals involved in experimental psychology.

We are preparing factual responses to these articles and have initiated studies of our own detailing the types of projects conducted by behavioral researchers; applications of that work to human clinical problems; and proposals for alternatives to the use of laboratory animals in behavioral research.

Under the sponsorship of the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies, representatives of The HSUS, the Psychologists for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, and Canadian and American psychological associations have met to discuss the issues raised in our campaign and possible responses to our concerns. Although promising, these meetings have not yet produced concrete, positive results.

At the recent APA convention in Toronto, the use of animals in experimental psychology was a major topic of discussion. A series of very successful demonstrations brought media attention to the issue, and The HSUS was clearly identified by the APA as the leader in efforts to stop experimental psychology's cruel waste of animal life (see the article on page 22).

HSUS Protests Migratory Bird Decisions

Despite strong protests from The HSUS, FWS once again allowed hunting of nesting mourning doves this September. The initiative of FWS to hold the hunt, The HSUS is prepared to file suit to save the Loxahatchee deer.

How often have you wished for a simple yet significant Christmas gift for a friend or relative, one that would subtly convey your concern and compliment the recipient on his or her sensitivity and love for animals? Membership in The Humane Society of the United States is such a gift. In an age when holidays overstate, overstress, and over-tax your budget, give a simple gift with a potent message: Animals are important and we are responsible for their welfare.

Each gift membership in The HSUS is just $10, $18 for a family (tax-deductible). If you don't belong to The HSUS, why not give yourself a gift of membership?
Institute Forecasts No Change in Government Farm Animal Welfare Policy

In July, Dr. Michael Fox, director of the Institute for the Study of Animal Rights at the Iowa Farm Youth Institute held at the University of Iowa. This annual, week-long program for high school seniors exposes them to many aspects of agriculture, but farm animal welfare and rights were new to their agenda. The students were not familiar with many of the problems associated with intensive factory farming but were obviously concerned when shown that drug-dependent factory farming is an environmentally and consumer hazard. They were sobered by the reality of "super farms" which they grew up. As has been shown in the HSUS report "Farm Animal Welfare and the Human Diet," the trend toward large factory farms for livestock and poultry production is linked with an increase in animal suffering and health problems, and these are the demise of the family farm.

Under the Reagan administration, nearly 200 farms have gone out of business since 1981, and while the Democratic Party has pledged to help restore the family farm structure of American agriculture, neither party has recognized the plight of farm animals as having any importance in its policies and proposals.

The present administration has attempted to deflect public concern over farm animal welfare through the U.S. Department of Agriculture's awarding of $380,000 in 1981 to several land-grant colleges to investigate a number of welfare issues. This strategy has placed on hold legislative efforts to improve farm animal welfare pending the outcome of research findings. The USDA has now made these research findings public. It is difficult to see how either political party can hope to improve U.S. agriculture while ignoring the overall health, welfare, and rights of farm animals.

The First Step for EPA

In late August, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced new guidelines emphasizing scientific alternatives to the routine use ofLD-50 andLD-100 tests, which kill large numbers of animals. Although the EPA is committed to ending the use of LD-50 tests, it needs animal data to predict potential human health effects, it is aware of the need to protect the welfare of laboratory animals, as well. The "underlying philosophy is to get needed data without using more animals than necessary; [the EPA] feels that is a matter of efficiency and animal welfare." John Moore, EPA Assistant Administrator for Pesticide and Toxic Substances.

Although the EPA has announced the strongest guidelines of any federal agency, its statement that it no longer needs LD-50 test results for product or chemical approval is neither a regulation nor a law. Companies can choose to continue using LD-50 but now shoulder the burden of proving its necessity. We are pleased with EPA's new guidelines but believe they should be strengthened and made into regulations. Write to William Ruckelshaus, Chairman, EPA, Washington, DC 20460 congratulating the agency on its awareness that animals need not be used in testing and its attempt to curtail the use of the classic LD-50. Ask that EPA vigorously enforce its guidelines, ban LD-50 testing, and work for turning those guidelines into regulations.

NAAHE Looks Forward to New Addition

In August, construction began on an addition to the Norma Terris Education Center at the headquarters of the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) and the New England Regional Office of The HSUS. The Center, located in southeastern Connecticut, was built in 1973 on thirty acres of woodland donated by ac­ tors Norma Terris. The modern log cabin facility at one time served as office space. The new twenty-four-foot addition, scheduled for completion in late fall, will provide office space that will allow the reopening and expansion of the NAAHE library. The added space will also allow NAAHE to expand its intern program for college students interested in careers in humane education.

In September, NAAHE Director Kathy Savelsky delivered addresses on humane education for educators and members of the Puerto Rican Federation of Hu­ mane Societies at special workshops hosted by the Federation at the Catholic University of Puerto Rico. NAAHE staff members also participated this fall in a re­ gional workshop sponsored by The HSUS Great Lakes and North Central regional offices and in "Humane Education 1984," a spe­ cial symposium sponsored by the Humane Education Center in New York City.
Thumbs Up for Brown Bill

In late June, Rep. George E. Brown, Jr., introduced a bill calling for the amendment of the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) to ensure the protection of animals in these facilities. The bill, introduced under fiscal year 1985, was restored by the House Agriculture Appropriations. Since the AWA’s coverage of research facilities, departments or agencies which receive or may receive federal grant monies for research, experimentation, or testing involving animals, the House supports the Brown bill. H.R. 5725, which, according to Rep. Brown, “would improve the minimum levels that are under present law and [would] assure the public that laboratories are not substandard and that humane principles are being offered to laboratory animals.”

Appropriations Update

Agriculture Appropriations. The USDA requested a twenty-five percent cutback in funding for enforcement under the Animal Welfare Act, from the current funding level of $4.5 million to $3.6 million. This money, which funds inspection programs for millions of animals in 1985, laboratories, puppy mills, and marine aquariums, was restored by the House and Senate to the current level of $4.9 million. The HSUS presented testimony in the House and Senate to raise the funding level to $8.5 million, but funds were simply restored, not increased. Since that figure has not gone up since fiscal year 1981 and USDA is now operating under fiscal year 1985 demands, even the restoration of the $1.2 million will not begin to satisfy the needs of the animals in these facilities.

Suppression Update

A companion to S. 657, the “Improved Standards for Laboratory Animals Act,” introduced by Sen. Robert Dole of Kansas, H.R. 5725 requires the Secretary of Agriculture to set standards for research facilities, including requirements for animal care, treatment, and practices in experimental procedures to ensure that animal pain and distress are minimized. Like S. 657, H.R. 5725 will require all research institutions to establish an animal-welfare committee to monitor the care and treatment of laboratory animals. The committee, appointed by the chief executive officer of the research facility, would be composed of one veterinarian, at least one member having no affiliation with the facility responsible for representing community concerns regarding the welfare of animal subjects, and not more than three scientists from the research unit of the facility. The committee is required to make at least two inspections of the facility annually. To reduce the amount of research being duplicated and to promote improved research and laboratory techniques, H.R. 5725 calls for the establishment of a national data system at the National Agricultural Library. The library would “provide information and possible alternatives for minimizing animal pain and distress,” said Rep. Brown.

Please write to your representative and ask him/her to cosponsor the Brown bill. And, please thank Rep. Brown for introducing and holding hearings on this important legislation.

Defense Appropriations. In the 1984 budget, the HSUS was able to persuade the house appropriations subcommittee to adopt a language that would protect all animals from being used by Department of Defense (DOD) laboratories. But the same amendment in the Senate was drastically weakened to include only dogs and cats. This year, when the senate appropriations subcommittee on defense appropriation modified its fiscal year 1985 bill, it did not include language sought by The HSUS to end the practice of animals being shot in the DOD wound laboratories for training wildlife management students. In presenting testimony before this subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Ted Stevens, H.S.U.S. Director of Laboratory Animal Welfare Dr. John E. Mc Ardle was interrupted by Sen. Stevens before completion of his testimony. The HSUS, said Sen. Stevens, would never see this language on his bill again. In response to Dr. McArdle’s testimony that animals were actually used in treating actual battlefield wounds, Sen. Stevens claimed animal welfare officials were engaging in “frivolous” forays into the use of animals for research.

In an attempt to discredit the argument that animals cannot be used, Sen. Stevens claimed Dr. Grandy was incorrect in stating that animals can be used as pain indicators. “Until the animal can talk to me in our language, I don’t believe we can say anything we can learn from other countries.”

In an attempt to discredit the argument that animals cannot be used, Sen. Stevens claimed Dr. Grandy was incorrect in stating that animals can be used as pain indicators. “Until the animal can talk to me in our language, I don’t believe we can say anything we can learn from other countries.”

House Trapping Drama

Members of animal-welfare groups, members of Congress, veterinarians, farmers, trappers, three-legged dogs and cats, and a one-legged hawk filled the house committee room on August 3 to hear testimony on H.R. 1797, a bill designed to end the use of steel-jawed, leghold traps both in the United States and abroad. Dr. John Grandy, HSUS vice president of wildlife and environment, was among those who presented testimony before the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, chaired by Rep. Henry A. Waxman of California. On a panel on disease control and pain perception in animals, Dr. Grandy explained the ineffectiveness of the steel-jawed, leghold trap in preventing the spread of rabies and the unnecessary suffering animals are forced to endure when caught in the trap.

The basic objection to the steel-jaw trap is that this device closes on an animal’s limb with such velocity and holds its leg with such force that it causes painful and inhumane injury, Dr. Grandy said. “Progressively, a painful grip of the trap…combines with the animal’s attempt to escape and results in torn flesh and ligaments and broken bones.”

In an attempt to discredit the argument that animals cannot be used, Sen. Stevens claimed Dr. Grandy was incorrect in stating that animals can be used as pain indicators. “Until the animal can talk to me in our language, I don’t believe we can say anything we can learn from other countries.”

During the four-hour hearing, Rep. Waxman also heard testimony from Dr. John W. Grandy (left) presents the HSUS viewpoint on H.R. 1797.

Rep. Clarence Long of Maryland, sponsor of H.R. 1797, explained that the trap does not control disease as claimed and that there are several alternatives available. Mr. Lambertson held that, although fifty-nine countries have outlawed the steel-jawed, leghold trap, the U.S. has no need to do so until the other countries for advice and assistance in ending its use. Rep. James Scheuer of New York stated, “Why shouldn’t we look to them? If there’s something we can learn from other countries, we should do so.”

Rep. Doug Walgren of Pennslyvania called for remediation of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s evaluation of various traps being used in other countries and of the other countries’ experience with animal control and disease.

The HSUS is continuing its fight to have H.R. 1797 reported favorably out of subcommittee. Please write to your representatives and ask him/her to cosponsor H.R. 1797. Also, write to Rep. Waxman and ask him/her to report H.R. 1797 favorably out of his subcommittee.

Any member of the Senate may be reached c/o The U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20515. Any representative may be reached c/o The House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515.
Great Lakes
Changes at One of the Great Lakes Zoos
The Glenn Miller Fish Zoo, located in Richmond, Ind., named as one of ten substandard zoos in the HSUS’ 1983 issue, has received considerable adverse publicity from local and national newspapers as a result of our evaluation.

When she first visited the zoo, Regional Director Sandy Rowland found unsanitary conditions, odors, flies, improper caging and other problems which to house the animals. After our repeated urging, the USDA took action against the Fish Zoo, and Richmond’s new mayor has agreed that no new animals will be taken into the zoo. The zoo will be closed, and beonna be placed under the care of Indiana Humane League to house the animals.

In the Know
The Great Lakes Regional Office was able to implement a successful humane education workshop on July 12 and 13 in Columbus, Oh. Exclusively for educators from Ohio and Indiana, the session attracted twenty-six people representing seventeen humane organizations. Kathy Savsky, director of the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education, led a program which included sessions on identifying needs and assets of each represented organization, evaluating alternatives for new programming, and setting goals and objectives.

At session’s end, plans for a humane educator’s network in Ohio and Indiana were in the works. We hope to sponsor similar sessions in other states in the region in the future.

West Coast
Bullfight Threat
After his bill to legalize bloodless bullfighting in California failed in the state’s natural resource committee, Humane Society lobbyist, Cal- deron publicly vowed to reintroduce the legislation. The West Coast Regional Office has been working on numerous problems involved with such exploitative events and will be opposing bullfighting again, in 1985. Bloodless bullfights are now only allowed as an integral part of a religious celebration. They have been involved in controversies with religious and racial overtones.

Schools Face Lab Charges
Last year, California animal protectionists were outraged by accounts of a laboratory dog found lying in a hallway in the research wing of Stanford-affiliated Palo Alto Veteran’s Administration’s Medical School. The student took the animal, suffering from infected oped wounds and sepsis, to a veterinarian. She learned that the animal was to be destroyed.

This case continues to have repercussions. The Peninsula Humane Society of the Humane Society of Santa Clara Valley, and the Palo Alto Humane Society have attempted to publicize the animal cruelty in the case, and the HSUS West Coast Regional Office has been asked for its assistance. Despite a mountain of evidence, the Humane Society has refused to prosecute under the anti-cruelty statutes because of ambiguous animal protection laws. The California penal code.

The three local humane societies have filed a civil suit against Stanford, the Palo Alto Veteran’s Administration Hospital, and the USDA to determine whether the defendants violated or are violate the Animal Welfare Act (AWA).

Another prestigious California university faces charges based upon its care of laboratory animals. The University of California at Berkeley was charged by the USDA with violating standards of laboratory-animal care under the AWA. The USDA charge is based upon multiple alleged violations uncovered during compliance inspections over a five year period. The West Coast Regional Office is asking all of our California members to write the USDA (83 Scripps Drive, Sacramento, CA 95817) and urge it to prosecute the University of California at Berkeley for violations of the federal law.

Will sea otters receive sanctuary on San Nicolas Island?

West Coast (continued)
Sea Otter Haven Sought
Californiais working to provide a reserve breeding colony for sea otters by relocating some of them to San Nicolas Island, apparel of the California Fish and Wildlife Service, Ventura County, California, coast line. The present sea otter population is in jeopardy from oil spills, gill nets, poachers, and other hazards. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, prior to its preparation of a draft Environmental Impact Statement, held hearings on the proposal this summer. The agency will make its decision next spring.

The West Coast Regional Office invites all HSUS members to join in urging U.S. Fish and Wildlife Director Robert Jantzen to support and work for prompt implementation of a federal plan for the better transplantion to San Nicolas Island. Letters should be addressed to him at U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC 20240.

Cal. Legislative Wrap-Up
The defeat of S.B. 883, the bill that would have bound pound seizure in California, was a tremendous disappointment to everyone who worked for its passage. California’s legislative did not turn a deaf ear to all animal-welfare issues. Gov. George Deukmejian signed A.B. 2358, which outlaws the use of nitrogen chambers to euthanize dogs and cats; and A.B. 1548, which would have allowed trophy hunting of big horn sheep, met with defeat. We’d like to thank everyone who worked to protect California’s wildlife from more hunting pressure.

Southeast
Solution for Silver Springs
In June, the HSUS learned that Silver Springs, a popular Florida tourist attraction, had captured and killed a laboratory monkey. An animal dealer two hundred of their rodent-like animals had lived there for decades that had lived there for decades as a wild troop. The Florida Game and Fish Commission had demanded that the free-roaming monkeys be either caged or eliminated from the 4,000 acre attraction because it believed that the monkey population was a threat to both the public health and the environment. Although there had been isolated incidents of monkeys straying from the Silver Springs property and making nuisances of themselves, the animals had basically lived peaceful ly at the attraction for fifty years.

Their trapping and removal angered animal-protectionists and the general public.

After conferring with the management of Silver Springs and with other animal-protection groups, Southeast Regional Director Marc Paulus drafted an alternative management plan to be presented to the game commission. The plan called for selective sterilization of certain breeding members of the monkey troop to keep the population in check while preserving appropriate social interaction between the monkeys. This plan, if adopted, would minimize the possibility of human/monkey conflicts.

The rhesus macaques have lived at Silver Springs since the 1920s when they were released prior to the filming of Tarzan movies on location. For more than fifty years, the population grew gradually, though no breeding colony was established outside the compound. The troop has been considered a unique educational and recreational experience because of the opportunity to observe the natural behavior of primates from river boats.

A moratorium on the removal of the remaining 100 Silver Springs monkeys is now in effect pending reviewing of the alternative management plan by the game commission.

Good News for S.C.
The South Carolina Humane Society has for many years lobbied behind the rest of the country in adopting strong laws to deter or punish those who violate the laws to deter or punish those who
Four Zoos Seen in Summer

New England Regional Director John Dommers and Jeanne Roush, director of captive wildlife protection, inspected the Beardsley Zoo in Bridgeport, Conn., and the Bates Woods Zoo in Wau­wich and the Bates Woods Zoo in Mohegan Park, R.I. Every state in New England has操作系统 had laws to protect the animals in filing a lawsuit to halt the slaughter of North Pacific spotted seals. The other suit was brought by The Humane Society of the United States to block the killing of the seals. The court held that the killing clearly involved animal torment.

2010 Maneuver

In our continuing fight against the use of the poison 1080 for predator control on the western rangelands, we have filed lawsuits against U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service experimental-use permits which allow research on 1080. One project involves the use of 1080 in single-lethal-dose baits, small poisoned baits that are scattered in an area to kill coyotes. The other project involves a post in the ground baited with a scent attractive to coyotes.

The Law Notes are compiled by HSUS General Counsel Murdaugh and Stuart Madden and Associate Counsel Roger Kindsler.
The note cards of four cat paintings by Thaddeus Krumeich have proved to be so popular with HSUS members that we have decided to offer you the opportunity to purchase these same charming scenes as high quality lithograph prints. A complete set of four prints, including "Basil’s Cabinet," "Chauncey’s Toys," "Oliver’s Chrysanthemums" (reproduced here in color), and "Walter’s Other Window" (reproduced on the front cover of the Spring 1984 issue of The HSUS News) is now available for $100.00. (No individual prints will be sold.) Each print measures 18” x 24” and is reproduced in full color on high quality stock suitable for framing. Mr. Krumeich has generously donated to The HSUS the right to offer these beautiful prints to our members at a special price, so why not take advantage of this unique opportunity now?

Imagine the delight of having these works of art in your home year ’round! Just complete the coupon below and send your payment to The HSUS. Please allow six weeks for delivery.

HSUS Prints Order Form
Please send me __ sets of HSUS prints by Thaddeus Krumeich at $100.00 per set. I enclose $__________

Send the prints to:
Name ____________________________
Address __________________________________________
City ___________________ State __________ Zip ____

Make all checks or money orders payable to The HSUS and send this coupon to: HSUS Prints, 2100 L Street, NW Washington, DC 20037.

The HSUS proudly introduces our 1984 holiday greeting card, a winter night scene painted by Thaddeus Krumeich, whose note cards have been so popular with our members. Let this curious cat peering out a window at reindeer below carry your holiday message to friends, neighbors, and loved ones of all ages.

Cards are 5” x 7” and in full color. Inside is the message, "May the hope for peace and goodwill which fills this season be extended to all creatures, both great and small."

Each package of twenty-five cards and envelopes costs $7. $6 if you order four or more packages. Last year’s holiday cards were sell-outs, so avoid disappointment and order your greeting cards early this year!

HSUS Greeting Card Order Form

Send the cards to:
Name ____________________________
Address __________________________________________
City ___________________ State __________ Zip ____

Make all checks or money orders payable to The HSUS and send this coupon to: HSUS Greeting Cards 2100 L Street, NW Washington, DC 20037.

Please send me 1 2 3 package(s) of HSUS greeting cards at $7 per package

OR please send me (4 or more) Packages of HSUS greeting cards at $6 per package

I enclose $__________

Orders will be sent by UPS and must be delivered to a street address. Please do not use a P.O. box.
Very Special 1985 Calendars

These colorful wall calendars from Bo-Tree will brighten every day of the year. There's also lots of room for writing, and they support your HSUS, too!

Order 3 or more calendars and receive a 10% discount!

| 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>Bless The Beasts</td>
<td>$7.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In The Company of Cats</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whales &amp; Friends</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Animals</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shipping Charges</th>
<th>Arizona Residents Add 6% Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First calendar add</td>
<td>$1.50; additional calendars add 50¢ each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping Amount Enclosed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mail to: Bo-Tree Productions Dept. HSUS 730 W. Fairmont Tempe, AZ 85282 (602) 961-0168

Baby Animals, 8½” x 11” (includes stickers to mark special occasions)