Achieving Strength Through Unity

In January of 1985, a coalition of eleven major animal-protection organizations was forged to help bring to an end the practice of obtaining animals from public animal shelters, a practice commonly known as pound seizure. Although the groups that convened to form this coalition held widely divergent views on a variety of issues, all except one remain a part of this united effort to bring an end to this deplorable and unnecessary practice. Now, almost two years later, I am pleased to tell you that the objective for which the National Coalition to Protect Our Pets (ProPets) was created is very much in the process of being achieved, and the coalition itself remains strong.*

There are those who would have liked this coalition to have failed from the start, some, unfortunately, from within the animal-protection/rights community itself. Primarily, however, it was the research establishment that had hoped for the early demise of this united effort to oppose pound seizure, a practice that heretofore had been challenged only by individual groups working in isolation, many of which lacked both financial and moral support.

It is important, of course, that the ProPets coalition continue to exist as a strong and effective entity. For it has too often been the case that animal-protection/rights groups are unable to make common cause and meld their individual strengths in working for a common objective. We have sometimes been our own worst enemy and have given great comfort to our adversaries in knowing that our ranks are divided and our efforts fractured. Likewise, we have confounded and confused legislators and others in a position to effect change by our not-infrequent lack of cooperation and mutually supported objectives.

It has always been the practice of The HSUS to work in concert with other groups when we believed their objectives to be rational, realistically achievable, and responsibly administered. We are committed to continue that policy in the future, for we believe that our efforts and those of others will be greatly enhanced through the combined strength and vitality of cooperative endeavors.

Likewise, it has never been, nor shall it ever be, the practice of The HSUS to disparage publicly or ridicule the efforts of any other animal-protection/rights group, even though we may strongly disagree with its views or practices or both. However, we cannot and shall not condone violence or the threat of violence against others as a responsible means of achieving protection for animals. Indeed, we condemn such violence and those who would perpetrate it in the pursuit of otherwise noble objectives. For justice can never be served by injustice nor can the protection and welfare of animals be secured at the price of injury or abuse to others.
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Save on pet food: spring for a houseful of dogs and cats from Determined’s line of HSUS plush animals.

**Doggled and Determined**

The HSUS has joined with Determined Productions, international creators of unique plush animal toys, to produce a distinctive and distinctly huggable collection of jumping, sitting, sleeping, crouching plush dogs and cats for year-round gift giving. Each of the twenty-five different animals comes complete with an official gold-and-white HSUS medallion, a brush, and an informative booklet, prepared by our staff, outlining the basic rules of responsible pet care. The animals, from collies to calicos and from Old English sheepdogs to All-American cats, range from five to fifteen inches tall. They’re priced from approximately $18 to $60 and are now available in toy stores across the country.

“We are particularly pleased that these plush animals will not only bring joy to everyone who receives them, but will also carry with them a positive message of responsible care for the cats and dogs that share our world,” said HSUS President John A. Hoyt.

A portion of the sale price of each of these exclusive, HSUS-licensed animals is donated to The HSUS to help in its work to promote responsible pet ownership.

These are some of the most appealing plush animals we’ve ever seen. Most of us on the HSUS staff have already purchased a houseful for family and friends. We’re sure you’ll love them, too. If you can’t find the HSUS collection of animals, please call The Happiness Shop at (415) 433-0660 for individual orders or more information.

For the Photogenic Only

Barbara Cohen and Louise Taylor, creators of a proposed new book called *Dogs and Their Women*, are looking for photographs of women and their devoted canine companions. Although they haven’t yet found a publisher for their project, they expect to donate a portion of their book’s eventual sales to a worthy humane organization. For more information, contact the authors at 11 Prospect Street, Maynard, Mass. 01754. Deadline for submissions is March 1.

While Supplies Last

For several years, our distinctive blue-and-white “Club Sandwiches, Not Seals” t-shirts have been brightening beaches, offices, and rallies across the country. In fact, the response to our shirts has been so great that our stocks of medium and large shirts are completely gone. We’ve only small and extra-large shirts left. So, come on, all of you 5’1”s and 6’3”s—get yourselves a t-shirt. They’re $6.00 each, while supplies last, available from The HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

The HSUS t-shirt: if you are small or tall, you’re still in luck.
There Ought to Be a Law

Thousands of horses are shipped to slaughter every year in this country under cruel and dangerous conditions. In order to end this tragedy, animal-welfare leaders and horse experts from here and abroad met September 26 in Dearborn, Mich., at a conference jointly sponsored by The Michigan Humane Society and The HSUS. They gathered to share information and learn more about the problems unique to horse transportation.

HSUS President John A. Hoyt pointed out that, even though humane slaughter laws require a relatively quick and painless death at the slaughter plant, no laws protect horses during the many hours—or even days—they are forced to spend in transit.

Technical presentations were given by Dr. Sharon Cregier of the Canadian Wild Horse Society and University of Prince Edward Island and Dr. Temple Grandin of the University of Illinois-Urbana. The working group, which includes HSUS State Legislative Coordinator Ann Church, is preparing language that could provide the basis for a much-needed federal law on horse transport to slaughter.

Twelve Winners

The Pets Are Wonderful Council has just finished giving out more awards to local shelters in recognition of those organizations that create outstanding programs to benefit homeless animals. Named as recipient of the 1986 $5,000 prize was the Humane Society of Huron Valley, in Ann Arbor, Mich., which won for its comprehensive adoption program. Other winners were the Organization for Responsible Care of Animals (Lancaster, Penn.); Capital Area Humane Society (Columbus, Ohio); Humane Society of Shelby County (Columbiana, Ala.); the San Francisco (Calif.) SPCA; Arizona Humane Society (Phoenix, Az.); SpokAnimal C.A.R.E. (Spokane, Wash.); Salt Lake County (Utah) Animal Services; Denver (Colo.) Dumb Friends League; Humane Society, Inc. & SPCA of Seattle/King County (Bellvue, Wash.); Humane Society of the Willamette Valley (Salem, Ore.); and The Michigan Humane Society (Detroit, Mich.).

Representatives from The HSUS and The American Humane Association judged more than seventy-five entries in the categories of pet adoption, humane education, fundraising, community image, and volunteer programs.
Sixty Seconds of Brutality, Injury, and Danger

Washington State's Suicide Race

From the starting hill 150 feet away, the starter's pistol cracks, and the thunder of pounding hooves builds rapidly. Within seconds, twenty horses and riders fly over the edge of the steep incline known as Suicide Hill. Clouds of dust billow from the face of the hill as the frantic horses descend at breakneck speed, sometimes tumbling and crashing into each other, to the bank of the Okanogan River some 200 feet below. The water explodes as the first horses hit the river. The riders who have been able to hold on so far use stout quirts and plastic baseball bats to beat the water, and sometimes their horses, as they charge across the rocky bottom of the river. The frenzied pace quickens as the contestants emerge at the opposite side of the river and then gallop full-speed to the rodeo arena and the finish line, less than a minute after the starting gun's explosion. Instinctively following the group are two riderless horses that

Riderless horse tumbles helplessly down the steep slope of the suicide race course.
had fallen on the hill. The fallen riders are already being brought across the river by one of the two boats available to rescue riders who might be too injured to survive the river. Surprisingly, no horses are lost. None has shattered its legs, as has happened in previous races, although later observations would reveal that many had injured their legs or ripped open wounds stitched after the previous days’ races.

Billed as the “premier” event of the Omak Stampede in Omak, Washington, the Suicide Race began as a publicity gimmick in 1935. The idea was conceived as a means of getting free publicity for the small-town rodeo. It worked, and, since then, the Suicide Race has been written about in numerous newspapers and magazines, featured in television programs, and even appeared in a movie. While the Suicide Race has brought a measure of fame and fortune to Omak, most of what has been written and said about the race has centered on the “bravery” of the human participants. No one can dispute the risk involved. The race is virtually without rules, brutal, and dangerous. Every year, riders are hurt, some seriously enough to require hospitalization. There has been one fatality. Much less attention has been given to the risk to the horses involved, however. Unlike the riders, competing horses that have qualified in earlier heats must run all of the races that cap each of the four rodeo performances. Horses face increased risk during the two races that are held at night in virtual darkness.

Having received complaints about a terrible pileup in 1985 that resulted in a number of animals being injured and one horse destroyed, HSUS West Coast Field Investigator Eric Sakach and North Central Regional Director Frantz Dantzler traveled to Omak in August to observe the 1986 Suicide Race and document the abuse firsthand. There, they met with representatives of SpokAnimal C.A.R.E. of Spokane, Washington, to discuss past problems and coordinate future efforts to end the cruelty.

One of the first things apparent to both HSUS representatives was that, for many of the thousands of visitors, the stampede weekend is only an excuse for around-the-clock displays of public drunkenness and brawling. Attitudes appeared to change little from the streets of Omak to the rodeo grounds and areas where the Suicide Race could best be observed. In fact, a number of spectators actually appeared hopeful that they would witness a pileup on Suicide Hill during each of the races. Immediately preceding one of the races, Mr. Sakach found himself positioned among a group of older teenagers on the hillside who were chanting “We want blood!” in anticipation of an accident. Mr. Dantzler overheard onlookers from his position recount gruesome details of previous years’ races. Both men interviewed contestants after the races. Unaware that they were talking to HSUS representatives, the riders spoke freely. The father of one rider told our investigators how he had ridden the course for thirteen years. His secret was to “...just get drunk as hell and hold on.” Mr. Sakach interviewed a veterinarian who stated that, while he wasn’t opposed to the race, he felt that “Probably half the horses would be eliminated from the competition if the animals had to be inspected before the race, because they’re not in condition. Others,” he said, “would be dropped because of their injuries, and there’s a good possibility that a few have been drugged.”

According to this individual, a local veterinarian is available during the race; however, a pre-race inspection is not mandatory, and nothing prevents the owners of any of the animals from administering whatever treatment or drugs they believe will enable their horses to compete. Nothing guarantees that a horse will receive any medical treatment if needed.

“Matters like this tend to leave you feeling the situation is somewhat hopeless,” said Mr. Sakach. “Local citizens see this event as a boon to their economy, so they’re not about to condemn it. They’ll overlook the cruelty because of the income that’s generated. While the Omak Stampede is sponsored in part by Coors, Pepsi, Winston, and Wrangler jeans, the major national sponsor of the Suicide Race is Coca-Cola. We believe the sponsorship by national advertisers shows that when profit is involved, the animals are the losers.”

In October, HSUS President John A. Hoyt wrote a letter of protest to the Coca-Cola Company. Coca-Cola responded immediately: “Based on our internal findings,” wrote Roger H. Nunley, manager of industry and consumer affairs, “we have strongly recommended that the [Omak Coca-Cola] bottler withdraw any future support of the ‘Suicide Race.’ ”

We urge our members to write other national sponsors of the Stampede/Rodeo, including Pepsi, Inc. (Pepsi), Purchase, NY 10577, Donald M. Kendall, Chief Executive Officer; R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. (Winston cigarettes), Winston-Salem, NC 27102, Gerald H. Long, President and Chief Executive Officer; Adolph Coors (Coors beer), Golden, CO 80401, William K. Coors, Chief Executive Officer; and Blue Bell, Inc. (Wrangler jeans), 301 N. Elm Street, Greensboro, NC 27401, Edward J. Bauman, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer.

Only through such protest can we hope to influence Omak to make the 1986 Suicide Race the last.
"I advise cat owners that, if they really care for cats, they should also care for all creatures, and that it is as much their responsibility to protect wildlife from their cats as it is to protect their cats from outdoor hazards."

The Responsibilities of Cat-Keeping

At one time, human beings lived not simply close to nature, but with nature, like all the other animals. Today, most of us have no real connection in our everyday lives with nature or with wild animals. Our parks and gardens are mere facsimiles of all that was once wild. The few “wild” creatures—birds, rodents, snakes, lizards, and insects—that live close to us (and that we often demean as “pests”) are the last survivors of the animal kingdom in our immediate environment.

Like the tamed landscapes that we have created, so are our domesticated farm and companion animals tamed, docile, and transformed facsimiles of their wild ancestors.

There is one exception: the cat. Unlike most breeds of dogs, the average cat is much closer to its wild relative, the desert cat Felis libyca, than the dog is to its purported wolf ancestor, Canis lupus pallipes.

Because of its naturalness, self-reliance, independence of will, and wild spirit, the cat appeals to those persons whom I call “cat people.” The natural cat loves you on its own terms.

The average cat is wilder and more natural physically and psychologically than the average dog because the cat has been domesticated for a much shorter period of time, approximately 6,000 years, compared to an estimated 14,000 years for the dog. During most of this time, the cat was simply tamed, socialized to humans, but not changed significantly in other ways because its purpose was to hunt, especially to keep rodents away from households, grain, and food-storage areas.

Because of its relatively short period of domestication and utilitarian role in mankind’s universe, we have not seen in the cat such extreme variations of species type as the Chihuahua or Great Dane, found in the dog family. As cat breeders begin to breed selectively cats with mutant traits such as brachycephaly (short faces), dolichocephaly (long faces), large and small stature, folded ears, long and thin bones, unusual eye and coat colors, curly hair, and hairlessness, we will, in a few decades, have as many recognized varieties of cats as there are various breeds of dog today.

All “cat people”—as distinct from “cat fanciers”—share my concern that many of these new varieties will suffer from the inherited health problems that are so common in purebred dogs as a consequence of selective breeding for certain traits and in-breeding. These can be avoided and the welfare and rights of future generations of cats better ensured if cat fanciers stop producing structurally, functionally, and in other ways abnormal cats, and if prospective cat owners choose healthy, natural-looking cats.

Some cat lovers go a little too far, however—believing that, if they are going to keep a cat, it should not only be natural-looking, but also should live as natural a life as possible. That natural life, to them, includes being able to roam free outdoors, hunt and kill wild animals, breed with other cats, and produce offspring. While I understand the logic of such cat owners, I regard their views as irresponsible. Free-roaming cats can get into fights with other cats that often result in severe bite abscesses; can pick up infectious diseases such as feline influenza, distemper, and leukemia from other cats and rabies and plague from wild animals; and can bring home fleas, lice, ticks, and mites. Free-roaming cats are killed by automobiles and, not infrequently, by free-roaming dogs and hunters. In some areas, they are also victimized by traps set to catch wild animals for their fur; stolen and sold...
to research laboratories; or sacrificed to train pit bull terriers to fight and kill.

Free-roaming cats also get lost and starve to death or die from infections. Many will kill wildlife, even bringing dead or injured prey home. Wild animals have enough problems surviving as it is, and cat people who respect the rights of all creatures keep their cats indoors to prevent such needless killing. (An exception may be made for "working" cats that control rodents around farms and warehouses. These cats should be provided with veterinary care when needed, vaccinated, and neutered to control their numbers, three basic rights that they are rarely granted.)

Free-roaming killer cats also compete with and displace native wild predators such as the fox, marten, weasel, and wildcat, sometimes even transmitting infectious diseases to them.

I respect and love cats, but one thing that does enrage me is seeing them carrying dead birds, squirrels, and other wildlife that they have killed. Only too often, since they are home-fed house cats, they don't eat what they kill, so the death of these creatures is pointless. One could argue that it is right to let cats follow their natural instincts and that it is an inhumane violation of their rights to confine them indoors when they want to go out to hunt and kill. But what of the rights of wildlife that have a hard enough time surviving, since so much of their habitat is being taken over and destroyed by people? That cats help keep certain urban and suburban wildlife species "in balance" (such as rats, mice, and pigeons) is a flawed justification for letting them out to kill, since they are generally nonselective. They kill whatever they can, from young birds (whose parents feed them on the ground before they can fly) and fend for themselves) and helpless ground-nesting birds, such as pheasants and quail, to harmless snakes, lizards, and young rabbits and squirrels.

One evening, I saw a neighbor's cat carrying a dead squirrel in its jaws. I asked the cat's owner, who was in her garden next door, how she felt about allowing her cat to roam freely and kill wildlife. She immediately took offense, thinking I was telling her how she should keep her cat, and demanded that I mind my own business. But it was my business—I was concerned for the squirrel and other wild creatures that her cat and a half-dozen others in the vicinity were killing constantly. My neighbor blamed one of the other cats for encouraging hers to hunt, but I pointed out that cats hunt alone and don't need others' encouragement. Then she said she hadn't seen her cat for two days and was worried. I suggested that it might be going wild—feral—and that the more it got a taste for the outdoors, the harder it would be to keep it indoors. When kept indoors, her cat was already expressing its frustration by spraying all over the place, even though it was neutered.

My advice to people with killer cats that can't tolerate being indoors all the time is not to let them out except long after dusk and bring them in well before dusk, since cats hunt most efficiently around dawn, dusk, and through the night.

A better alternative is to try training the cat to enjoy being outdoors, under supervision, in a pen or on a line and harness (provided the yard is dog-proof). Some enjoy walks on a leash and harness. Be warned, however: if frightened, the cat may climb up you for protection and injure you with its claws.

Prevention is the best medicine, and by this I mean starting out right from kittenhood and never letting the cat outdoors. Life indoors can be satisfying for cats provided with a companion cat and carpeted window shelves for sun-bathing and surveying the outdoors. Cats don't usually get frustrated when kept indoors until they have had a taste of the outdoors. I advise cat owners that, if they really care for cats, they should also care for all creatures, and that it is as much their responsibility to protect wildlife from their cats as it is to protect their cats from outdoor hazards.

My offended neighbor loved her cat, but love is not enough. Responsibility and understanding make a cat-lover into an animal person, one who respects not only the rights and needs of his or her own animal companion, but also the rights and interests of other creatures wild and tame.

A cat's domesticated life indoors can be enriched in many ways to satisfy its basic needs. The cat can be provided with a companion, ideally a kitten of the opposite sex. It is best to raise two kittens together and never allow them outdoors, since, once cats have gotten used to roaming outdoors, they may resist being confined at a later age.

Two cats together are generally healthier and happier than those that live alone, though it is true some cats do seem to prefer to have only humans for company when they mature, and especially when they have been raised without any contact with their own kind.

A pair of cats can play and sleep together, groom each other, and generally take care of each other and provide for their social needs. This is especially important when one remembers that, in most homes, children and adults are away all day at school and work. Cats left alone without a companion all day may suffer from bore-
Some become lethargic and obese, others groom themselves excessively, sometimes to the point of self-mutilation, and may even become unhousebroken—a very common symptom of emotional distress.

I advise cat owners to provide their cats with a one-meter-tall scratch post; a tree branch or carpet-covered pole to climb with one or two carpeted shelves to lie on or boxes to hide in; expanded shelves covered with carpet material by one or more windows; a screened-in balcony or screened window where the cats can go out in good weather; or an outdoor enclosure (while supervised).

A good arrangement for cats is to build an enclosure at least five feet wide and twelve feet long (the longer, the better). The enclosure should be covered with chicken wire so the cats cannot climb out, and half of the top covered with plywood or tarpaulin to provide shade and shelter. Include a litter box, placed inside a large box open at one end to keep rain out. The floor of the enclosure can be seeded with grass and planted with small shrubs. A large tree branch for climbing and resting boards for sunning, set up like shelves, three feet wide and two feet deep, at convenient heights along the side of the enclosure, are welcome additions. Provide a warm, insulated box (two feet by three feet by two feet high) with a small entry hole and a blanket for each cat. The cats can be put inside the enclosure during good weather. A very effective arrangement is to give the cats free access to the enclosure from the house via a one-foot square, wire-mesh-enclosed runway connecting from a flap door cut into a windowpane or the base of any house door that leads out to the enclosure.

A similar set-up for cats can be arranged using a screened-in porch. They will enjoy a few pots of grass on the porch floor and a large tree branch for climbing.

Many cats enjoy having a bird feeder set up outside so that they can watch the birds from the window. Some even enjoy spending time observing fish in an aquarium, which should be securely covered to protect the fish.

Cardboard boxes and large paper bags make excellent hideaways for cats and can be used for games of ambush and hide-and-seek.

Cats are especially active early in the evening, and this is a good time to play with them. Hide-and-seek games and catching “prey” such as a strip of fake fur on the end of a piece of string will entertain cats for long periods of time, giving them beneficial exercise and strengthening the emotional bond between them and their human companions. Some cats, especially Siamese, will learn to retrieve a toy and enjoy having it thrown for them to catch.

People who play with their cats while they are kittens often find that their cats remain playful and attentive when they mature. With a minimum of effort and expense, a cat’s home environment can be so enriched that it thrives and its owners need feel no guilt about not allowing Puss its freedom outdoors. Because cats are so adaptable to our modern life-styles, especially to life in apartments, and since they do not need to be taken outdoors regularly, their popularity is increasing. They are, in many ways, more convenient and less demanding of one’s time and attention than dogs, which suffer much more from being left alone for extended periods and have no natural instinct or ability to learn to use a litter box.

I hope that those who might find the idea of restricting cats’ activities to the indoors offensive will consider this position very carefully from an ethical and responsible perspective. The risks and costs to cats (and wildlife) of allowing these animals to roam freely are far outweighed by the benefits of raising them to be indoor companions.

Most cats relish human companionship.

Dr. Michael W. Fox is scientific director of The HSUS.
For four days in October, Miami Beach's luxurious Doral Hotel-on-the-Beach was filled with almost four hundred of the country's most active animal protectionists, participants in our 1986 annual conference.

Those who had made plans to attend the pre-conference symposium, held on October 22, were rewarded with an ambitiously conceived and implemented program on the care, use, and disposition of primates in captivity.

The next day, the conference opened formally with the lively keynote address of perennial favorite Dr. Amy Freeman Lee and the inspiring presentation of Dr. Roger Fouts. The professor of psychology at Central Washington University shared with the conference audience spellbinding videotapes of his work with the chimp Washoe, his "senior researcher" who communicates using American Sign Language.

THE HSUS 1986 ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Kinship With All Creatures
Pre-conference symposium speakers included (clockwise from left) Dr. Roger Fouts of Central Washington University; Dr. Geza Teleki, formerly director of National Parks for Sierra Leone; Ted Finlay of the Atlanta (Georgia) Zoo; Janis Carter of the Gambia Wildlife Conservation Department, West Africa; Michael Pereira of Duke University; Dr. Martin Stephens, associate director of laboratory animal welfare for The HSUS; and HSUS Vice President Patricia Forkan, program moderator.

On Friday, Dr. Randall Lockwood, director of Higher Education Programs for The HSUS, and Trevor Scott, director-general of the World Society for the Protection of Animals, spoke to different aspects of the conference theme, "Kinship With All Creatures." Workshops on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday offered participants everything from a lively reenactment of a unique legislative hearing to a sobering assessment of the conditions facing animals in Central and South America. The sharing of experiences among those facing frustrating problems in their communities was, as always, a most important element of many sessions from "Euthanasia Methods" to "Vicious Dogs."

Following Friday's membership meeting, a conference resolution reading as follows was passed by those assembled:

Whereas, many pet owners face evic-
tion from rental property for having a pet, regardless of that pet's size or behavior, and

Whereas, most leases contain the following clause: "The possession of a pet is a substantial violation of the lease" or words to that effect, and

Whereas, many pet owners must either face eviction or remove their pets from the premises because of such a provision in leases, it is hereby

RESOLVED that this conference goes on record demanding the removal of the phrase "substantial violation," or similar language, from leases as it relates to the keeping of pets because such language is discriminatory against pet owners and man's companion and instructs its members to initiate legislation to that effect.

Saturday's banquet brought several surprises. Although the 1986 Joseph Wood Krutch medalist, "James Her-

This Fall, Phoenix

The Southwest beckons this year—we'll be holding our annual conference in Phoenix, Arizona, from October 14 through 17, at the Phoenix Hilton. Keep those dates free, and watch for more information in the next News.
Dr. Michael Fox (left), Phyllis Wright, and Dr. Graham Smith respond to questions from a participant in a workshop on euthanasia methods.

Moneta "Dixie" Morgan receives special recognition for her twenty-five years of service to The HSUS during banquet festivities.

Investigative reporter Scott Klug (left) and HSUS investigator Bob Baker describe how national news exposes can help curb abuses in horse and dog racing.

riot," was unable to attend, HSUS President John A. Hoyt narrated a charming slide and sound presentation of his visit earlier in the year with the famous author and veterinarian, Jeanine Faubion, of Ft. Myers, Florida, described on behalf of the General Federation of Women's Clubs the new cooperative program between that international organization and The HSUS (see the Fall 1986 HSUS News). Finally, Determined Productions, creators of the new HSUS "spokesdog" and "spokescat," introduced these lovable characters in a heartwarming puppet drama, to the delight of banquet guests.

Although four days of listening, learning, and exchanging ideas left conferees alternately exhausted and exhilarated, ultimately, the time together...
Edward S. Duvin (left), director of The HSUS's Center for the Respect of Life and the Environment, and Mrs. Duvin chat with HSUS Gulf States Regional Director Bill Meade during a break in the workshop schedule.

Jeannine Faubion greets Saturday's banquet audience on behalf of the General Federation of Women's Clubs International President Phyllis Roberts.

HSUS Vice President John Grandy (right) exchanges views with John Walsh, regional director for the World Society for the Protection of Animals. Both led workshop sessions on Thursday.

Determined Productions' President Connie Boucher smooches with her creations, "Wagger" and "Purrell" after their debut as the new HSUS "spokesanimals" at the conference banquet. Puppeteers Kevin Clash (left) and Jim Martin provide animated support.

seemed all too brief. Plans for the next conference began before the last workshop was over; addresses were exchanged; and all achievements seemed possible in the upcoming year.

How much progress will the animal-protection movement make in 1987? Let's talk about it again—in October.
How You Can Make a Difference

by Paul Tsongas

I remember the moment well. The critical vote was being taken on what was perhaps the most significant legislative battle of my senate career. The fate of the Alaska Lands Act was at stake. That bill, which I had helped author, would preserve over 100 million acres of land in our largest state as parklands, forests, wildlife refuges, and wild and scenic rivers. Most Alaskans were opposed to the bill because they wanted the option of developing the land. Ranged against them were all the major environmental, wildlife, and animal-welfare groups. Now the Alaska senators were leading an effort to filibuster the bill—that is, to talk it to death.

The hour of truth had come. Other leading proponents of the legislation and I were calling for a cloture vote to end the filibuster and to permit the Senate to vote on the Alaska Lands Act up or down on its merits. The vote on cloture was expected to be close. If the Alaska senators could muster the votes necessary to defeat the cloture resolution, the conservationist bill of the century would be dead.

I was standing nervously on the senate floor when one of the two Alaskans ambled over to a long-time ally of his—a Republican veteran of the institution who hailed from a deep southern state that was hardly known as a hotbed of environmentalism. The senator in question had been a longtime foe of cloture votes. Yet his message to his friend from Alaska was simple and to the point: "I'm sorry, but just don't count on me for this one. People in my state really seem to care a lot about this." He had heard from a lot of folks back home and what he detected was a ground swell of support for the Alaska Lands Act. That was enough for him. With the loss of his support, the filibuster forces fell apart.

I relate this anecdote because it explains far better than I could why those letters and phone calls from constituents do make a difference. When I was in office, I was often asked at the open town meetings I conducted around Massachusetts about the value of writing to one's senator or congressman. My response was always the same: if you care about the issue, let us know.

Members of Congress have to balance the intensity of their opinions against those of the people they were elected to represent. A few simply put their finger to the wind and move with the currents. Most will vote their convictions on an issue about which they believe strongly, even if they are not always in tune with their constituents. But on issues where the merits of each side are fairly close or where the legislator has no strong predilections, input from the constituency can be the deciding factor.

Never underestimate the force of a particular group, even if it isn't one of those "powerful special interests" we hear about so often. When I was in the House, a new wing of the Library of Congress—the Madison Building—was under construction. As the building neared completion, a number of congressmen proposed that the Madison Building be used as an additional house office building. When the proposal became public, a new lobby was born overnight. Just about every librarian in America wrote to his or her representative to protest the idea. The librarians, not known in Washington as a powerful lobby, were heard loud and clear. The Madison Building became the new wing of the Library of Congress.

Letters from constituents are not just a vehicle for making an impact upon the votes and decisions of legislators. They also serve an important educational function in a democracy. When I was in the Senate, for example, it was grassroots communications that brought the leghold-trap issue to my attention for the first time. As a result, I studied the issue in depth and became a strong opponent of the use of the cruel device for trapping animals.

Now, more than ever, it is important to make your voices heard. There are influential and well-organized lobbies that mount sophisticated legislative campaigns. They could turn out to be your adversaries on some key issues. By writing and speaking out, you can counter their influence—and make a difference yourself.

Remember: you only get one opportunity every six years to vote for your senators; but, through the power of the pen, you can help shape their votes on issues that matter to you many times each year. That is just as much a part of the democratic system as the exercise of your franchise on Election Day. Use it!

The Hon. Paul Tsongas, former senator from Massachusetts, now works on behalf of animal-protection issues for The HSUS and other groups. This article originally appeared in Animals, published by The Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and is reprinted with permission.

The Hon. Paul Tsongas
Americans have always placed a high value on education. With students eagerly lining up for admission to colleges and graduate programs, schooling is becoming big business. When it comes to their dogs, Americans are equally keen on education. Thus, the fields of obedience training, animal behavior modification, and counseling are also quickly becoming big business.

by Curtis B. Hane

offering countless services as complex and intimidating as any university curriculum. If you yourself are considering instruction for you and your dog, your choice must be an educated one. While some people harbor delusions of transforming the family terrier into Rex the Wonder Dog, your goals should be more realistic—teaching Spot not to pull your arms off when walked on a leash or competing in a local obedience show. Perhaps you are part of a smaller number who have a serious problem—a dog that bites, barks incessantly, or has the family in such a state of upheaval that permanent separation from the dog looms as the only solution.
In many cases, dogs can kick their destructive habits with a program of proper training.

Whatever your problem, you may consider seeking the help of professionals in solving it. With some basic knowledge and a bit of consumer investigation, most people can find a program that suits the needs of both dog and owner.

Most dog training methods can be roughly divided into two groups: 1) obedience drills and exercises (heel, sit, stay, for example) and 2) behavioral counseling and training (to correct such problem behaviors as chewing, biting, and jumping up). This is an informal categorization, however; many programs fit neatly into neither group, offering aspects of both types of training. Therefore, choosing the right training program for your dog must be done carefully. You'll want to consider your own goals and financial resources and your dog's needs if you want the best chance for effective, humane training.

Should I Train My Dog?

People become involved in dog training for many reasons:

"My dog was chewing on the potted plants."

"Flash needed to become accustomed to strange noises and strange people."

"I wanted the instructor's expertise."

If you've never been involved in dog training, you may not be aware that all breeds, including mixed breeds, can and should be trained. But, contrary to the adamant claims of many dog owners, there is no magic breed or breed mix that can be trained in minutes with a snap of the fingers. Phyllis Wright, HSUS vice president for companion animals and a former dog trainer, emphasizes that both owner and animal should learn together. "Eighty percent of [any] problem is with the owner," says Ms. Wright. When training your dog, there is no substitute for dedication and perspiration. But it can be rewarding—and even fun!

While all breeds can be trained, an individual acquiring a new dog should consider the physical size of the dog that he or she will be able to train. Some dogs are simply too big for their owners to handle comfortably. As Phyllis Wright explains, "Large dogs need strong, confident handlers. A woman with arthritis shouldn't try to train a Great Dane." But she admits that physical size is not always the ultimate criterion: "One woman had a dachshund that dragged her all over the streets!"

Choosing the Best Training Method

There are four methods of dog training most commonly considered by dog owners: 1) the do-it-yourself method using one or more training manuals; 2) kennels or schools that board dogs for a predetermined length of time for training by in-house handlers; 3) the private trainer or counselor who provides individualized instruction, often in the pet owner's home; and 4) group classes for both dog and owner. Each method has its benefits and drawbacks.

Dog training manuals. It is possible, with the aid of books, to train your dog yourself. While this method can prove effective and economical, it also requires a little more care both in planning and in execution.

First, carefully read, cover-to-cover, at least two books before you begin the actual training. Many books cover only basic obedience exercises. With a bit of bookstore or library searching, however, you should be able to find at least one book that deals directly with the problem behaviors you are experiencing with your dog.

Second, keep in mind that a group class or other outside-the-home method has the advantage of introducing your dog to strange sounds and odors and, especially, other dogs. Should you decide to train your dog yourself, avoid practicing solely in the familiar, isolated backyard. Once you have your dog under control, it is usually best to move training sessions to a public park or an isolated corner of a parking lot. This is the environment the two of you will ultimately face, so accustom your dog to its surroundings early.


Kennels and schools. Dog-boarding facilities that house your dog for a period of time and promise to return to you an "obedient" dog are often merely profiting from an owner's laziness or insecurity. The handlers often employ inhumane methods and return dogs to untrained owners who dishearteningly watch their animal companions quickly revert to their previous poor behavior within a matter of days.

While not a recommended method, if
you do intend—for whatever reason—to leave your dog in any facility for training by a professional handler, be certain to investigate carefully. These operations make a great many promises. Don’t be innocently drawn in by free school bus service, recorded telephone tips, elaborate graduation ceremonies, and other costly frills.

First, visit several kennels and evaluate what you see, smell, and hear. Is there a noticeable odor? A well-run facility will be clean and neat. Do all fences and runs look and feel secure? Many dogs have escaped from poorly designed runs. Listen for any sounds of shouting or confusion from the staff or tell-tale signs of abuse or abusive equipment. Phyllis Wright suggests a dog owner visit a facility at least twice before leaving a dog for training; three visits are not too many. Also, keep in mind that the “five-day quick train” method offered by many handlers is a myth. No reputable professional should offer or recommend such a program.

Second, it is essential that you insist upon follow-up sessions for you and your dog with the trainer. Any lessons the dog has learned will be wasted if the still-ineducated owner returns to unsuccessful methods at home.

The private trainer. This method is perhaps the most effective means of correcting a dog’s problem behavior. It is, for obvious reasons, also the most expensive, at $20 or more per hour. On the positive side, many private trainers are behaviorists who specialize in individualized programs emphasizing counseling for the owner and in-the-home instruction for dog and owner.

One such trainer is Bob Maida, who operates a pet counseling and training facility in Northern Virginia. Counseling plays an indispensable role in his dog problem-solving plan. In fact, he prefers to start with a person who is looking for a dog, interviewing a prospective dog owner and helping him choose a dog that suits his life-style and personality. This initial counseling is often just the beginning of the close relationship that develops among trainer, dog, and owner. Working individually with both dog and owner—either in the owner’s home or at the training facility—a good trainer can tailor a program that concentrates on particular behavioral problems, always taking the dog’s needs, and temperament, into account.

While most private trainers are
reluctant to divulge their professional secrets, Mr. Maida offers some tips he has used effectively to stop destructive behavior:

- Tie balloons on any area that your dog is chewing. When you see your dog near the area, walk over casually and pop a balloon.
- Leave your radio on when you go out ("No rock music," Mr. Maida emphasizes, "just elevator music. Rock music makes dogs aggressive.") and turn on a light if it is or will be getting dark before you return.
- When giving your dog verbal commands, change the inflection of your voice from the sing-song praising voice to a more powerful, no-nonsense tone.

Mr. Maida stresses that private instruction is a worthwhile choice for all dogs but may be essential for some animals: "Some dogs do not do well in a group setting," he explains, "for example, aggressive dogs with meek owners." Mr. Maida points out the limitations of the group setting, which often involves fifteen or more dogs and owners: "It's a question of time. Group classes can't zero in on the person whose dog is having a specific problem at home. Class instructors must come up with a universal method, a choreographed routine. But you've got to talk to people, not just run them through the motions."

This individualized attention can be costly. Approximate prices can range anywhere from $50 for a two-hour counseling session to over $350 for a complete program of behavioral counseling, in-the-home training, individualized lesson plans, and homework plans for the owner.


The group obedience class. With the exception of books and manuals, the group class is certainly the most common method of dog training. However, when approached with the idea of training his dog in a group obedience class, the novice's first words may be: "But I want my German shepherd to stop jumping on visitors, not win a blue ribbon in a show!" True, most dog owners want to solve behavior problems, and, equally true, very few group instructors are behaviorists who have the time and expertise to address your specific needs. However, many dog trainers believe that obedience training in a group setting can both aid in the dog's socialization and establish a positive dog/owner relationship that carries over into behavioral problem-solving. When the dog misbehaves—for example, jumps up on a visitor—the dog can be told to "sit." If the classroom training has been successful, the dog will sit; thus the owner now has a means of communication through which he can make corrections. "Whatever the dog learns in class should be transferable to the home. The goal is for dog and family to live in harmony," says Phyllis Wright. She emphasizes the importance of dog and owner simply spending time together: "Obedience training gives the dog an interaction with you, and the more interaction you have, the closer you

---

**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 after you're gone.

Naming The HSUS demonstrates your lasting commitment to animal welfare 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.
become as companions. Training sessions should be quality time between you and your dog.” By taking an active role in your dog’s training, the bond between owner and pet is strengthened. As Ms. Wright explains, “Obedience is too strong a word. ‘How you and your dog can live together’ is a better goal.”

When looking for an obedience class, be sure to observe at least one session before enrolling. An instructor who welcomes visitors is more likely to employ humane methods and enjoy working with both dogs and people. The instructor should be an adult over the age of twenty-one. More than a few dog owners have found themselves receiving inaccurate instruction from poorly trained teenagers who were little more than glorified dog walkers. Carefully observe how the instructor handles dogs. Is a reward system used? Do not assume that all dog-training instructors are—because of their daily involvement with animals—great lovers of dogs. As unfortunate as it may seem, some are in the business solely for profit.

**How to Find a Good Class**

If you have decided to enroll yourself and your dog in an obedience class, seek the recommendations of any acquaintances who have attended classes previously. If you have difficulty obtaining first-hand information, don’t head for the Yellow Pages yet! Check first with one or more of the following resources: 1) your veterinarian, 2) your local humane society, 3) the Better Business Bureau, and 4) your local consumer-protection agency.

Group classes designed specifically for beginners usually emphasize the rudimentary obedience skills: heel on the leash, down, down-stay, heel-sit, sit-stay, and come when called. The knowledgeable instructor, however, will attempt to deal—whenever possible—with specific behavior problems. Don’t expect individual attention at every turn, but don’t be afraid to ask questions and get involved. You will get out of the program only what you put into it.

The class will normally last from eight to ten weeks, one meeting per week. A knowledgeable instructor will stress at-home practice; set aside at least one half-hour (an hour, if possible) for you and your dog to review the previous week’s lesson. Also keep in mind that preliminary veterinary attention—particularly up-to-date vaccinations—is essential before exposing your dog to other animals.

**A Closer Look at Obedience Classes**

Marla Brady has been training dogs since childhood and currently trains sixty or more dog/owner teams each year. At Braywood, her dog-training facility in Johnson City, New York, she employs and endorses a training method with foundations in sound humane principles: “I have a philosophy of training, a rather holistic approach,” she explained. “I’m building a team. . . . They [dog and owner] have to work together, and they have to enjoy their work.”

Ms. Brady offers an eight-week course for $55, with a collar and leash provided. Her instruction emphasizes the practical benefits of training, always making a connection between class exercises and the home, yard, and sidewalk. “I will always explain to people why we’re doing something. For example, in my classes dogs learn to stand for examination. The owners usually say, ‘My dog’s never going to need to do that!’ But, in fact, the dogs will—in the vet’s office. So it applies to real life.”

As for the use of painful punishment devices, Ms. Brady’s opinion is simple and direct: “Anything that—in the dog’s mind—connects pain with the owner, I don’t use.”

Non-profit organizations such as the Capital Dog Training Club of Washington, D.C., also offer group classes. This all-volunteer group offers classes for puppies (puppy kindergarten) and for dogs over six months (basic) at $35 for ten weeks. “Any dog, purebred or mixed breed, is welcome,” explained Armand Bailey, who serves as both secretary and a trainer for the club. “Our goal is simply to get a better behaved animal for the home. For example, our puppy kindergarten concentrates on the puppies’ socialization with other dogs and people. We use body language with the puppies, because dogs understand it better than words.”

Shirley Sullivan of Arlington, Virginia, is a staunch supporter of puppy kindergarten. She has attended classes with eight of her dogs over a fifteen-year period. Why such dedication? “Most of what I get out of it is for him,” she explained, gesturing toward her Australian shepherd puppy, Flash. “It is far and away worth it, particularly for the socialization.” Flash was purchased from a small breeder, and thus Ms. Sullivan was able to judge the temperament of her puppy before taking it home. She has, however, already witnessed the difference in attitude and behavior of one of Flash’s littermates not exposed to early socialization: “His littermate is not as confident around people. There is an obvious difference between the two dogs that is easily seen.”

Basic, which instructs dogs and
owners in the six AKC novice exercises, emphasizes positive reinforcement. According to Ms. Bailey, “You don’t punish your dog for getting on the sofa; you praise him for getting down.” We condition the word ‘good’ in the animal, so it’s the only word it understands. Then we work from there.” Ms. Bailey also stressed that praise and reprimand must be immediate: “Two seconds later is too late. The dog will have forgotten already.”

As for punishment devices used during training, Ms. Bailey was adamant: “Positive reinforcement is better. If a dog owner approaches me with the idea of training his dog with a shock collar or other such device, I tell him to find another trainer.”

How an Obedience Class Works

Let’s look in on an advanced beginners program for adult dogs. This class is offered by a private training facility and held in the multi-purpose room of a suburban YMCA.

Twenty dog/owner teams attend the Friday night class, the mid-point in an eight-week series. Most arrive early to walk their dogs, to socialize, and to practice a few lessons before class. Terry, the instructor, stresses punctuality by closing the doors at the stroke of nine.

The class includes a wide variety of purebred and mixed breed dogs, and an equally diverse selection of owners, young and old, male and female. The owners attach training collars and long leads to their charges and take advantage of a short practice period, vying for space to put the finishing touches on that perfect heel. Terry, in a booming, no-nonsense voice, sets the class in motion, ordering the pairs to one side of the large and, suddenly, hushed room. Both dogs and owners are well trained in obeying verbal commands; the two-legged pupils obediently line up like happy recruits, their four-legged partners heeling at their sides.

The first lesson is “heel on a leash with turnaround,” in which the dog must follow closely at its owner’s side while he walks several steps, quickly turns 180 degrees, and then continues for several more steps. Most of the teams perform this exercise with relative ease, with two exceptions. Terry helps one team by simply correcting the attachment of the leather lead and collar, encouraging those having difficulty to intensify practice sessions at home.

She then moves quickly to the next exercise: the dog must stand for examination while its owner stands three feet in front, holding the leash. Next, as an added temptation, the leash is dropped. The dog must stand perfectly still; any foot movement is corrected immediately. When this exercise is completed, Terry gives the signal to praise, and an echoing chorus of “Gooooood Dog!” fills the room.

As a final drill for the evening, the dogs practice their “sit-stay,” their passive poses belying their eagerness to run to their owners for some well-earned praise.

As the class winds down, Terry explains the homework for the week. Teams are to practice the “go to place” lesson, which teaches the dog to go on command to a physically defined place, such as a rug or dog bed, and lie down. After a few student questions, the class ends.

A Final Word

The dog is, first and foremost, a companion animal. As such, its training should make dog and owner better companions through close interaction. Achieving this simple goal need not be a painful or inhumane process. Finding the training program that meets your needs requires some legwork, knowledge, and a large dose of common sense. With the right program, dedicated effort, and respect for your animal companion, the rewards for both you and your dog can be impressive. Your bonds of companionship, respect, and understanding will be strengthened, and, most importantly, the home you share will be more comfortable for both of you.

---

ALICE MORGAN WRIGHT—EDITH GOODE FUND TESTAMENTARY TRUST

December 31, 1985

Statement of Assets and Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust Corpus 12/31/84</td>
<td>$1,309,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on Sale of Securities</td>
<td>14,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985 Income from Investments—Net</td>
<td>98,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Distribution of 1984 Income</td>
<td>(123,297)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 12/31/85</td>
<td>$1,299,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Represented by

| Cash in Interest Bearing Accounts           | $422,216    |
| Accrued Interest Receivable                 | 17,950      |
| Investments—Securities at Market Value      | 890,704     |

Balance 12/31/85                            $1,299,870

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985 Income from Investments—Net</td>
<td>$98,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disbursements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants of 1985 Income to Organizations Listed</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$98,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizations Receiving Aid From Alice Morgan Wright—Edith Goode Fund 1985 Trust Income

The American Fondouk Maintenance Committee, Inc., Boston, Massachusetts
Animal Protective League, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
The Animals’ Crusaders, Inc., Everett, Massachusetts
Association Uruguayos de Protección a Los Animales, Montevideo, Uruguay
Assistance aux Animaux, Paris, France
Association for the Prevention of Cruelty in Public Spectacles, Barcelona, Spain
Association for the Protection of Furbearing Animals, Vancouver, B.C., Canada
Association of Veterinarians for Animal Rights, Winters, California
Blue Cross of India, Madina, India
Brooke Hospital for Animals, London, England
Bund Gegen den Misshandel der Tiere e.v., Munich, West Germany
Council for Livestock Protection, New York, New York
Dublin Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Dublin, Ireland
Ferne Animal Sanctuary, St. Erme, England
Friends of Dogs, Calcutta, India
Hellenic Animal Welfare Society, Athens, Greece
Irish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Dublin, Ireland
La Ligue Francaise des Droits de L’animal, Paris, France
Michigan Humane Society, Detroit, Michigan
Missouri Anti-Vivisection Society, St. Louis, Missouri
Nagadochose Humane Society, Nagadochose, India
National Equine Defense League, Carlisle, England
National Humane Education Society, Leesburg, Virginia
Nigerian Animal Welfare Society, Nigeria, South India
Nordic Society against Painful Experiments on Animals, Stockholm, Sweden
People’s Dispensary for Sick Animals, San Francisco, California
St. Hubert’s Giralda Shelter and Education Center, Madison, New Jersey
Scottish Society for the Prevention of Vivisection, Edinburgh, Scotland
Society for Animal Rights, Inc., Carlisle, Pennsylvania
Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Fiji, Suva, Fiji
South African Federation of SPCA’s and Affiliated Societies, Johannesburg, South Africa
Tierschutzverein fur Berlin und Umgebung Corp., Berlin, West Germany
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"Living With Animals" Celebrates Its First Anniversary

"Living With Animals," The HSUS's weekly television show seen on public broadcasting system (PBS) stations across the country, celebrated its first anniversary in October by announcing that WHMM, Channel 32 in Washington, D.C., has been named the program's new "presenter" station.

"With this new affiliation with a PBS station, we expect that the number of stations carrying the program will increase dramatically," said Gale B. Nemec, executive producer of the program.

"Living With Animals," which focuses on both wild and domestic animals, has broadcast many segments on animal-protection issues within its magazine-style format. It has featured HSUS staff members, including Dr. Michael Fox, Patricia Forkan, Bob Baker, and Phyllis Wright.

Recent programs have brought viewers across the country special features on New York's Animal Medical Center, carriage horses, veterinary surgical advances, trapping, and greyhound racing. Interviews with primatologist Jane Goodall, artist Richard Ellis, and Mrs. George Bush have brought to viewers people with unusual ties to the animal kingdom.

More than 100 PBS stations now carry "Living With Animals." Some stations offer each half-hour show as often as three times a week.

If your local station has already included "Living With Animals" in its program schedule, why not write the station manager and thank him or her for offering the program? If you can't find "Living With Animals" on any station in your viewing area, please write those PBS station managers and ask that they make this highly praised series part of their program roster. PBS stations are publicly supported and seek to give their viewers the shows they want!

Expanding the viewing audience for "Living With Animals" guarantees that more people will be exposed to the most important issues in animal protection. Please answer our "call" and call your station, today! Then, settle back and tune in our own "Living With Animals." We know it is a half hour you'll enjoy.
New Jersey Trap-Ban Trial Ends in Victory

After almost a year of nail biting, a trial lasting nearly a month, a summer of incessant worrying—after all that, we have won. The New Jersey trapping ban will stay in effect. Animals will remain legally protected from the brutality and cruelty of leghold traps in New Jersey (see the Summer and Fall 1986 HSUS News). Now, with 20/20 hindsight, the worry, concern, and paranoia that we felt seem so unnecessary, and the major investment in dollars and other resources that we made in defending the trapping ban seems all the more worth it.

It was October of 1985 when The HSUS heard that the New Jersey trapping ban had been challenged by New Jersey trappers. Two animal-welfare organizations responded to the challenge immediately: The HSUS and Friends of Animals (FOA) both filed motions to intervene in the case. Staff members of The HSUS spent many late nights at our 1985 annual conference hurriedly piecing together affidavits that would support our right to intervene and, more importantly, support the ban on steel-jaw leghold traps.

The courts granted our move for intervention. However, our first setback occurred almost immediately when it became certain that the trial would be held in Salem County and would be presided over by a Superior Court judge from a nearby community. Salem County—and the entire southern part of New Jersey—is well known for its trapping and trappers. We were concerned that the trapping ban would not get a fair trial.

Despite this disappointment, we felt we had to go forward. Months of strategy conferences, phone calls, and meetings, together with volumes of legal papers, followed. HSUS staff members Dr. John W. Grandy, vice president for wildlife and environment, and Nina Austenberg, director of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, were deposed as witnesses in preparation for the trial. Trial dates were established and regularly postponed because attorneys had not finished their preparatory work. Time and again, we prepared for the trial. Time and again, we were disappointed.

Finally, on June 2, 1986, the trial began in the courthouse in Salem, New Jersey. The trial was, in fact, presided over by a local judge of the New Jersey Superior Court, Judge George Farrell. The HSUS was represented by attorney William Fiore and FOA by attorney Douglas Sanborne in our efforts to support the state of New Jersey and its law. Our attorneys did a masterful job of preparing evidence and witnesses and working with the state deputy attorney general, Harley Williams.

New Jersey trappers contested the law on two principal grounds. First, they argued that use of the padded or "soft catch" trap was legal under the statute. (A padded trap has a small bit of rubber-like material between the steel jaws but is still considered a steel-jaw leghold trap.) Second, the trappers argued that the ban on the steel-jaw leghold trap was unconstitutional because it was a deprivation of their land, business, and property rights. Messrs. Fiore, Sanborne, and Williams demonstrated to the court that, since the statute banned all "steel-jaw leghold type" traps, the ban applied to the padded steel-jaw leghold trap. In effect, we argued that the trappers' claims were specious and designed to allow the use of a device that had already been banned. Our attorneys argued the constitutionality claims with equal vigor and persuasiveness, taking the position that the powers of the state allow it to ban the cruel and inhumane leghold trap without infringing upon the constitutional rights of trappers.

Numerous witnesses testified on issues ranging from trap construction and operation to legislative intent. Always, we were mindful that Judge Farrell was a local judge and that Salem was a trapping county. Often, we thought that our attorneys, witnesses, and legal points were receiving short shrift.

So, we were overwhelmed and ecstatic when, on October 3, 1986, Judge Farrell ruled that we were basically right. He decided, first, that the padded leghold trap was banned by the statute and thus could not be used. He also ruled that the law was not unconstitutional—ruling, in effect, that trappers did not have a constitutional right to make money while causing inhumane and cruel treatment of animals. For Nina Austenberg and New Jersey animal protectionists, the trial was the apex of more than twenty years of work on trap-ban legislation. For The HSUS, FOA, and all humanitarians, it was quite a victory.

All of that is the good news. The bad news is that the trappers have appealed. Soon, we'll all be back in court.

-Dick Randall

HSUS staff members Dr. John Grandy (left) and Nina Austenberg confer with attorney William Fiore during trap-ban trial last summer.
Profile of a Pigeon Shoot

Labor Day Leads to Death for Thousands of Pigeons in Hegins, Pennsylvania’s Shooting Gallery

by Guy R. Hodge

For fifty-two years, the citizens of Hegins, Penn., have celebrated Labor Day with a town picnic that attracts 6,000 people from the state and across the country. The holiday celebration is quite an accomplishment for a rural town of 900 residents in the eastern foothills of the Appalachian Mountains. It is not food or companionship that attracts a crowd to Hegins. It is the Fred Coleman Memorial, a marksmanship competition in which gunners take aim at live pigeons. In between the social chatter and carnival games, some 6,500 pigeons are killed for fun and profit.

Pigeon shooting is a relic from our not-so-distant past. The earliest live pigeon shoots date to the 1880s, about the time repeating shotguns were developed. Flyer shoots, as such events are called by aficionados, evolved into modern trap and skeet shooting—except in places such as Hegins, where some people apparently still thrill to the spray of blood and feathers as pigeons are gunned down in the name of sport.

Over the years, the Labor Day shoot has earned about $250,000. The money has been used to equip the city park with playground equipment, to build the community swimming pool, and, of course, to finance the Fred Coleman Memorial, which is promoted as the largest one-day flyer shoot in the world.

The art of blasting pigeons to oblivion is serious business in Hegins. The town park is equipped with bleachers, a public-address system, rest rooms, an office, and wooden umpires’ chairs. Actually, two contests are held on Labor Day. The Fred Coleman Memorial is open to all shooters with double-barreled shotguns, while the Pennsylvania Single Barrel Championship is open only to residents of the Keystone State. Each competition consists of a series of events with titles such as “Last 9 Miss & Out” that are conducted according to a strict code of rules.

Five shooting stations ring Hegins Park. A contestant stands at the firing line, a distance of from twenty-one to thirty-four yards from a row of small metal “release boxes,” each containing a live pigeon. A string runs from each box to the scorer’s table. At the appointed moment, the shooter shouts “Pull!” and an official tugs on a cord, collapsing the sides of a box and freeing the pigeon. The shooter is allowed one shot to down the bird (two shots in double-barreled contests) before it clears a boundary marked by a wire mesh fence. One by one, the release boxes fall open. Many of the birds are bewildered and never take flight. They are gunned down while still standing on the ground.

Some of the pigeons are killed instantly; others are wounded and flutter about on the ground. Once a round of shooting is completed, squads of teenage boys, each paid $28 for the day, dash into the fields to collect bodies and kill the wounded birds.

From dawn to dusk, the shooting continues, and, through it all, people gather in the park to eat barbecued chicken, chat with neighbors, and wager on carnival games. The sights, smells, and sounds of the shooting don’t seem to bother anyone in the crowd. They continue with their partying as dead and dying birds fall to the ground nearby.

The people of Hegins have kept pretty much to themselves about their Labor Day festivities. The Fred Coleman Memorial is a major social event in Hegins, but most Americans had never heard of the event before the HSUS and the Pennsylvania Animal Protector’s Association (PAPA) undertook their investigation.

The Fred Coleman Memorial dates to 1934, but Pennsylvania laws against cruelty to animals were first enacted in 1860. In theory, these statutes prohibit the flagrant mistreatment of animals. Title 18, Subsection 5511.(c) of the Pennsylvania Crimes Code states that “A person commits a summary offense . . . if he wantonly or cruelly ill treats, overloads, beats, or otherwise abuses any animal, whether belonging to himself or otherwise, or abandons any animal, or deprives any animal of necessary sustenance, drink, shelter or veterinary care . . . .”

The language of the Pennsylvania law does not differ substantially from anti-cruelty statutes in other states. Courts in those jurisdictions have consistently found that pigeon shoots violate state statutes against cruelty to animals. Just recently, the attorney general of Arizona ruled that the organizers and contestants in pigeon shoots could be prosecuted under state anti-cruelty statutes. But in Penn-
sylvania, which sells more hunting licenses than any other state, many residents still consider pigeon shooting to be a sport. Some legal scholars believe that the Pennsylvania Crimes Code may not apply to flyer shoots. There is nothing in the law explicitly pertaining to pigeon-shooting contests. The Crimes Code does, however, expressly prohibit the shooting of homing pigeons. It is the absence of a similar provision protecting feral pigeons that raises doubt as to whether flyer shoots are prohibited by the state anti-cruelty laws.

The organizers of the Fred Coleman Memorial claim that the district attorney for Hegins Township had determined the shoot does not violate the state criminal code and that any attempt to prosecute the sponsors for cruelty to animals would be “unjustified.” The district attorney’s opinion makes the task of halting the Fred Coleman Memorial even more formidable in a state notorious for its partiality toward hunters.

The district attorney is responsible for the prosecution of suspected violations of the Crimes Code. Without his cooperation, animal-welfare officials are in a bind. In May of 1985, a humane agent for a local animal-welfare organization, the Humane Enforcement League of Pennsylvania, attempted to prosecute the operator of a pigeon shoot in Upper Hanover Township. The local district attorney’s office declined to prosecute the case and ruled inadmissible, and the defendant was acquitted.

Concerned with the lack of success of these local efforts, staff members from The HSUS and PAPA decided to observe firsthand the 1985 Fred Coleman Memorial. It was immediately apparent to them that this bit of local pageantry is animal abuse mislabeled as sport. The Fred Coleman Memorial is only the final contest in a four-day marathon of pigeon shoots; the killing begins with a pre-Labor Day shoot on Friday morning of the holiday weekend at the nearby Valley View Gun Club. More than 13,000 pigeons lost their lives in Hegins over the 1985 Labor Day weekend.

To describe boys dispatching the birds is to describe total mayhem. Boys grasp birds by the tails and beat the animals against the ground until they are lifeless or crush them under the heels of their shoes. They bend back the birds’ heads until they snap their necks as one might crack a walnut. Boys hold birds by their heads and twirl their bodies in the air until the birds’ necks snap. In 1985, witnesses also watched boys, who, as the day wore on, tired of their chore, abandoned all pretense of dispatching wounded pigeons, and simply tossed them alive into the barrels.

Many of the birds never made it to the firing line. They apparently succumbed from starvation, dehydration, or suffocation. As the wooden and plastic crates crowded with birds were carried to the firing lines, boys would reach in and toss aside the dead and dying birds. These animals may have been held in crates for as long as five days. The crates had been stacked atop one another inside an unventilated truck. It is also questionable whether anyone bothered to offer food or water to the condemned animals for the duration of their ordeal.

There is no ambiguity in the Pennsylvania Crimes Code as to the duty of the organizers to provide care while the pigeons are in their custody. But, like all the spectators, the humane investigators have had access to the crates and trash barrels blocked by a cyclone fence. In court, the burden of proof rests with the prosecution. Without postmortem examinations of the birds, investigators could not conclusively determine the causes of death or show that any of the birds succumbed as a direct result of the negligence of the flyway’s sponsors.

In the week before the 1986 Coleman shoot, the ASPCA and the Hillside SPCA, a local animal-welfare group, jointly petitioned the Court of Common Pleas to block the Hegins Park Association from holding their annual pigeon shoot. The judge denied an injunction without ruling on the merits of the complaint but indicated that he did not think that pigeons were animals under the cruelty statute. The case is still pending.

Other Pennsylvania-based humane groups, led by Trans-Species Unlimited, tried to persuade the shoot organizers to substitute clay pigeons for live ones. When their request to meet with park officials was rebuffed, Trans-Species Unlimited organized a rally. When the citizens of Hegins gathered in the park on Labor Day 1986, as many protestors were present as shooters.

HSUS Mid-Atlantic investigator Rick Abel was also in attendance with notebook and camera. He not only attended the Fred Coleman Memorial but also managed to gain entrance to the Valley View Gun Club and was the only humane official to witness the pre-Labor Day shoot.

It is obvious that current law does not adequately address the use of live pigeons as targets in shooting competitions. The Crimes Code leaves a good deal to the discretion of officials, and many people in central Pennsylvania, including some judicial officials, see nothing wrong with pigeon shoots. Several members of the state legislature, led by Reps. Frank Pistella and Thomas Murphy, have rallied to the plight of pigeons and committed themselves to sponsoring a bill expressly prohibiting pigeon shooting. They have announced plans to introduce a bill when the next session of the legislature convenes this month.

The outcome both in the courts and in the legislature is far from certain. Hunters are an influential lobby in the Keystone State, and, no doubt, they will look with disfavor upon the proposed ban against pigeon shoots.

The folks in Hegins may not understand all the fuss over pigeons. Why should anyone demand that these pigeons be fed and watered when they are going to be shot anyway? No doubt they wonder about our concern over the deaths of the few thousand pigeons killed on Labor Day weekend when similar contests are held throughout the United States, particularly in the South and Southwest. In the view of The HSUS, the Fred Coleman Memorial has come to symbolize the thoughtless killing of animals much as the killing of baby seals in Newfoundland was a rallying point for the humane movement in the 1970s. Flyer shoots represent a perverse form of recreation that humanitarians have disdainfully termed the “shooting gallery” approach to hunting. The HSUS is committed to ensuring that the publicity surrounding the 1986 Fred Coleman Memorial and the resulting public outcry are a giant first step in bringing an end to such practices.

Guy R. Hodge is director of data and information services for The HSUS.
It is heartening to see that so many are coming to understand that reverence for life and environment is not an ethereal concept that detracts from our central focus on other beings but represents the heart and soul of any movement that purports to affirm life. No serious-minded person holds romantic illusions about our small movement leading a misguided nation to the Promised Land, but we must begin to present a compelling case for other creatures within a broader, life-affirming framework—a framework that is comprehensible to a society that legally and morally views nonhumans as little more than chattel.

We now refer to ourselves as an animal-rights movement, and numerous philosophical treatises have been published on the principle of inherent rights, but the reality for other beings remains essentially unchanged: animals have virtually no rights or standing in law and only the barest protection from the most heinous of acts. This is not surprising given that members of our own species are still struggling for basic rights throughout the world, even though the general concept of human rights has been evolving since Roman times and is deeply embedded in our systems of theology, moral philosophy, and jurisprudence. If humans are still not honoring the intrinsic worth of their own species, the salient question becomes, how do we achieve recognition for the rights of other beings?

Animallines fervently believes that the movement’s words will continue to fall on deaf ears so long as those words are articulated within a vacuum. At the risk of appearing...
cynical, it is sheer folly to expect the human animal to relinquish its exploitative control over other animals solely as a result of moral suasion or altruistic concerns, as the use and abuse of animals are deeply ingrained in the economic and social fabric of this society. There is a Kafkaesque dimension to our movement in which we distort reality at times to suit our dreams. For us reasonably to expect a fundamental change in the treatment of animals, the harsh reality is that our ethical precepts must be perceived by the public as benefiting the human community—for history tells us emphatically that profound changes in societal attitudes are predominantly fueled by enlightened self-interest, not altruism.

It is a sad testament to the present state of human affairs that the inherent rights of other beings are not recognized solely by virtue of their existence, for in a more just and rational world, it would not be necessary to link respect for life and environment with human self-interest. Given the current reality, however, if humankind is ever to embrace our planet, we will need to approach that has characterized our species, but also the very existence of humankind is mindlessly severing at an alarming rate. Reasonable people can differ as to the degree of irreparable damage that has already been done to the ecological system, but no thoughtful person can remain oblivious to the relentless assault presently being launched against Nature, Nature’s beings, and Nature’s fragile life-support system.

Our movement responds only to those abuses of animals that are directly before us, and in that we profoundly err, for the widespread poisoning of our earth insidiously erodes the most basic of rights—the right of all species to exist in their natural state. Of course, there is massive suffering in laboratories and on farms that require our urgent attention, but Animalines is talking about a holocaust already well underway in which species upon species is being devastated beyond repair. Humankind has usurped their lands, contaminated their water and food chain, slaughtered them in the name of benevolent management, and systematically destroyed Nature’s precious ecological balance. Is it not the responsibility of an animal-protection/rights movement to address these basic survival issues? The abuses we see in our daily lives, horrendous as they are, are not the surface indications of a much deeper societal pathology—a pathology in which a manifest disregard for life and earth threatens not only other species, but also the very existence of our planet.

Nature is talking to us, but we are not listening. As a result, her many warning signs have largely gone unheeded. Humankind continues to go about its merry way, busily engaged in more “important” endeavors, seemingly unconcerned about the troubled earth. Even within the animal-protection movement, talk of ozone layers, tropical rain forests, and topsoil erosion appears to many as being far removed from the tragic plight of animals; however, if we cannot see the interwoven pattern amongst all the natural elements of this world, and if we cannot communicate the critical interrelationship between all things and the earth that sustains life, then we are left with only isolated threads. The general public must come to understand that its fate is interlocked with all the life forms that share this earth, for we are all nourished by Nature’s bounty and ultimately subject to her laws. The magical harmony of Nature is indivisible, and, if we irreparably destroy any part of her symmetry, we destroy all of it.

Spinoza spoke of the oneness of our universe three centuries ago, and his words take on additional meaning at this point in history. Our movement has a powerful story to tell, but it need not be a grim message full of sacrifice and gloom, as there is boundless joy and satisfaction to be derived from living in concert with Nature’s wisdom and splendor. We have a nation full of people who are desperately seeking some semblance of balance in their lives, and Nature is the supreme teacher of harmony. In replenishing what we as a species have taken from Nature, we also replenish ourselves, for Nature invariably returns what she receives.

The Center for the Respect of Life and Environment was created by The Humane Society of the United States to move beyond the fragmented approach that has characterized our movement’s history for over a century and to begin painting a broader portrait that conveys the devastation we are inflicting on our earth, other creatures, and ourselves—not in negative terms, but through outreach efforts designed to create an inviolable circle of life.

Edward S. Duvin is director of The HSUS’s Center for the Respect of Life and Environment and editor of the center’s publication Animalines.
Good-bye, Ninety-Nine

As the 100th Congress opens, let's take a last look at the accomplishments of its predecessor, the ninety-ninth. The past two years have been one of the most active legislative periods affecting animal protection in recent memory.

Four pieces of legislation were enacted, beginning with passage of the Manpower Act in October of 1985. This measure makes federal funds available to veterinary schools for the development of programs to train laboratory animal personnel in humane care and alternatives.

One month later, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Authorization became law, requiring all federally funded research facilities to establish animal-care committees to oversee experimentation. The members of such committees must include a veterinarian as well as an individual from outside the institution who represents the concerns of the animal-welfare community.

In December of 1985, President Reagan signed the Omnibus Drug Bill, which included provisions to establish animal-care committees in biomedical laboratories. The new law improves conditions for millions of animals by mandating exercise for dogs, special protection for primates, and stringent use of painkillers.

Finally, in October of 1986, an omnibus drug bill was enacted, amending the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration Authorization. The new law ensures that animals used in psychological research and alcohol and drug abuse studies are afforded the same protections as are included in the NIH authorization.

In 1986, we welcomed the dissolution of the North Pacific Fur Seal Treaty—an international agreement that required U.S. participation in the commercial slaughter of more than 22,000 fur seals on Alaska’s Pribilof Islands. Thanks to a deluge of mail from you, forty-four senators signed on to a letter to Secretary of State George P. Shultz stating their opposition to the treaty’s ratification. Because all treaties must pass the Senate with a two-thirds majority, we saw an end to the commercial harvest. This victory could not have been achieved without the grassroots efforts of HSUS members.

We achieved substantial success in appropriations for fiscal year 1987. The house and senate agriculture subcommittees saw fit to increase funding for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service—the agency charged with enforcing the Animal Welfare Act. President Reagan had proposed that no money be provided for that agency’s inspections of laboratories, zoos, circuses, and puppy mills. Thanks in part to your letters, however, the House and Senate not only restored funding to the 1986 level ($4.8 million) but added another $1.25 million for program expansion and the establishment of an alternatives center at the National Library of Medicine.

Congress recently directed the Environmental Protection Agency to spend some $16 million on the development of alternatives. This allocation represents an important step toward ending the suffering for millions of laboratory animals used in toxicity testing.

Unfortunately, a similar success was not realized for wild horses and burros on public lands. Although the Interior Department appropriations bill provided no money for more roundups of wild horses until the backlog of animals had been adopted from their holding pens, the House caved in to the wishes of the Senate and allocated another $17.5 million for the continued removal of these creatures from public rangelands.

We brought other important legislation to the attention of lawmakers, greatly enhancing those measures’ chances for passage in the upcoming session. H.R. 4871, the Pet Protection Act, introduced by Rep. Robert J. Mrazek of New York, did not make it out of the House Subcommittee on Health and Environment. However, this anti-pound-seizure bill attracted sixty cosponsors. We’re looking forward to its reintroduction this month.

No action was taken on the Endangered Species Act, which authorizes protection for threatened and endangered wildlife; the Kangaroo Protection Act; another Mrazek bill designed to halt the import of kangaroo products into the United States; or H.R. 1809 and S. 2151, bills to end the use of the steel-jaw leghold trap.

Unfortunately, despite what appeared to be almost certain passage, S. 2611, a bill to reduce the number of marine animals accidentally drowned in drift nets, faced stumbling blocks in the Senate and was never voted on.

We can take pride in the accomplishments of the last two years and hope for the upcoming session. With the continued support of our members, our legislative activities should face a promising future.
$16 Million Mandate

After many months of behind-the-scenes lobbying, The HSUS's hard work has paid off. As the Ninety-ninth Congress drew to a close, a joint senate-house conference committee passed language that directs the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to spend a record $16 million for the development of non-animal alternatives for use in toxicity tests. This directive represents an unparalleled breakthrough for millions of animals used in product-safety testing.

By joining forces with the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and engaging the services of former Massachusetts senator Paul E. Tsongas and his principal associate, Dennis Kanin, we were able to make a big push for congressional support of alternatives. Our team spent many hours with researchers from the National Institutes of Health, Food and Drug Administration, EPA, and the Johns Hopkins Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing in an effort to gain a better picture of current in-house searches for reliable alternatives. Using this information, we then approached EPA, requesting that a specific amount of money be set aside from the agency's research and development budget for the exploration of alternatives.

Next, we lobbied the House and Senate, gaining the support of key members of Congress, including Sens. Quentin N. Burdick and David Durenberger. Convinced of the need for alternatives, these two legislators approached Sens. Jake Garn and Patrick J. Leahy, the chairman and ranking minority member of the senate appropriations subcommittee that funds EPA. Sens. Garn and Leahy agreed to include alternatives language in the appropriations bill. The entire lobbying process had to be carried out quickly and quietly for fear the research community would mobilize opposition, despite the noncontroversial nature of this measure.

Why did we single out EPA in our efforts to encourage the development of alternatives? First, EPA is the federal agency responsible for the testing of all substances found in the environment that may adversely affect human health. It sets the standards that guide chemical manufacturers in their testing of new products. Ultimately, EPA has final regu-
latory approval over all chemicals set to be released on the market.

Second, we recognized that EPA's current testing methods were not only cruel and wasteful but also altogether too costly and time-consuming. Live animals are expensive to purchase and maintain, and most animal-test results are not apparent for two to three years. EPA has found it virtually impossible to keep up with the enormous number of pesticides that must be tested before being made available to the public. At present, there are more than 20,000 potentially toxic substances and 3,500 pesticides on—or in route to—the market that have never been adequately tested for human safety.

Compared to animal tests, alternative testing methods such as cell cultures and computer models are not only less expensive, but also much faster. In fact, if a full-scale alternatives testing program were developed and implemented, it has been estimated that EPA could catch up with the backlog of untested substances in seven years.

The report recently issued by the conference committee specifies that EPA should investigate particular testing methods, including cell-tissue- and organ-culture technology, and that funds should be used for computer simulations of living systems. It goes on to emphasize that the objectives of EPA's research should be to 1) develop more efficient and economical methods of testing without a loss of statistical accuracy; 2) target specific tests for which alternatives would be most desirable; and 3) eliminate unnecessary animal testing (emphasis added).”

Under the directive, EPA is also required to report to Congress at the beginning of fiscal year 1988 on its progress. In this way, Congress is guaranteed that its demands are being met.

Finally, and of greatest significance to the animal-welfare community, the report language stipulates that a record $16 million be spent strictly for EPA's development of alternatives. When Congress asked EPA to step up its research into alternatives, that agency protested that it was already spending millions on such a program. Congress then directed EPA to substantiate not only its current program, but also the way it would actually spend $16 million.

Please let these supportive legislators and their colleagues know how vital their efforts have been for millions of lab animals used in brutal toxicity tests each year. Encourage them to be diligent in ensuring that EPA carries out the mandate. Explain that, in addition to Congress's directive, we would like to see a specific, long-term program authorized and established for this research.

Write The Hon. Edward P. Boland, Chairman, Subcommittee on HUD/IA Appropriations, H-143 Capitol Bldg., Washington, DC 20515; The Hon. Bill Green, Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on HUD/IA Appropriations, 1110 Longworth House Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20515; The Hon. Jake Garn, Chairman, Subcommittee on HUD/IA Appropriations, 123 Dirksen Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20510; The Hon. Patrick J. Leahy, Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on HUD/IA Appropriations, 196 Dirksen Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20510; The Hon. Quentin N. Burdick, 511 Hart Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20510; and The Hon. David F. Durenberger, 375 Russell Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20510.

It is also essential to put pressure on EPA to make certain that the agency carries through as instructed by Congress. Your letters will be instrumental in the successful implementation of this program. Write The Hon. Lee M. Thomas, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Room W1200, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460.

Revamped and Realistic

The Information Dissemination and Research Accountability Act, introduced by Rep. Robert G. Torricelli of New Jersey, was recently amended to lower the cost of its implementation, making its passage a more realistic goal. The original bill, introduced as H.R. 1145, was intended to reduce the amount of duplicative research taking place by 1) transcribing and storing—in full text form—all biomedical information at the National Library of Medicine and 2) translating all foreign-language information at the library into English. The cost of such a massive undertaking was projected at between two and six billion dollars.

In the closing days of the Ninety-ninth Congress, Rep. Torricelli reintroduced an amended version of the bill that reduced the costs considerably. The amended bill, H.R. 5486, would require the National Library of Medicine to 1) transcribe and store only that information acquired after January 1, 1960, and 2) translate into English only that foreign biomedical information acquired after enactment of H.R. 5486.

United Action for Animals, the organization that helped draft the legislation, supports the amendment, stating, "Although small concessions made in H.R. 5486 are expected to substantially reduce the cost of implementing the bill, they in no way compromise its intent. . . . We have no doubt that the new bill will make sufficient amounts of full-text biomedical literature readily and economically available to the research community so [it] can find out what has been done before.” The HSUS supports this new legislation and looks forward to its reintroduction during the 100th Congress.
International Activities Close Institute's Year

During the last three months of 1986, the institute's director, Dr. Michael W. Fox, lectured at Tufts University's School of Veterinary Medicine in Massachusetts on the subjects of animal welfare, animal rights, and veterinary ethics. He also addressed the press in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, before the World Cat Show, on the behavior and care of cats and the problems of inbreeding, especially for show purposes. Dr. Fox exchanged views with several academicians from various Dutch universities at a meeting at the University of Leiden and advised them on setting up an institute for the study of animal problems in their country. The provisional plan will be to seek government support and make research and teaching in the area of animal welfare an integral part of university curricula.

Dr. Fox also attended the World Wildlife Fund's conference in Assisi on Religion, Ethics, and Conservation. The world's religions have been relatively silent in response to man's mistreatment of animals and nature, and a religious perspective on these ethical concerns has been long overdue. One concern that evoked considerable discussion was the impact of meat-based agriculture and the worldwide expansion of the beef-cattle industry on wildlife populations and habitats.

Ms. Linda Mickley, the institute's research associate and co-editor of Advances in Animal Welfare Science, has left the staff. We welcome Ms. Cynthia Kline to the institute as research assistant. She comes to us with a master's degree in animal behavior from the University of Maryland and a strong commitment to help advance the science and philosophy of animal welfare and protection.

NAAHE Hits the Road for Education

Twelve workshops in two weeks? The staff of the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) just can’t say no to a chance to talk to educators! This marathon began with two workshops at The Humane Society of the United States annual conference in Florida. One of the sessions attracted more than seventy-five participants and featured NAAHE’s “Kids & Kindness” program.

Next, it was on to Wisconsin for workshops at the Wisconsin Federated Humane Societies, Inc. (WFHS) education/communications seminar. NAAHE also provided the keynote address, congratulating the participants on their progress in humane education.

NAAHE presented three teacher workshops at the Wisconsin Education Association (WEA). The presentations were sponsored jointly by WEA and WFHS. Vickie Butts, WFHS education chairwoman, commented, “The three workshops were quite popular, and the NAAHE handouts gobbled up like Swiss chocolates.”

To wrap up this whirlwind of workshops, NAAHE staff conducted a number of sessions at “Animals in Our World: Humane Education Resource Conference,” held in West Greenwich, R.I. NAAHE's participation was made possible by the Rhode Island Foundation. Sharon Rallis, conference coordinator, recently wrote to NAAHE to say, “Your teacher workshop received rave reviews. I'm constantly having positive references to the program as I go into schools for other reasons. Hooray—and thank you!”

Not every two-week period is this busy, but schedules like this one have made it an exciting fall and winter at NAAHE.
Great Lakes

Hang Up the Harness!

In response to a number of complaints lodged by local residents, The HSUS's Great Lakes Regional Office has written the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, asking that it ban its carriage horse operations. Questions have been raised not only about the care of the horses but also about public safety since a carriage passenger was killed in a collision with an automobile on the Ohio River Bridge. Cincinnati is one of a number of cities plagued by problems with a tourist attraction that we believe cannot be safely incorporated into an urban environment.

The Great Lakes office will be happy to help any city in the region looking for assistance in modifying or eliminating its carriage horse operations.

Two Weeks of Control

The Great Lakes office will sponsor a session of the HSUS Animal Control Academy in May. All animal-control facilities and humane societies in the region will receive more details in the mail. Anyone else should contact the Great Lakes office at 735 Haskins St., Bowling Green, OH 43402.

Continuing Education

Program Coordinator Kurt Lapham recently took part in two seminars on dogfighting offered to law-enforcement officials and animal-control personnel in the region. The School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University held a session in September that attracted approximately seventy-five participants, and the Montgomery County (Ohio) Sheriff's Department in Dayton held another, smaller gathering.

Southeast

Uphill in Hillsborough

In October, Circuit Judge Vernon Evans agreed to issue a permanent injunction prohibiting the release of animals from Hillsborough County Animal Control to research laboratories of the University of South Florida.

Plaintiff Philip Snyder, executive director of The Humane Society of Tampa Bay, had testified that "pound seizure" was so objectionable to county residents that 4,000 stray cats and dogs were brought to the humane society shelter annually by people who feared the animals would otherwise be picked up by county animal-control officers and sold for experimentation. He pointed out that pound seizure was in conflict with a county ordinance specifying that animals from the county facility only be redeemed by their owners, adopted, or humanely euthanatized.

Southeast Regional Director Marc Paulhus testified that Hillsborough County Animal Control provided the university with healthy, young, friendly animals—those most suitable for adoption into loving homes. During an inspection of the facility in 1983, Mr. Paulhus noted that some of the best animals were segregated in holding pens for the researchers to acquire but were denied the opportunity for adoption.

Sadly, this heartening legal victory may be overturned by the Hillsborough County Commission. On November 19, 1986, the commission unanimously voted, at the urging of the University of South Florida researchers, to draft a new ordinance that specifically permits pound seizure. (A public hearing on the new ordinance was scheduled for January 5, 1987.) The commission decided to appeal the court-imposed injunction as well.

Hillsborough County is the last remaining Florida animal-control facility to send former pets to research labs. Animal protectionists' fight there, unfortunately, is not over yet.

Starting Over

During a December planning meeting, the Southeast Regional Office and South Carolina animal-protection and -control organizations drafted legislative proposals to upgrade inadequate and outdated animal-cruelty codes.

Although, collectively, these groups have spent two years lobbying for better state laws and higher penalties against animal abuse, only a felony dogfighting law has been passed by the South Carolina General Assembly.

Now that a new general assembly is convening, we must begin again. Please help us by becoming part of this campaign. Legislators must learn from their constituents that animal issues are a high priority.

Turning the Clock Back?

Florida's new felony cockfighting law, which took effect October 1, 1986, is already under attack. The Florida Animal Fighting Act is regarded as one of the strongest in the nation. Not surprisingly, it has drawn the fire of cockfighters and some politicians.

Recent shifts of power in Florida's political arena have led The HSUS to expect attempts to legalize cockfighting during the 1987 state legislative session. Several lawmakers who previously opposed our efforts to abolish blood sports now hold positions of leadership in the Florida Senate.

We ask that our Florida members contact their state representatives and senators to seek their promise to resist any attempt to weaken the Florida Animal Fighting Act, Chapter 828.122. Let them know that you expect their vigilance!
New England

Weighty Issues

Throughout the summer and fall months, New England regional staff observed oxen-, pony-, and horse-pulling contests held at agricultural fairs throughout Connecticut. Recently, staff members met with representatives of draft-animal associations, state agricultural agencies, and humane organizations to discuss the use of electric prods, whips, and drugs to enhance the performance of animals forced to pull tons of dead weight in competition. New England Regional Program Coordinator Frank Ribaudo offered several proposals, including drug testing, to prevent injuries to the animals involved. (Although no evidence of drugs has been found in horses tested in Connecticut, the Maine Animal Welfare Board has found substantial evidence of drug abuse in its testing program.)

In response to humane societies' pressure, fair and draft-animal association personnel have promised their support in the fight against these particular abuses.

Bird-Trade Regs Wanted

In a letter to Connecticut's Governor William O'Neill, Regional Director John Dommers has supported the Connecticut Department of Agriculture's request for funding of a staff person to oversee the regulation and sale of exotic birds in the Constitution State.

In 1985, a legislative task force found that, of the 57,000 birds estimated by the pet industry as having been sold in Connecticut in 1984, only 36,699 were accounted for in Agriculture Department files, in spite of regulations requiring health certificates and permits for all birds sold.

The regional office supported legislation in 1986 to enforce effectively the regulation of the sale of wild birds and will do so again in 1987.

Ferret Ban Proposed

The New England Regional Office has joined with the Connecticut Humane Society (CHS) in calling for a ban on the sale of ferrets as pets. Mr. Dommers has been assisting CHS officials in documenting the dangers that ferrets pose to infants and small children. The groups hope to see legislation banning the species as pets introduced early this year.

Last spring, Mr. Dommers testified in opposition to a bill in New Hampshire to legalize the sale of ferrets in that state. Fortunately, that bill failed to pass.

Gulf States

Betting Bad News

Despite the best efforts of humane organizations, Texas has passed a bill that will allow dog and horse racing if citizens vote for it in referendum and local-option elections.

Unable to resist the lure of tax revenue for the troubled Texas economy, state legislators and Gov. Mark White acquiesced to heavy pressure from racing interests during a special legislative session last fall. The Gulf States Regional Office had sent more than 200 personal letters to state senators and representatives and to Gov. White himself, urging that they consider the animal abuse inherent in racing as it is operated in this country. The office issued an action alert to active Texas members, as well. Unfortunately, this effort wasn't enough to turn the tide away from pari-mutual betting. Since the racing industry itself—aware that optimistic racing-revenue projections have consistently failed to materialize in other states—has shifted its argument to jobs and away from tax money, it seems inevitable that the Texas lawmakers' hopes for a wind-fall from racing will be disappointed. It's too bad that they won't find out until it is too late to reverse their ill-considered decision.

Fire in the Forest

In November, Regional Director Bill Meade alerted HSUS Texas members to the U.S. Forest Service's burning of 2,500 acres of the Sam Houston National Forest, an attempt to control a pine beetle infestation in the forest's trees. Since the plan to use a napalm-like substance is bound to destroy much of the protected wildlife in the affected area, animal protectionists and conservationists have opposed it. Mr. Meade has called upon forest-service officials to determine whether or not a natural regrowth of the forest would not be the better—and more humane—solution to the beetle problem.

Another Pound Protected

The Gulf States office recently was happy to help the Fort Bend County Humane Society convince the city of Richmond, Tex., to prohibit pound seizure at the city shelter. This decision stopped the flow of animals for experimentation from the facility to Texas A&M University.
Animal protectionists picket the fund-raiser sponsored by Kansans for Pari-Mutuel.

**Midwest**

**Fund-Raiser Fizzles**

Members of The HSUS, The Humane Society of Greater Kansas City, and People for Animal Rights gathered recently to protest "An Evening at the Races," sponsored by Kansans for Pari-Mutuel (betting). The event was held to raise money for a campaign to support the passage of a constitutional amendment legalizing horse and dog racing in the Cornhusker State.

Organizers had originally prepared a program that would show videotapes of actual races and allow participants to wager fake money. The gambler’s "winnings" were then to be exchanged for prizes. However, the state attorney general prohibited the awarding of prizes under state gambling laws.

The fund-raiser was far from a smashing success: there appeared to be more people outside protesting than inside gambling. Pari-mutuel supporters credited the protest and adverse media coverage with their poor turn-out.

Regional Director Wendell Maddox was interviewed by a local television station during the protest. "The state’s desire to raise needed revenue is not sufficient justification for the abuse and suffering by the animals involved in the sport," he told reporters.

**Judge Rules for Trappers**

For more than thirty years, Daniel Miller trapped minks, raccoons, red foxes, beavers, opossums, and coyotes in Town and Country, Mo.

In January of 1986, the city council of Town and Country, in an effort to preserve and protect wildlife, passed an ordinance outlawing trapping. Mr. Miller, who is president of the Missouri Trappers Association, and the trappers association itself filed suit against the city and the state attorney general. In his suit, Mr. Miller held that the Missouri constitution empowers the state conservation commission, not local governments, to control and manage wildlife in the state. Mr. Miller contends, therefore, that the trapper's license issued to him by the state grants him the right to trap along roads owned by the state highway department.

On November 14, the circuit judge of St. Louis County granted a temporary injunction in favor of the trappers that will remain in effect until the end of the trapping season. The case will go to trial sometime between now and November. Mr. Maddox is slated to testify against the trappers' interests at that time.

**Iowa Listens**

Fifty representatives of Iowa animal-welfare groups attended the Iowa Federation of Humane Societies annual conference, held recently in Ames, Iowa. Mr. Maddox led workshops on humane treatment and housing for animals, then, as keynote speaker at the federation dinner, addressed the issue of recruitment and coordination of volunteers.

**On the Agenda**

Around the region, many organizations are preparing their agenda for the coming legislative session. Iowa groups have targeted the abolition of pound seizure as their priority. Organizations in Missouri will be working to outlaw all forms of inhumane trapping. Kansans are preparing for the reintroduction of a bill to provide state licensure for everyone working in private or commercial animal-care facilities. This measure passed both houses but fell victim to the governor’s veto at the end of the last legislative session.

**North Central**

**Minnesota Groups Organize**

Late last fall, organizations from throughout Minnesota met to form a new statewide federation, the Minnesota Federated Humane Societies.

The need for better organization among the state's groups had been underscored when the Minnesota State Humane Society ceased its operations early last year. North Central Regional Director Frantz Dantzler told the group, meeting in St. Cloud, that much could be accomplished by the new organization. He also gave a presentation on the proper way to conduct cruelty investigations.

The federation will assist humane societies with humane education, cruelty investigations, and legislation. Other priorities will be established in future meetings.

**Animal Dealer Charged**

A Wisconsin dealer has been charged with sixteen violations of the Animal Welfare Act that reportedly occurred during 1985. Ervin Stebane of Kaukauna, Wis., is a USDA-licensed animal dealer for dogs, cats, and wildlife.

During a recent oral hearing in Oshkosh, charges lodged against Mr. Stebane in 1986 were added to those linked to alleged violations during the previous year. Both the Outagamie Humane Society in Appleton and the Alliance For Animals in Madison have been instrumental in bringing complaints about this facility to the attention of the authorities.

A decision on the case was expected in mid-December.
Susa Frederick leads a session on direct-mail marketing for the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office's fund-raising workshop.

Mid-Atlantic

Getting It Together

Mid-Atlantic Regional Program Coordinator Rick Abel joined HSUS Director of Data and Information Services Guy Hodge and Field Investigator Bob Baker at the conference of the Federated Humane Societies of Pennsylvania. Held in Wilkes-Barre and hosted by the SPCA of Luzerne County, the meeting attracted more than 100 participants.

The Mid-Atlantic Regional Office expected 30 participants for its workshop entitled "Fund Raising: The Art of Asking" and was pleasantly surprised when 57 individuals from New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania registered to attend. Partially funded by St. Hubert's Giralda and Animal Welfare and Education Center, this full day included sessions on direct-mail marketing, proposal writing and grantsmanship, locating funding sources, and operating thrift shops.

Current plans are to offer a workshop entitled "Euthanasia: The Human Factor" at the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office in Convent Station, N.J., on February 6 and 7, 1987. Led by Hurt "Bill" Smith, director of The HSUS's Animal Control Academy, the program will concentrate on learning to deal with stress related to euthanasia. All those who wish further information should contact the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office at (201) 377-7111.

Trap Ban in Suffolk?

Steel-jaw leghold traps would be banned in Suffolk County, N.Y., under a bill approved by the county legislature.

The bill, approved over the objections of trappers and sportsmen's groups, sets a penalty of $250 for having or selling the devices, the most commonly used traps in the county.

Dr. John Grandy, HSUS vice president of wildlife and environment; Cathy Hiss of the Society for Animal Protective Legislation; and Samantha Mullen, a spokeswoman for the New York State Humane Association, testified on behalf of the ban.

This testimony and the overwhelming public support supplied largely and tirelessly by HSUS members had a major impact on the position of legislators on this important matter.

Stakes Raised in Dog Death

After his case came to the attention of The HSUS and other concerned groups, a Grass Valley, Calif., cattle-ranch foreman has been charged with a felony in connection with the beating death of a champion show dog.

James E. Gates is accused of using heavy boards and his six dogs to kill "Cajun Blue," a catahoula belonging to Dan and Ruth Brown of Grass Valley. Mr. Gates was quoted as telling investigators that he killed the dog after it chased a calf and that he had previously shot at least four other dogs. Although roaming dogs have created problems for livestock operators in rural county foothills, two ranch hands who witnessed the killing told investigators Mr. Gates's act was not justified.
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MOVING?

If you have moved, or are planning to, please send us this coupon so we can correct our mailing list. Attach your present mailing label below, then print your new address. Mail to: The HSUS, 2100 L St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

New Address:

Name ________________________________

Address ________________________________

City ________________________________

State __________________ Zip __________

Attach present mailing label here
First Steps Toward More Protection of Turtles

Trachemys scripta elegans, better known as the red-eared turtle, a popular fixture of many American households until 1975, may win a much-needed respite from the commercial exploitation it has endured at the hands of U.S. turtle farmers.

In April of 1986, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service announced its plans to develop proposals for the United States, a party to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), to amend Appendices I and II of that treaty, and requested comments from the public.

In response, The HSUS submitted a petition to the FWS requesting that the red-eared turtle be included in Appendix II (a listing of animals the continuing trade in which should be strictly regulated so as to avoid utilization incompatible with the species' survival), even though the red-eared turtle is not yet endangered. Although, in 1975, the Food and Drug Administration banned the sale within the U.S. of all turtles with a carapace (shell) length of less than four inches, the sale of larger turtles within the U.S. and the mass export of turtles of any size remain unregulated. The export trade in red-eared turtles involves three to four million animals each year.

The HSUS's petition, submitted in September in support of the petition of the International Wildlife Coalition, cataloged the major reasons why the inclusion of the red-eared turtle in this appendix is so important: first, U.S. turtle farmers take an estimated 100,000 red-eared turtles from the wild each year to replace captive stock unable to survive the artificial living conditions on turtle farms. This relentless tapping of the wild populations has many conservationists concerned. Second, the farming and marketing methods utilized by the U.S. turtle industry are inhumane, since they are not geared to the turtle's natural habitat and life cycle and cause needless debilitation and mortality. Third, because of the well-documented association of salmonellosis with turtles, the United States, by exporting turtles, is, in effect, exporting this disease.

Hunter-Harassment Act Target of Suit

A suit supported by The HSUS has been filed in the United States District Court in Connecticut challenging the constitutionality of that state's "Hunter-Harassment Act." This act makes it a criminal offense to harass or interfere with another person who is engaged in the lawful taking of wildlife or in the preparation thereof. The suit, which names several state law-enforcement officials as defendants, seeks declaratory relief pronouncing the act unconstitutional; calls for an injunction to prohibit future enforcement of the act; and claims monetary damages.

The plaintiff, Francelle Dorman, lives on property bordering a state forest containing marshland frequented by a variety of waterfowl. Distressed by the sounds of gun-shotss ringing day and night and by the sight of dead or injured birds being dragged along the road bordering the marsh, Ms. Dorman approached and spoke with several hunters in the marsh in an attempt to convince them to abandon their hunting plans. She spoke of the violence and cruelty of hunting and of the beauty of the waterfowl and their right to live peacefully and without harm. The hunters informed her that what she was doing was unlawful and that she could get arrested for it. When Ms. Dorman refused to leave the marsh, insisting upon her right of access to the marsh and waterfowl, one of the hunters summoned an officer, who arrested her for violating the hunter-harassment act.

Ms. Dorman's suit charges that the Connecticut law is unconstitutional because it is so vague that it does not provide clear notice to the public of what behavior is considered criminal, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment, and because it is overbroad, in that it forbids activity protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, resulting in a chilling effect upon plaintiff's exercise of freedom of expression. Ms. Dorman is represented by Beck & Elder, a Manchester, Conn., firm that has donated its services in this case.

Pit Bull Ordinance Upheld

A federal court in Pennsylvania recently dismissed a suit brought by pit bull owners who sought to void an ordinance enacted by the Township of Chester regulating the keeping of pit bull terriers. The ordinance required pit bull keepers to buy licenses for fees ranging from $500 to $3000, post a $20,000 bond to cover injuries caused by their dogs, and keep their dogs securely confined (and keep them leashed and muzzled when not confined); subjected any pit bull running loose to police action; and provided for destruction or removal from the town­ship of a dog attacking a person.

The pit bull owners challenged the ordinance on constitutional grounds, asserting that it was discriminatory in applying only to pit bulls and not to any other breed of dog and, thus, violated plaintiffs' rights to equal protection.

In its discussion, the court alluded to evidence of pit bulls chasing residents, including police, and to testimony that pit bulls bite to kill without signal. The court concluded that the township could reasonably determine that pit bulls were dangerous and that the Constitution does not require the township to regulate every dangerous kind of animal at the same time in the same way.

Law Notes are compiled by HSUS General Counsel Murdaugh Stuart Madden and Associate Counsel Roger Kindler.
Visit James Herriot Country, North Yorkshire, England

Experience the Sights and Sounds in the Area Where the BBC Filmed "All Creatures Great and Small"

"It can truly be said that American readers of James Herriot's books have found in him and his relationship with animals the attributes of a modern-day St. Francis of Assisi. His sensitivity, caring, and genuine affection for these creatures have awakened in literally thousands of persons an appreciation and regard for animals not previously experienced. By no means a crusader for 'animal rights,' this gentle man has nonetheless perhaps done more to promote a genuine appreciation and caring for animals than any other single individual throughout the world." — John A. Hoyt, President, The Humane Society of the United States

**Departure Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Start/End</th>
<th>Optional Cities</th>
<th>Tour Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>19-26, 1987</td>
<td>Chester/Stratford</td>
<td>$1,187.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>31-June 7, 1987</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>$1,277.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>21-28, 1987</td>
<td>Chester/Lake District</td>
<td>$1,267.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>19-26, 1987</td>
<td>Chester/Lake District</td>
<td>$1,267.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>16-23, 1987</td>
<td>Chester/Stratford</td>
<td>$1,237.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>13-20, 1987</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>$1,277.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>11-18, 1987</td>
<td>Chester/Stratford</td>
<td>$1,187.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Price is per person, double occupancy, departing from New York's Kennedy Airport to Manchester, England. Prices from other gateway cities are available on request.

**Itinerary:**

- **Day 1:** Sunday — Depart U.S.
- **Day 2:** Monday — Arrive Manchester, England
- **Day 3:** Tuesday — Optional City Tour
- **Day 4:** Wednesday — Optional City Tour
- **Day 5:** Thursday — Begin Herriot Trail Tour
- **Day 6:** Friday — Herriot Trail Tour
- **Day 7:** Saturday — York Tour
- **Day 8:** Sunday — Return U.S.

**Included in the price of this tour:**
- Six nights' accommodations at superior tourist-class hotels, all with private bath.
- Full English breakfast and dinner daily, plus lunch at Simonstone Hall.
- Touring aboard a comfortable, modern coach.
- Escort throughout, plus local guides.
- Sightseeing and entrance fees as indicated.
- Autographed copy of Dr. Herriot's book (one per couple).
- All hotel service charges, local taxes, hotel tips, and baggage handling.
- Travel bag and document wallet.
- One-year membership in The Humane Society of the United States.

TOUR OF JAMES HERRIOT COUNTRY

- **Desired date:**
- **Second choice:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (1)</th>
<th>Passport Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name (2)</td>
<td>Passport Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone (Home)</th>
<th>(Office)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deposit of $150.00 per person</th>
<th>(Balance due sixty days prior to departure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tour price:</th>
<th>per person, double occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air required from:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Mail coupon to:
The Corporate Travel Center, Inc.
1210 Kenesaw Avenue
Knoxville, TN 37919
Phone: TN (615) 323-8989
Phone: US 1-800-654-7086

☐ Send insurance information
☐ Non-Smoking
☐ Smoking
☐ Vegetarian
☐ Non-Vegetarian
☐ Send departure information
County Humane Society stated, “It was because of The HSUS’s interest and Ms. Drennon’s letter to the D.A. that the charge was raised to the felony level, and we are thankful.” The West Coast Regional Office will continue to monitor the case.

Who Says Local Government Doesn’t Care?

Surely not the residents of Berkeley, Calif. The director of parking enforcement for the city directed his twenty officers during the summer months to put HSUS summer-warning fliers on every car they saw containing a dog. Our thanks to City of Berkeley Animal Control Director Kathy Flood, who said she was “thrilled” to have the help for her four officers.

“Western States Vice”

In September, West Coast Investigator Eric Sakach was a guest speaker at the eleventh annual seminar of the Western States Vice Investigators Association held in Las Vegas, Nev. More than 200 investigators, representing law-enforcement agencies in the western United States, attended the five-day seminar. Mr. Sakach’s presentation dealt with illegal animal fighting and recommendations for making successful cases.

Lagging Behind in Lebanon

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) APHIS Division has filed a complaint against David Melbye and Dorothy Smith, d/b/a W.D. Kennels in Lebanon, Ore. The complaint alleges numerous violations of the Animal Welfare Act by the individuals as Class B license holders, including failure to permit APHIS personnel access to the property, the presence of dogs and cats without identification, incomplete records, and sanitation and ventilation violations. On three occasions, Mr. Melbye and Ms. Smith were cited for inadequate veterinary care. USDA is asking for a suspension of their license and wants to prohibit respondent Smith from engaging in business subject to the Animal Welfare Act. Unfortunately, this trial, originally to be held in November, was postponed “due to the judge’s calendar.” Having learned conditions at the facility were deteriorating, Ms. Drennon sent a letter to USDA’s Office of General Counsel, asking for immediate action. The hearing is set for February 24.

The West Coast Regional Office has learned that the hearing on James Hickey of S&S Farms, also in Lebanon, Ore., will be heard March 24-27, 1987, in Portland. This is another ridiculous delay in a case involving seventy-one alleged violations of the Animal Welfare Act.

Mr. Hickey and Ms. Smith are the largest animal dealers on the West Coast supplying animals to research institutions. We need support from HSUS members all over the United States to speed resolution of these cases. Write to Daniel Oliver and Chief Administrative Law Judge John Campbells at USDA/APHIS, South Agriculture Building, 14th and Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250.

The only strategy left to us if these cases are not resolved in early 1987 will be to demand a full congressional inquiry. If this drastic step has to be taken, the West Coast Regional Office will supply Congress with documentation of the incredible stalling by the administrators of USDA/APHIS.

Last-Minute Triumph

The disposition of the Rita Roberts case in Hayward, Calif., (see the Summer 1986 HSUS News) involved a recent appellate court holding that, if allowed to stand, would have constituted a legal precedent for returning all animals, no matter how viciously treated, to their owners when those owners are convicted of cruelty. In a last-minute effort to sidestep such a precedent, Ms. Drennon prevailed upon Sen. Dan McCorquodale to amend his S.B. 2330, the only bill still open for amendment at the legislative session’s eleventh hour. Thanks to Sen. McCorquodale, as of January 1, 1987, it became mandatory for all animals involved in cruelty cases to be forfeited to the agency that confiscated them. Judges will be unable to return animals to the people who have abused them. Instead, the animals will have a chance for adoption to loving homes.