James Herriot Award

On Saturday, October 17, The Humane Society of the United States will inaugurate its prestigious James Herriot Award, to be presented annually at its national conference. Established for the purpose of recognizing an outstanding agency or individual who, through communication with the public, has helped to promote and inspire an appreciation of and concern for animals, the James Herriot Award will, on this inaugural occasion, be presented to the noted radio commentator and journalist Paul Harvey.

The idea of honoring veterinarian and author James Herriot by means of an award bearing his name resulted from a conversation that took place between Paul Harvey and myself approximately a year and a half ago. Pursuing this idea, I contacted Dr. Herriot, seeking his permission to create such an award, to which he readily agreed. The concept was finalized during a visit with Dr. Herriot at his home in Thirby Thirsk, England. Little did Mr. Harvey suspect at the time of our conversation several months ago that he himself would be the first recipient of this outstanding award.

Designed and created by the internationally renowned Boehm Company, creators of fine porcelain art, the magnificent statue symbolizing this award depicts six animals representative of those that are the beneficiaries of the veterinary practice of Dr. James Alford Wight, the real-life James Herriot we have come to love and respect through his heartwarming stories and the outstanding PBS television series, "All Creatures Great and Small." This limited-edition statue is being donated to The HSUS by Helen Boehm, president of Boehm, Inc., in memory of her late husband, Edward Marshall Boehm, who with her shared a great respect and affection for the animals of this world, especially birds.

Elsewhere in this magazine you will find information about a very special tour to James Herriot Country during the period of July 26-August 5, 1987, at which time a special edition of this fine porcelain statue will be presented to Dr. Herriot personally by Helen Boehm and myself on behalf of The HSUS. You are invited to join us for this spectacular trip to the countryside and setting in which Dr. Herriot resides and practices and to share a memorable evening with him and his charming wife, Joan.

In the event you may have already registered for one of the previously announced trips, you may choose to elect this trip instead if you so desire. Space is, of course, limited; consequently, reservations will be accepted on a first come, first served basis. All tours announced in the previous issue of The Humane Society News will be conducted but will not include the evening with Dr. and Mrs. Herriot nor be personally hosted by me.

I very much look forward to greeting those who can join us for this special tour to James Herriot Country.
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From Deborah Salem, and Director of Data and from the Dogwriters Association on behalf of The Magazine of the Year been named 1986 Magazine of the tion of America at its annual the fur retailers' association has aban­ doned its ridiculous new name, Fur Magazine of the Year (an honor it to anyone who is familiar with the death and destruction caused wildlife/animals against rabbits in Europe, and similar tests may take place in Pennsylvania if the Food and Drug Administration approves.

Beyond the Genetic Threshold After attending a conference in December held at the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, D.C., HSUS Scientific Director Michael W. Fox reports that, unfor­ tunately, genetic engineering biotechnology is alive and well. One hot topic was the possibility of so-called molecular farming, which would create genetically engineered animals that produce excessive amounts of various biochemical compounds to be used for biomedical and other purposes.

Standing Up to Be Counted HSUS President John A. Hoyt has recommended television personality Bob Barker for his opposition to the use of furs in the Miss USA Pageant. Mr. Barker threatened to walk out on the pageant if contestants wore fur coats at the last minute to ensure Mr. Barker’s participation.

"Your action, demonstrating your personal commitment, provided a valuable public service to the entire animal protection/animal-welfare movement," wrote Mr. Hoyt.

Mr. Barker’s action was publicized in newspapers and on television across the country.

Return of the Roman Circus? What do Jake “The Snake” Roberts and Rick “The Dragon” Steamboat have in common? Both are professional wrestlers who use live animal mascots as part of their acts. Both were involved in incidents in which those animals were allegedly mistreated.

The HSUS has, over the past months, received a number of complaints from viewers of televised events sponsored by the World Wrestling Federation (WWF), which promotes so-called entertainment wrestling, seen across the country. These events, targeted at adults and children, feature as much theatrical hoo-ha as genuine athletic prowess.

In the latest gymnick, Mr. Roberts and Mr. Steamboat allegedly pitted their animal mascots, a box constrictor and a monitor lizard, against one another during a WWF main event. The HSUS has contacted the WWF vice president of promotion in the hope that we can ensure that these in­cidents do not recur.

If you are a fan of professional wrestling and even if you are not, and you witness any mistreatment of animals during wrestling events, please contact David Herbet, captive wildlife specialist, at The HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Africa Bound The Humane Society of the United States is sponsoring a trip to Kenya for its members June 16 – July 1, 1987. The cost is $3,095, inclusive. There are a few spaces available. If you would like more information, call The HSUS at (202) 452-1300, ext. 346, for a brochure.
Sex: Female, Breed: Golden Retriever. Age: Two and a half years.

The female, gray-haired young woman's tears are already smearing her makeup and pushing her guilt button: "She's the basis for his presence. She's really good with kids. I've trained her a little."

The dog sits obligingly and gazes up at me in that trusting, tuned-in way that so many Goldens have. In this situation, that only makes me feel sad, and I look away. "She'll go to a good home—or won't she?" The woman is pleading with her voice now, as well as with the tear-stained eyes in the pale face. She needs to make her problem mine, and so be the lighter for it.

I wince inside and put on my flat, facts-and-figures voice. "Maybe. We get in probably half a dozen Goldens a week. People often want younger dogs.

The woman is crying earnestly now as she signs the form acknowledging that her dog may have to be euthanatized—but still she signs it. She sniffles and, embarrassed, wipes her nose with the hand holding the pen. "She's a really nice dog; it's just that...

Reason for surrender: "She plays too roughly with my older dog."

Sex: Male, Breed: German Shepherd. Age: One and a half years.

"Khan, sit!" The scruffy, wolf-gray powerhouse is whirling on a leash; his visibly tired, dusty owner is reaching the end of some other kind of rope of his own.

"Huh?" the young man snorts scornfully at my "ignorance." "You won't have trouble finding somebody who wants this dog! This dog is a purebred Shepherd! I paid $200 for this dog. I just gotta leave him here because my landlord won't let me keep him—even in my truck."

"Your landlord won't let you keep him?" I'm hoping he's exaggerating.

"He chews everything up."

There is a long moment while this slowly sinks in. The bony, tight face becomes stranger. Khan's owner throws up his hands with the teary eyes in the pale face.

"Khan's owner throws up his hands, and the bony, tight face becomes stranger. The man thinks about this—or about something else—for what seems like a long time; then, wooden-faced, he signs the form.

Reason for surrender: "Landlord won't allow."

Sex: Male, Breed: Labrador Retriever. Age: Four months.

The teenage girl faces me across the counter, the honey-colored puppy casually draped on her arm. "We've had him three weeks, and he chews everything up."

A puppy, and he chews: surprise, surprise. I wonder if people ever get rid of goldfish because they swim. I breathe deeply to grab my flat, facts-and-figures voice.

"You keep him if I told you some ways to stop him from chewing things?"

Reason for surrender: "She's eating the carpet."

"We've had him three weeks, and he chews everything up."

Reason for surrender: "My landlord won't allow."

"We've had him three weeks, and he chews everything up."

"Khan whines, rears up on his hind legs, and peers over the counter with good-natured, but frustrated responses are "I guess" and "Maybe"; those won't fill the boxes. Maybe he was sent here by Dad to do this—to have the dog put down."

"Why?"

The potentially elegant red dog is bony and stands awkwardly. The kid is vague. Something is wrong... some kind of bone problem, I guess. The dog is limping. We're not really sure... Yet said something about maybe some disease.

"Is it something she could outgrow? Have you had another vet look at her? Maybe a second opinion..."

My hopeful suggestions slide off his...
“I don’t care what you do with them. I just hafta get rid of them.”

“Reason for surrender: Euthanization.


“His just too old,” the drab, older woman shrugged with a genial smile.


A young, dark-haired man is on the other side of the counter. A medium-sized, medium-dark dog licks his owner. “I can’t keep her at my apartment,” he says. His rigour sounds real.

“Housebroken!”

No. She’s an outside dog.

I stop writing. “Just so you know. We’ve got so many dogs here. If they’re over a year old and not housebroken, people usually don’t choose them. They wind up being put down.”

“Not! At first his forehead wrinkles in disbelief. ‘She’s a good dog!’ She’d make a great pet for somebody! Frustration begins to set in.

“I know! It’s ironic how many owners say their dogs would be a great pet for somebody, as they are leaving the dogs here because their owners can’t find somewhere else, apparently, not very great enough pets for their owners to keep them.

The man sighs deeply. He bends down and gently rummages the dog’s ears as I finish scrutinizing. His new frustration is now anger: anger at the situation that makes it a problem for him to own a dog, anger at the public for not magically providing someone who will happily relieve him of his duty, untrained adult dog, and anger at her, the problem.

By the way,” he scribbles, the bitterness like acid in his voice, “her name is Freckles.”

“Reason for surrender: Euthanization.


Candie came from the flea market, says her young female owner. Candie’s wrestler’s build and stick, caramel and cream coat came from a Pit Bull; her obvious attentiveness to people comes from the “down-under” side of the family. Candie’s owner lives in a mobile home; kept in the yard. Candie is ripping up the trailer’s skirting. The only solution the owner can see is to leave Candie here. Candie’s owner asks, “Can she go to a good home with plenty of room to run?”

That phrase always makes me bristle. So many people leaving their dogs here seem to think that a “good-home-with-plenty-of-room-to-run” is something that there are drawers behind the counter. People helpfully request “a good-home-with-plenty-of-room-to-run” as though the phrase were all one word, as though it were a cure-all. “I need a tranquilizer,” Fred needs “a good-home-with-plenty-of-room-to-run.”

As though that can take the place of structured exercise, training, attention, and care!


The man has graying, sixties-length black hair, and he matters-fadily pulls up to the counter in a wheelchair. The well-worn, apparent healthy, silver-haired black dog paces calmly beside the chair, seems to trust that she belongs there. She has dignity there.

I’m not used to dealing with wheelchair people. Standing behind the counter, I feel apprehensive, gazing down at him, trapped in the chair. I worry that he sees my freedom as a taunt. Many who come in here do not need much from the counter before they blare into anger. Life has already given this guy plenty to be furious about, and now he is here.

When I look at the dog, irritation and sadness roll over and over each other in my mind. This man must know that nobody is going to adopt a dog that old! How can he be callous enough to leave her here, knowing that—after she has obviously been with him for so long? I shrink at thinking of how her dignity will crumble when she realizes she’s leaving without her.

Maybe he really can keep her. He is in the chair, probably doesn’t have much money. . . . What an assumption! How bigoted can he be? Maybe he has to put her down because she’s old. . . . But she looks healthy. . . . There must be some good reason. After all this time, he must feel wretched about this. . . . I feel wretched about this.

Automatically, I begin filling out the impound form. Try to stay detached. Getting involved just makes me feel worse. It’s not my problem. The man looks a little puzzled as I ask him question after question from the form, but he keeps on answering cooperatively. Sex? Breed? Age? Finally I get to the big one, the one that will make this all final: “Reason for surrender?”

At this, the man’s puzzlement flows away. Amusement tickles the lines in his face toward new directions, and he chuckles. “Surrendered? I’m only here to get proof to the vet that she’s been spayed! I’m moved and lost her records. Surrender her? Not for a billion dollars!!”

A moment for this to compute. Sweet, sweet relief. A lump is in my throat, and the impound form looks blurry. “Not for a billion dollars . . . .”

Steve Granows is director of education for the Humane Society of Santa Clara Valley in California. This article has been reprinted with permission from the Winter 1985 issue of The Humane Society of Santa Clara Valley News.
State-Subsidized Spaying and Neutering: Taking a Giant Step Forward in New Jersey

by Ann Church

It all started in 1983 with the enactment of a law, sponsored by the Hon. Dean Gallo, now a member of the twenty-dollar club, that would subsidize the cost of neutering pets. The law was designed to create a program that would come from fees added to the cost of licensing or registering unneutered dogs. This policy placed the burden for solving the problem on the people who caused it—those with unneutered animals. 

Imagine a program that allows pet owners to have their dogs and cats spayed or neutered for a ten-dollar or twenty-dollar fee; one that stops the state and municipal governments nothing yet will undoubtedly save them tremendous sums in future animal-control costs; one that promotes a healthier life for dogs and cats; one that effectively attacks the dog and cat overpopulation problem; and one that promotes licensing and inoculating dogs and cats. Does this sound like something good to be true—something dreamt of? Animal protectionists and veterinarians alike dream of such a program. The state veterinarians are taking positive steps to placate, negotiate with, or, if necessary, sue humane societies, the New Jersey animal control efforts by requiring that each participating owner must have an animal be properly licensed in order to qualify for the subsidized neutering program.

The New Jersey program was created in 1983 with the enactment of a law that would make the neutering program mandatory. The bill was passed with a vote, and in record time last year. The bill was an amendment to the Animal Population Control Act. The law could be amended to make the neutering program mandatory. The New Jersey law also promotes the neutering program by requiring that each participating owner must have an animal be properly licensed in order to qualify for the subsidized neutering program.

The New Jersey bill also promotes animal control efforts by requiring that each participating owner must have an animal be properly licensed in order to qualify for the subsidized neutering program. The New Jersey bill also promotes animal control efforts by requiring that each participating owner must have an animal be properly licensed in order to qualify for the subsidized neutering program.

The New Jersey bill also promotes animal control efforts by requiring that each participating owner must have an animal be properly licensed in order to qualify for the subsidized neutering program. The New Jersey bill also promotes animal control efforts by requiring that each participating owner must have an animal be properly licensed in order to qualify for the subsidized neutering program.

With an estimated 7.5 million homeless animals facing euthanasia each year and as many as 3,000 dogs and cats born each hour in this country, the tremendous pet overpopulation problem cannot be ignored. New Jersey is showing other states that the only way to deal with the problem is to pass a law that makes the neutering of pets mandatory. With this law, the New Jersey animal health department would welcome, since such animals have a negative impact on human health and safety.

With an estimated 7.5 million homeless animals facing euthanasia each year and as many as 3,000 dogs and cats born each hour in this country, the tremendous pet overpopulation problem cannot be ignored. New Jersey is showing other states that the only way to deal with the problem is to pass a law that makes the neutering of pets mandatory. With this law, the New Jersey animal health department would welcome, since such animals have a negative impact on human health and safety.

With an estimated 7.5 million homeless animals facing euthanasia each year and as many as 3,000 dogs and cats born each hour in this country, the tremendous pet overpopulation problem cannot be ignored. New Jersey is showing other states that the only way to deal with the problem is to pass a law that makes the neutering of pets mandatory. With this law, the New Jersey animal health department would welcome, since such animals have a negative impact on human health and safety.
A Magical Place Called Earth

by Edward S. Duvin

Despite our movement's unfortunate propensity for devouring our own, Animalines has received an extremely thoughtful and supportive response over the years from all the ideological segments of our movement—even those who follow a dissimilar path. While obviously very grateful for this expression of support, Animalines measures its own performance by the same standards we have repeatedly asked others to adopt: how have we taughfully lessened the suffering and furthered the process of seeking fundamental solutions to the underlying causes of abuse and exploitation? As readers of Animalines well know, we continue to champion ideals as the bright source of light available to us. Animalines is often asked how we espouse such a "romantic" philosophy in view of the present state of the world and, invariably, our answer is that we do so very carefully! Fleebe humor aside, the relevance of ideals in an increasingly destructive world is an important question not only for Animalines, but for all of us.

Our movement has historically faced a parade of formidable challenges—most recently, the twin "goals" of science and technology—but none more pervious than the economic considerations that lead to the slaughter of countless animals at the altar of profit. We are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars changing hands through the use and abuse of animals, justified by a convoluted ethic that fails to distinguish between suffering and self-interest. There can be no doubt as to the extraordinary degree animals are woven into the economic fabric of our avaricious society, and one doesn't need to be an economic determinist to grasp the enormity of this reality on societal values. In view of the almost overwhelming number of economic chains that perpetuate the unconscionable enslavement of other beings, the salient question becomes, how can ideals make a significant difference in the midst of such nefariously brutalized brutality? There are no simplistic pathways to nirvana, but the very essence of Animalines's work has been our fervent belief in the capability of every person to make a meaningful difference—not through grandiose programs or dramatic leaps forward, but through the most potent revolutionary force in human history: the power of all of us to create a peaceful revolution within ourselves. For some, this might appear romantic in the extreme, but we implore them to open any history book to any chapter and they will soon discover that the "liberated" moments humankind has known originated not from governmental proclamation or organized reform movements, but from the spiritual forces of ideals carried forth by individuals committed to the vision of a more just world. The capacity lies within each of us to nurture fortile ideals so that they flourish and multiply, ultimately reaching every community in this land. This, then, is the remarkable power of the individual—the power to bring the ideal to life by living the ideal! It's within this context that Animalines has repeatedly pleaded for a return to the non-material behavior within our movement, behavior that, sorrowfully, reflects our lack of tolerance and respect for each other. Beyond the obvious self-destructive nature of this conduct, there is a higher cost to our mindless squabbling—the damage we do as individuals to our own integrity when we lose sight of our personal responsibility to affirm the sanctity of life, in chiding human life! Are we so shallow and lacking in moral vision that we have hopelessly lost our way by violating the very ideals we set out to honor? Even more germane, by what miracle do we expect others to respect profoundly the rich diversity of life on this planet when we so often fail to respect each other? We simply must hold ourselves to a higher standard, a standard that exemplifies the conduct we wish others to follow.

We also need to examine our attitude toward our adversaries, for, like the animals we respect and cherish, our adversaries are also members of the family of life—tragic victims of a virulent disease that has destroyed their capacity for genuine love and compassion. Those who know Animalines understand we make no excuses for the pathological behavior that degrades everything we hold sacred; however, Animalines distinguishes between those whose acts and the individuals who commit them, for while those who brutalize and maim are fully responsible for their reprehensible conduct, they are also victims of a world gone mad that is rapidly devastating the precious life and beauty of our earth. Can we not embrace our adversaries as fellow beings, while at the same time expending every ounce of our energy combating the cancer they spread? We not only can but we must, not just for their sake but for ourselves and the animals we serve—as unconditional love of life is contagious only if we would practice it ourselves! It's in this same vein that Animalines has consistently raised the issue of a compassionate lifestyle regarding dietary and consumer choices, for our personal habits don't reflect the values we seek to convey to others, we run the risk of appearing hypocritical to the public and limiting our possibilities for peaceful change from within. The opportunity to experience the boundless joys from living in concert with all life is a recurrent theme of Animalines. It requires no sacrifice to adopt a cruelty-free lifestyle, since peaceful journeys in cruelty but caring and committed people going forth to ignite the flame of life inside each person? The concept of one earth, one family, is not some romantic fantasy but a biological and ecological reality since, for billions of years, the same life-supporting chemical elements have been recycled from the earth through all living organisms and back to the earth again. If we are ever to succeed in our quest for a just and peaceful earth, each of us must begin to transform animal rights from a abstract expression to a living philosophy—a philosophy spread not by centralized campaigns, but by creating a dynamic for change among people "teaching" people, beginning with ourselves and moving outward to family, friends, and community. We have a compelling story to tell about a magical place called Earth that is being devastated by a desperately troubled species. Let us begin now!

Edward S. Duvin is director of The HSUS's Center for the Hapect of Life and Environment and editor of the center's publication Animalines. Mr. Duvin in­

the populace to understand truly the most literal and fundamental meaning of spiritual: the breath of life. As stated earlier, the movement's limited resources pale in contrast to the powerful forces that oppose us, and the future is bleak if we rely predominantly on conventional methods. However, if we stop thinking in the structured terms of an organized movement and begin seeing ourselves as a peaceful army of individuals committed to living an ideal, then we can impart that ideal to others through the sheer spiritual force of our own example. This is the spirituality Animalines speaks of—the spirituality of life.

How much more we must return the historical lesson that the antidote for hatred and cruelty is not more hatred and cruelty but caring and committed people. It's in this same vein that Animalines has consistently raised the issue of a compassionate lifestyle regarding dietary and consumer choices, for our personal habits don't reflect the values we seek to convey to others, we run the risk of appearing hypocritical to the public and limiting our possibilities for peaceful change from within. The opportunity to experience the boundless joys from living in concert with all life is a recurrent theme of Animalines. It requires no sacrifice to adopt a cruelty-free lifestyle, since peaceful journeys in cruelty but caring and committed people going forth to ignite the flame of life inside each person? The concept of one earth, one family, is not some romantic fantasy but a biological and ecological reality since, for billions of years, the same life-supporting chemical elements have been recycled from the earth through all living organisms and back to the earth again. If we are ever to succeed in our quest for a just and peaceful earth, each of us must begin to transform animal rights from a abstract expression to a living philosophy—a philosophy spread not by centralized campaigns, but by creating a dynamic for change among people "teaching" people, beginning with ourselves and moving outward to family, friends, and community. We have a compelling story to tell about a magical place called Earth that is being devastated by a desperately troubled species. Let us begin now!

Edward S. Duvin is director of The HSUS's Center for the Hapect of Life and Environment and editor of the center's publication Animalines. Mr. Duvin in­

the populace to understand truly the most literal and fundamental meaning of spiritual: the breath of life. As stated earlier, the movement's limited resources pale in contrast to the powerful forces that oppose us, and the future is bleak if we rely predominantly on conventional methods. However, if we stop thinking in the structured terms of an organized movement and begin seeing ourselves as a peaceful army of individuals committed to living an ideal, then we can impart that ideal to others through the sheer spiritual force of our own example. This is the spirituality Animalines speaks of—the spirituality of life.

How much more we must return the historical lesson that the antidote for hatred and cruelty is not more hatred and cruelty but caring and committed people.
By now, most of you have received a postcard through the HSUS Close-Up Report—of the national campaign we've launched to end the suffering of hogs and hens. In a move intended to force pork and egg producers to abandon their cruel production practices, The HSUS has targeted consumer power, urging our members to avoid bacon-and-egg breakfasts in protest. We provided members with postcards addressed to the National Pork Producers Council and the United Egg Producers, informing them of your pledge not to eat the "breakfast of cruelty" and your demand for the adoption of humane reforms. A third Close-Up postcard encouraged local grocers and restaurateurs to carry humanely produced pork and eggs.

There's been an unprecedented response to our campaign! Inside sources have revealed that, already, thousands of postcards have poured into both the National Pork Producers Council and the United Egg Producers. And, much to our delight, we've received letters from grocers in various parts of the country requesting information about the ways individuals or operations that have adopted humane alternatives, please jot down your names and addresses and send them to Humane Producers, The HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037. For a list to guide you in determining those conditions and practices that are acceptable and those that are not, mark the appropriate box on the coupon and mail it, along with a self-addressed, stamped, business-sized envelope, to The HSUS.

For a list to guide you in determining those conditions and practices that are acceptable and those that are not, mark the appropriate box on the coupon and mail it, along with a self-addressed, stamped, business-sized envelope, to The HSUS.

I am enclosing $____ for ____ sets of 3 postcards at the following prices: 4 sets for $1.00, 25 sets for $2.50.

Please send me free basic guidelines describing acceptable/ unacceptable farming conditions.

Name
Address
City State Zip

Make check payable to The Humane Society of the United States. Please return this coupon to The HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, along with your payment.

Joan R. Blue

Joan R. Blue, president of the American Horse Protection Association (AHPA), passed away following a brief illness on December 30, 1986. Mrs. Blue was born in Columbus, Ohio, and graduated from Ohio State University. She earned her master's degree in international relations from Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. During her early career, she worked as a cultural affairs officer for the U.S. Information Agency. Later, she accompanied her husband, William L. Blue, a foreign service officer, to diplomatic posts in Portugal, India, Switzerland, and France. Upon her return to the United States, she became active in promoting animal-protection issues.

Mrs. Blue was one of the most influential leaders of the modern animal-protection movement. She served first as an officer and then, for more than a decade, as president of the AHPA. She was particularly instrumental in persuading Congress to enact landmark federal legislation: passage of the Wild Free-roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971 ended the commercial exploitation and slaughter of many thousands of wild mustangs on western rangelands. Mrs. Blue also focused her attention on outlawing the "spring" of Tennessee Walking Horses and other breeds, a practice designed to achieve an exaggerated, high-stepping show gait. As a tireless and persuasive lobbyist, Mrs. Blue was a driving force behind the passage of the Horse Protection Act.

Through her extraordinary dedication, wit, and charm, Joan Blue inspired others to persevere against seemingly overwhelming odds. She conveyed a clarity of purpose that grew from her absolute certainty that her cause was morally just and that, in the end, justice was always attainable.

Many among the HSUS staff worked closely with the AHPA throughout the years of Mrs. Blue’s presidency. We admired her leadership and political judgment, but, most importantly, we treasured her friendship. –Marc Paulhus, director, HSUS Southeast Regional Office

Joan R. Blue attended a Capitol Hill art exhibit in 1985 at which HSUS President John A. Hoyt (right) presented The Hon. Bruce F. Vento with a certificate of appreciation for his work on behalf of wild horses.
**Viewers Talk Back to “Living With Animals”**

Each week, The HSUS's television program, "Living With Animals," brings tens of thousands of public broadcasting system (PBS) viewers timely information on pet care, animal protection issues, and important concerns about how animals are treated. Viewers, who are very much afraid he will get down the street ....

**Animals”**

Animals are very much afraid he will get down the street ....

**"Living With Animals”**

"Living With Animals” offers 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 program office and ask that they make this highly praised series part of their program roster.

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

**"Living With Animals”**

Sometimes, "Living With Animals” asks its viewers for opinions on a controversial topic. Recently, host H. I. "Sonny" Bloch solicited reaction to the problem of carriage horses working in urban areas across the country.

"After watching your recent report on carriage horses, I felt very strongly that legislation should be enacted to protect the horses and passengers from harm," responded a Williamsburg, Virginia, woman. "These horses need protection, and close supervision of enforcement of any laws passed for their protection is imperative," agreed a viewer in Honolulu, Hawaii.

"Being a ‘horse person,’ I really enjoyed the show (segment) about the carriage horses. I could see that some of the operators don’t know much about their animals, and that’s sad,” commented a woman in Willow River, Minnesota.

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 program manager and ask that they make this highly praised series part of their program roster. PBS stations are publicly supported and seek to give viewers the shows they want!

Exceeding the viewing audience for "Living With Animals” guarantees that more people will be exposed to important issues in animal protection. Please answer our “call” and call your station, today! And, let us know how you like "Living With Animals.” Drop us a line at "Living With Animals,” The Action Line Group, 1410 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

**Hearings, Reports, Press Conferences Promote Conflicting Views of Seal Populations**

Relatively dormant for some months, the volatile threat of grey seals to commercial fisheries in eastern Canada.

In 1985, The HSUS Vice President John Grandy testified before the Canadian Royal Commission on Seals and Sealing, which has now released its final report.

Canada ended the killing of whitecoat seals because of world opinion and the lack of markets. (The U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act bans import of whitecoat seal skins into the United States.)

Unfortunately, though, the report also recommended that the Canadian government attempt to find international markets for products from older seals. The HSUS and other animal-protection groups will continue to oppose this.

The report dwelt at some length with the alleged threat of grey seals to commercial fisheries in eastern Canada. This supposed problem has prompted eastern Canadian fishermen to call for a massive culling of thousands of grey seals, as a form of predator control. The threat of such a slaughter prompted Greenpeace, The HSUS, and renowned animal activist Farley Mowat (Never Cry Wolf) to oppose this action in a joint press conference held in Toronto, Canada, in December. Dr. Grandy represented The HSUS and expressed the continuing opposition of The HSUS and the American public to the slaughter of seals. He also pointed out the fallacy in associating the economically troubled eastern Canadian fishing industry with the economically troubled eastern Canadian fishing industry. Virtually as the people of Canada themselves, The Canadian government agreed not to permit a massive “call” of grey seals in 1987.
When Your Pet Can't Go Along

by Dr. Randall Lockwood and Deborah Salem

Vacations, business trips, weekend junkets—people seem to be getting away from home more often than ever these days. And many people are pet owners; they face a unique dilemma: should they take their pets with them or leave them behind? In the case of out-of-town business commitments, there is generally only one obvious choice: the pet must be left behind. More and more frequently, however, leaving your pet behind is the least stressful decision in many travel situations.

Why? Vacating with your pet can cause as much anxiety to you both as the cares you are trying to escape, since many pets treat any automobile trip as an unpleasant experience and can be physically or emotionally upset by even short journeys. Animals that tolerate—or even enjoy—their journey may not be welcome at the motels, campgrounds, and homes you intend to visit along the way. Air travel has its own hazards (see the Fall 1985 HSUS News) and can be costly as well.

So, if you're convinced that leaving your pet at home is a good idea, who will take care of that pet's needs while you're away? The answer depends on your pet's temperament, the length of your absence, and, of course, your budget. A vacation or business trip can cause anxiety to both pet and pet owner.

A vacation or business trip can cause anxiety to both pet and pet owner.

A Friend Is a Friend Is a Friend

The traditional solution for the traveling pet owner is to rely on friends, neighbors, and relatives to care for pets he has left at home or, alternatively, to take the pets into their own homes. Such people can be great choices, since you can count on their reliability and they usually expect no remuneration except out-of-pocket expenses. Your pet may already be familiar with them, thus eliminating the stress and anxiety of a new caretaker. Yet, even the most devoted friend may not be knowledgeable about signs of illness or stress, however, or may not be available to pet sit at holiday or vacation times due to other commitments. Unless you have an arrangement to take care of your neighbor's animals in return, you may be reluctant to impose upon a neighbor as often as you schedule requires. Even a successful reciprocal arrangement may include taking a neighbor's pet at a time inconvenient for you.

If your pet will be spending time in someone else's home, the change in environment and routine could be more disturbing to the animal than an unfamiliar kennel (particularly if a different caretaker is involved each time). If other animals are in residence, make sure your pet will accept your pet's intrusion with equanimity. Remember, too, that private homes do not usually have tight security. An upset or rambunctious pet could become disoriented or anxious and slip away from its caretakers. Remind them to be vigilant in case your pet tries to head out in search of you while you're gone.

To Board or Not to Board?

Many people are happy leaving their pets in the care of a boarding kennel. This option has the advantage of providing professional caretakers, good security, and around-the-clock supervision.

There are more than 6,500 boarding kennels in the U.S. and Canada. They vary widely in quality of care and cost. Some kennels cater to specific breeds or types of animals and may specialize in the habits and needs of those individuals. Their staffs are usually quite willing to go along with reasonable requests for special care, feeding, and housing (such as kenneling your two dogs in the same enclosure) and can sometimes provide added services such as grooming and training. A look at kennels listed in your local yellow pages will give you some indication of the kinds of amenities the kennel feels make it competitive and desirable to pet owners. Some kennels stress convenience (extended hours, central location, pick-up and delivery services) or expertise in problem behaviors (socialization, obedience training, "dog psychology"). Others boast of "tender, loving care for your beloved pet" and "all pets individually exercised and handled personally." Some, styling themselves "pet hotels," may offer background music, satin dog beds, or other luxury frills. Although the extras may be nice, even desirable, some, quite obviously, may not have a substantial impact on the actual boarding experience of your animal while it is on the premises.

At the very minimum, a kennel should provide food, water, security, sanitation, and protection from the elements for all animals accepted. All reputable kennels will be happy to have you make a get-acquainted visit to see the accommodations and discuss the services they provide. Some kennels do not permit visitors in the actual areas where animals are housed, but such facilities should provide a viewing area where you can see where your pet will be staying.) Don't be overly impressed by the property value, location, or construction of a boarding facility. Many modestly appointed kennels offer the highest standards of care. Of course, a place should be in good repair and clean, but, as HSUS Vice President for Companion Animals Phyllis Wright stresses, "The rapport the caretaking staff demonstrates in dealing with animals is more important than any particular architectural aspect of a boarding operation."

Kennels that advertise that they have all-indoor runs, all-outdoor runs, indoor/outdoor runs, air-conditioning and heating, large exercise yards, private yards, or any number of other housing configurations. The best way to determine which of any of these is best for your pet is to evaluate realistically your pet's needs and to satisfy yourself that the kennel caretakers will adjust to accommodate those needs.

Almost 1,000 boarding kennels belong to the American Boarding Kennel Association, which offers training, guidelines, and support to member facilities. A copy of the association's booklet, "How to Select a Boarding Kennel," is available for $2 by writing The American Boarding Kennel Association, 311 North Union, Colorado Springs, CO 80909.

Since kennelming animals is quite popular, good facilities often fill up quickly during peak vacation periods. Be sure to make reservations well in ad-

For an additional fee, pet sitters will take in mail, water houseplants, or perform other household duties.

A traditional solution for the traveling pet owner is to rely on friends, neighbors, and relatives to care for pets he has left at home or, alternatively, to take the pets into their own homes.
Many good kennels provide indoor/outdoor run arrangements for a variety of pets. Costs are generally competitive, but they can add up during an extended absence.

Kenneling can have other disadvantages. Your pet may be upset in a strange environment with an unfamiliar routine, and there is always a chance that it might pick up parasites or illnesses from other animals, even in a well-run operation.

There are several drawbacks to leaving your pets with a veterinarian. Since the facilities and staff do not count boarding as their first priority, there may be less opportunity for social contact and exercise. Veterinary hospitals also tend to be less flexible in providing the individual nonmedical care you might want your animal to receive, such as periodic walking. A veterinarian can also be costly because of the limited space available for boarding clients' animals.

Opting for House Calls
A relatively new solution is the use of visiting pet sitter services. Many such professional services have been started by animal lovers who enjoy personal contacts and flexible working hours. Pet sitters usually visit once a day to care for cats and twice a day for dogs. They sometimes offer late-night or emergency care for those who work late or are delayed from home for other reasons.

Their services include feeding, exercising, changing cat litter, giving medication, and providing a touch of tender loving care. Most sitting services will send you a daily log of their visits and your pets’ behavior. Many, for an additional fee, will also perform other tasks, such as plant and lawn care and home security checks. If you wish, they will call you from your home phone to give you a full report on your animal while you’re away.

Reputable pet sitters are bonded and insured and are happy to provide references. Most will make a free visit to your home to meet your animals, describe their rates and services, and learn about any special needs you might have. They may also ask you to complete a detailed questionnaire for each animal to provide the best possible individual care. Pet sitters are becoming a popular choice for pet owners, especially for those who own cats, since most cats would rather be cared for in a familiar setting by a stranger than travel to unfamiliar places. Like good kennels, reliable pet sitters are often very busy during holidays and other popular travel times, so advance planning is a must. They may not be available in all geographic and demographic areas.

The cost of professional sitters is higher than that of having friends or neighbors drop in, but the service is guaranteed. Pet sitters usually charge a per day or per hour basis. The daily charge for an one-cat household might be $10 for a single dog, $15 for two visits per day. These rates may be adjusted for more than two or three animals per household. One disadvantage is that your pets will have only periodic supervision, so emergencies or behavior problems may go undetected between visits. For some pets, particularly large or energetic dogs, two visits a day, even if they include play or some social time, might not be sufficient to keep them happy.

Living In
Another option is to hire a live-in sitter. This is often the best choice if you will be away for an extended period of time. Good prospects for live-in sitters include students (who can be contacted through campus employment offices) or staff of local animal shelters, humane societies, or veterinary hospitals. Usually, a sitter will provide routine care at low or no cost in exchange for a free place to stay, particularly if your home offers any desirable amenities (such as use of a swimming pool or cable television).

The advantage of this approach is that your home is lived in and your pets should be able to get the same kind of daily attention you provide yourself. There are also possible disadvantages. Although having someone in your home might provide security, it also opens your home and your pets up to the risk of the sitter. If the sitter brings other people or animals to your home, your pets could be distressed or your home security compromised. Your house(s) sitter should be responsible, knowledgeable about animals in general, and responsive to your animals, in particular.

Are fences and runs in good repair? Security is a key factor in evaluating a kennel. For some pets, particularly large or energetic dogs, two visits a day, even if they include play or some social time, might not be sufficient to keep them happy.

Living In
Another option is to hire a live-in sitter. This is often the best choice if you will be away for an extended period of time. Good prospects for live-in sitters include students (who can be contacted through campus employment offices) or staff of local animal shelters, humane societies, or veterinary hospitals. Usually, a sitter will provide routine care at low or no cost in exchange for a free place to stay, particularly if your home offers any desirable amenities (such as use of a swimming pool or cable television).

The advantage of this approach is that your home is lived in and your pets should be able to get the same kind of daily attention you provide yourself. There are also possible disadvantages. Although having someone in your home might provide security, it also opens your home and your pets up to the risk of the sitter. If the sitter brings other people or animals to your home, your pets could be distressed or your home security compromised. Your house(s) sitter should be responsible, knowledgeable about animals in general, and responsive to your animals, in particular.

Vacation and holidays should be fun. With just a little common sense and some advance preparation, you can ensure that your pet will enjoy your time away from home.

Dr. Ronald Leckwood, an animal behaviorist, is director of higher education programs for The HSUS.

Are fences and runs in good repair? Security is a key factor in evaluating a kennel.
of our literature on how inhumanely veal calves are raised. His response was typical: he said testily that I was trying to make him feel guilty about eating veal and that he would continue to eat veal anyway.

Many people, I believe, “really don’t want to know” about the suffering and cruel treatment of animals because they don’t want to feel the animals’ suffering. The trauma that ignorance is bliss is surely relevant to the apparent indifference of people toward animal suffering. Their indifference is not a sign of having no heart but rather a defense against having to feel. It is a consequence of their sensitivity, not insensitivity.

How can we help those who would rather be indifferent to the suffering of others because it hurts them too much to empathize?

This is a difficult question for which there is no simple or single answer. I think it is helpful to express one’s own feelings, one’s own pain and outrage, over the cruel treatment of animals, be they veal calves in crates or red foxes in traps. Never judge those who seem indifferent as being insensitive and uncaring. If they are informed but refuse to act accordingly (by not eating veal once they know the facts, for example), then they are denying their deeper feelings. This is more than a matter of conscience, of debating if it is right or wrong to eat veal or wear wild animals’ furs. It is more than a question of animal rights versus human interests. It is a matter of feeling, of having the courage to bear the burden of experiencing the suffering of others, and even of recognizing one’s own avoidance and denial of others’ suffering.

It is his feeling, his openness to the world, that makes a person whole and a responsible, humane planetary citizen. To paraphrase Australian aboriginal elder Bill Neidjie, who has given one of the most profound statements on this question of empathetic sensitivity, “If you feel sore, headache, some body, that mean somebody [is] killing tree or grass. You feel because your body [is] in that tree or earth. Nobody can tell you, you got to feel it yourself.”

When we really begin to feel deeply in this way and encourage others to have the courage to do the same, then humanness and respect for the “rights” of other living things become a way of life, not some abstract intellectual ideology.

As for my acquaintance and others who refuse to feel deeply about veal calves and other things that might disturb them, I feel sad, sad because they are missing out on life by cutting themselves off emotionally. By so doing and acting as though all is well, they live in a kind of dream world. As St. Francis of Assisi once said, “A man knows only as much as he has suffered.”

Dr. Michael W. Fox is scientific director of The HSUS.
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Asking Others to Empathize with Animals

by Dr. Michael W. Fox

Recently, I gave an acquaintance who told me how much he enjoyed eating veal some of our literature on how inhumanely veal calves are raised. His response was typical of many of those who don’t want to be informed: he said testily that I was trying to make him feel guilty about eating veal and that, although he would read the literature, he would continue to eat veal anyway.

It had not been my intent to shame this man so that he would find the consumption of factory-farm-raised veal morally repugnant, but he was angry and defiant toward me anyway.

Guilt is a very common reaction when one’s conduct is seen as offensive to others' sensibilities. With it comes the feeling of being judged, and being judged means that one’s conduct is seen as offensive to others’ sensibilities. With it comes the feeling of being judged. With it comes the feeling of being judged. It is very difficult to avoid evoking feeling from others when the anger materializes.
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NIH’s Chimpanzee-Breeding Program: Bad News for Primates

In response to a dwindling supply of captive chimpanzees available for research, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) recently launched an ambitious program to create chimpanzee-breeding colonies throughout the United States. The program is designed to ensure a steady supply of chimpanzees for experiments for decades to come.

NIH’s program is alarming to animal protectionists because it treats chimpanzees as a commodity and perpetuates indefensible use in experiments that cause pain or suffering. The same similarities between chimps and humans that create a demand for chimps in research on hepatitis, AIDS, and other diseases also call into question the ethics of this research and of this program.

NIH, the federal government’s largest funder of biomedical research, unveiled its program in 1986, the same year an earlier, more extensive version was rejected by Congress. Under the new program, NIH solicited proposals from institutions interested in establishing chimpanzee-breeding colonies or in conducting management research to improve reproduction rates at these colonies. The proposed breeding colonies or management research would be conducted at Yerkes, the University of Texas, University of Minnesota, Texas A&M University (College Station), and the University of Texas (Bastrop). Management research will be conducted at Yerkes, the University of Texas, University of Minnesota, Texas A&M University (College Station), and the University of Texas (Bastrop). Management research will be conducted at Yerkes, the University of Texas, University of Minnesota, Texas A&M University (College Station), and the University of Texas (Bastrop).

If anything positive can be said about NIH’s program, it is that it decreases the likelihood that the U.S. will resume importation of chimpanzees from the wild. Importation of this endangered species typically involves killing mothers and subjecting infants to a stressful—and frequently lethal—capture and journey. Despite that relatively positive feature, the program is seriously flawed. It ignores inadequate breeding conditions critical aspects of care, use, and disposition of chimpanzees.

Plans for the core of infant primates should take into account that infants deprived of their mothers or kept in tiny, barren cages are not likely to develop normal adult behavior or physiology.

Indeed, many of the 520 chimpanzees alive today that were born in captivity in the U.S. are incapable of rearing offspring precisely because their genetic material is psychologically damaged as a result of their own impoverished upbringing. There is hope that, with the NIH program, offspring that remain in breeding colonies will be kept in housing environments that are improved over the prevailing—and abysmal—standards. But that cannot be a certainty because NIH’s program for care does not specify minimum standards for housing design. Nor does it stipulate that infants be reared with their mothers. For those infants that are mother-reared, the minimum period for mother-infant contact is twelve months, far too brief a contact for a species that takes twelve years to reach adulthood.

The HSUS board of directors has taken the position that primates should be phased out of research as soon as possible. Until that happens, any plans for the use of chimpanzees should take into account the special relationship between human beings and chimpanzees. Chimpanzees are our evolutionary brothers and sisters, having 99 percent of their genetic material in common with humans. For those chimpanzees that are mother-reared, the minimum period for mother-infant contact is twelve months, far too brief a contact.

The HSUS’s program should take into account chimpanzees are long-lived animals, expensive to maintain, and easily damaged psychologically by poor housing conditions. Hence, the program should provide for the disposition of damaged individuals through rehabilitation and retirement, or euthanasia. Nor does it address the fate of chimpanzees unsuitable for inclusion in the breeding colonies. The NIH program is unacceptable to The HSUS. We are prepared to work with NIH on a reformulation of the program but will work to see it ended if substantial modifications are not made.

There are signs that NIH is now grappling with some of our issues. For example, one of the projects funded under the chimpanzee program reportedly will investigate rehabilitation of animals under semi-natural conditions. NIH is also drafting a set of principles for the use of chimps in research as a result of a meeting with The HSUS.

NIH may have ignored some of our humane issues and treated others half-heartedly in an effort to make its program more palatable politically and economically. Avoiding discussion of humane issues may have been an attempt to ensure that those issues were not raised by legislators and other key players. However, according to Dr. Martin Stephens, director of the laboratory animals department of The HSUS, “NIH needs to lift its head out of the sand. The HSUS will see to it that chimpanzees are not used as pawns for political expediency.”

* Details of these projects are not available because NIH has not yet supplied us with copies of the proposals in response to a Freedom of Information Act request.

Chimpanzees at the University of Texas at Bastrop may be part of one of the five breeding colonies established under the NIH plan.
Suffolk County: Anatomy of a Victory

by Dr. John W. Grady

Thanks to thousands of humanitarian works, the largest county on Long Island, Suffolk County, New York, has enacted a ban on leghold traps. It sounds so easy and simple, but it was a hard fight.

First, the sponsor of the measure, County Legislator Sondra Bachety, agreed upon a legislative objective that met, to the extent possible, the desires of her and her constituents and the political reality in her county. She proposed a bill that banned all leghold traps. That decision gave her support from people who believe they need alternatives for animal control to protect personal property or safety. This support proved crucial to eliminating the steel-jawed leghold trap. Next, legislator Bachety justified her bill as a means of protecting human health and safety (which includes the safety of pets). She did not justify the bill as a way to protect wildlife. (Protecting wildlife from cruelty and destruction would be a "coincidence.") For proposed community or county laws, the distinction is important, since state laws generally leave the power to manage wildlife with the state, but each community, city, or county retains both the right and responsibility to protect human health and safety. (The move to protect human health and safety is not subjective, since pets and people alike suffer serious injuries every year in leghold traps.)

I learned of the bill at the 1986 HSUS annual conference, after a member called The HSUS and asked for our help. She said that one hearing had been held and that humanitarian issues had been overwhelmed by many trappers at that hearing. She was nearly certain that animal protectionists would lose, but she asked for help anyway.

HSUS Coordinator of State Legislation Ann Church; Nina Anastenber, director of the HSUS Mid-Atlantic Regional Office; Samantha Mullen, secretary, New York State Humane Association; and I discussed our strategy. How many trappers were there? What kind of political power did they have? How many members did The HSUS have in the county? Could The HSUS provide expert testimony? Could we alert our supporters in time, since another hearing would be held the following week?

We volunteered expert testimony. Working with organizations such as the New York State Humane Association and the Society for Animal Protective Legislation (SAPL), we agreed to mail a rush announcement to our members in the area.

At the next hearing, there were very few trappers, but our members were there, concerned and interested. Legislators spoke openly of receiving ten calls for the ban for every one call against it. The mailing had had its impact! SAPL, The HSUS, and numerous county citizens presented testimony. When the vote finally took place, we had won by a margin of 11 to 5.

That wasn’t the end, however. We faced another threat. The county executive had thirty days to veto the ban. If he did veto, a vote of 12-4 would be needed to override his action. We alerted our membership to this new development. “Urge the county executive to approve the measure, but, just in case, contact your legislator and urge an over­ride, if necessary,” we asked. Representatives from animal-welfare groups testified once again, as did more citizens. The trappers sought to involve the farm bureau, the National Rifle Association, and Wildlife Legislative Fund of America (a pro-hunting/pro-trapping group) in their effort to save the leghold trap. We lobbied, then we waited. On December 12, we heard the county executive had vetoed our hard-fought ban.

The HSUS contacted our members once again: “Alert your friends,” we said, “we need phone calls...now.” A legislative session was scheduled for December 23. The HSUS sent its Mid-Atlantic regional program coordinator, Rick Abel, The Animal Legal Defense Fund prepared a marvelous legal brief showing the legality of local communities protecting pets and animals in this way. The vote was 12 to 4. We had won, truly won: the leghold trap was banned in Suffolk County.

The lesson? Can we and want to help in these important battles. You, as our members, and we, as a staff, can do a lot together. We can win. You need to be involved with you from the beginning. We need a strong sponsor, a well-written bill, strong public support (with letters and phone calls to elected officials to demonstrate support for their position), good political insight, and experts with facts to counter the trappers’ claims. It will not be easy to win every engagement, but, together, we can win many of them.

Dr. John W. Grady is vice president of wildlife and the environment for The HSUS.
Dear NAAHE . . .

One important part of the work of The HSUS's National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) is responding directly to mail from children around the country. Over the past three months, the writers of children's correspondence received at NAAHE's Connecticut office has increased enormously. With the growth of NAAHE's publications Kind News and Children & Animals, more and more children are writing to us for information and advice. We find this to be especially true during the school year, explains NAAHE Director Patty Finch. "Often, teachers have children write to us as part of a class project. As a result, our office sometimes receives twenty or thirty letters in one day from a single classroom."

In order to handle the rising tide of children's correspondence, NAAHE recently recruited Eunice McNeil, a volunteer, to specialize in answering letters from young people. NAAHE was put in contact with Ms. McNeil by the eastern Connecticut office of the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP), a national volunteer placement service. Ms. McNeil, a mother of five children, has been pleasantly surprised by the sincerity and high level of awareness expressed by children in their letters to NAAHE. "It has been wonderful to see how concerned children are about animals and how much of them know about animal protection issues," she tells us.

Patty Finch believes that answering each child's letter is vital for educational reasons and for the good of the animal-protection movement in general. "By taking the time to answer their questions and acknowledging their feelings, we're sending them a strong message—that what they think counts." To illustrate her point, Ms. McNeil cites this letter from a child in Arizona:

Eunice McNeil answers children's questions.

"Dear NAAHE...

Today, scientists are using animals for experiments. I really don't like this and it hurts the animal, it may even kill them. Scientists think it's okay to do this. What do they know about the animals' feelings? Who's going to speak for them when they're hurt or when they're in pain?

Not all of the letters NAAHE receives from children contain such somber or profound, however. In one of the things that Eunice McNeil believes makes her job most enjoyable is the humor that often inadvertently finds its way into young people's correspondence. "Though the children are very serious about what they're writing," she explains, "their unique perspective on life sometimes gives their letters a humorous quality that I don't think they intended."

The following letter proves her point:

"Animals live among us and around us. They breathe our air and use the streams and land. They're really people except in one difference. They need everything we do. Except for clothes, a ceramic player, and other things we have."

Patty Finch believes that answering each child's letter is vital for educational reasons and for the good of the animal-protection movement in general. "By taking the time to answer their questions and acknowledging their feelings, we're sending them a strong message—that what they think counts."

Institute Hails Veal Crate Ban in Great Britain

In January, the Director of The HSUS's Institute for the Study of Animal Problems, Dr. Michael W. Fox, addressed European veterinarians on companion animal behavior and reintroducing the renowned Craft's dog show in London. He emphasized the inherited disorders of purebred dogs, a subject the institute has been monitoring for some time.

Some good news for farm animals was circulating in the United Kingdom at the same time. On January 5, 1987, the British government announced a ban on veal crates:

Mr. Donald Thompson, Parliamentary Secretary at the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, today announced details of the Ministry's proposed ban on the use of single-paned veal crates. New regulations would stipulate that calves should have sufficient space to turn round without difficulty, that their feed should contain digestible fibre, and that the diet should contain sufficient iron. The veal crate is the most intensive form of rearing of beef cattle in the sector and consists typically of a narrow, high-sided cubicle into which the animal is unable to turn round. The system is coupled with a diet which is low in iron and which contains no roughage. This can distort the development of the rumen and increase the risk of digestive problems, as well as causing the calf to become anemic. It is not uncommon for a government acting responsibly in advancing the welfare of farm animals on the basis of sound scientific evidence. American agriculturalists' denial of the proven cruelty of the crate system and the indifference of legislators to the suffering of farmed animals can only worsen their nation's image abroad as one that cares little for the rights and welfare of animals.

Getting the Drift

Every year, millions of marine animals are inadvertently caught and drowned in driftnets. Fishing fleets in the North Pacific drop the nets and leave them out in the open ocean currents. Even though the nets are intended to catch migratory salmon and squid, fisher­men are collectively inactive; there is no way to prevent other creatures from swimming or diving into them and getting caught accidentally. The unknowing victims include marine mammals, turtles, and birds.

Sen. Ted Stevens of Alaska and Rep. Charles Bennett of Florida have reintroduced legislation in their respective chambers to curtail this ugly practice. Their bills are slightly different from those of the Ninety-ninth Congress. S. 62 and H.R. 537 would mandate that the U.S. government increase monitoring aboard Japanese salmon boats and investigate the use of satellites to monitor drift netting operations more closely. In addition, they would require that our government enter into cooperative monitoring and research agreements with all foreign vessels in U.S. waters and beyond our 200-mile coastal fishing zone. Finally, they would elevate the U.S. to establish “driftnets-free zone” around the Aleutian Islands to protect breeding colonies of seabirds and Dall's porpoises.

Please help these important bills through the legislative process by writing to your representatives and senators and asking them to co-sponsor and support S. 62 and H.R. 537.

The Budget's Bad News

As in past years, the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) did not fare well under President Reagan's proposed budget for fiscal year 1988. It calls for a million-dollar reduction in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's budget to inspect thousands of laboratory animals, dogs, and puppy mills nationwide, under the requirements of the AWA. These inspections are crucial; they are receiving adequate, food, water, and housing.

This year, Congress voted to increase AWA funding from $4.8 million to $5.87 million. Since then, however, for the duration of 1987, AWA inspections division, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), have been expanded. The Dale-Brown provisions, passed as part of the 1985 farm bill, improved standards for laboratory animals, increasing APHIS inspectors' responsibilities in that area. The present level of funding is barely enough for the duties of 250 APHIS inspectors, and the level of funding for AWA appropriations from $4.8 million to $6.87 million would eliminate many necessary inspections.

The federal government already heavily subsidizes livestock producers, and, last year, Congress appropriated almost twice the amount proposed by President Reagan for that purpose. All in all, AWC was awarded $21 million, used to maintain and kill millions of animals in the name of livestock interests. AWC's methods include trapping, poisoning, and other inhumane practices. Millions of non-target animals, including coyotes, eagles, hawks, badgers, and foxes, are routinely destroyed under AWC's nonselective predator-control programs.
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Keeping Ozarks Trap-Free

Rep. Bill Emerson of Missouri has reintroduced his bill to allow trapping in the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways, a unit of our National Park System. In 1984, the National Park Service banned hunting and trapping in all units of the park system except what specifically allowed in the laws for which the park service provided by lawyers acting on behalf of The HSUS and other animal protection/conservation groups. Rep. Emerson then started pushing a bill through Congress to allow trapping at Ozarks by amending the law that exists now. Vigorously opposed by The HSUS and others, the bill did not pass last year, so Rep. Emerson has reintroduced it this year.

The bill, H.R. 138, would initially allow trapping for furbearers at Ozarks. During the first three years, a study would be performed to evaluate the impact of trapping on wildlife. At the end of the study, Congress would have two more years to decide, based on the study, whether trapping should continue permanently.

Please write your representative and senators opposing the bill. Ask them to send your letter to the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, to which H.R. 138 has been referred. Tell them that the park service has banned trapping based on its legal responsibility to protect wildlife, that the federal court upheld this decision, and that no amount of study will make trapping acceptable in this National Park Service area.

Kangaroo Clamor

On December 17, 1986, responding to pressure from farmers, ranchers, and kangaroo-industry officials, the Australian government announced its decision to increase the annual harvest of kangaroos to 2.8 million animals—the second largest slaughter since inception of the quota program in 1981.

The United States and Europe—the two largest buyers of kangaroo products—are, in part, responsible for this slaughter. Although not always apparent to everyone, this practice is widely used in athletic shoes, children's shoes, cowboy boots, purses, wallets, belts, reins, and novelties. Activists must now fight to halt the steady flow of kangaroo products into the United States.

Kangaroos are the only animals that can jump, because the Australian government has increased the quota in the past few years to 1.75 million million animals.

It is clear that the dominant force behind this year's inflated quota is a multi-million-dollar kangaroo industry that exports hides and meat worldwide. While farmers and ranchers in the state of Queensland—where the bulk of the slaughter takes place—have been complaining of crop and pasture damage caused primarily by gray kangaroos, industry lobbyists have successfully convinced the federal government to raise harvest figures for the larger, and more profitable, red kangaroo.

"The increase in Queensland's red kangaroo quota is particularly shocking, because the Australian government states that Queensland's red kangaroo population has declined by four percent," said Rep. Robert J. Mrazek of New York, who recently reintroduced his "Kangaroo Protection Act" in the House.

Recently, federal court judges ruled the 1985 Queensland kangaroo management program "invalid," due, in part, to the fact that inadequate consideration had been given to the survival of a particular population of wallabies there. "It also found possible cartels, illegal shipments of skins, and other questionable activities of the kangaroo industry," stated Rep. Mrazek. Despite these findings and the court's ruling, the Australian government has increased the quota in the past few years to 1.75 million million animals.

Harvest figures for the red kangaroo have been raised in Australia.

Wildlife Watch

Despite the efforts of animal-protection and conservation groups, the Endangered Species Act (ESA), which expired in 1985, was not reauthorized by Congress last year due to the objections of a few power-laden senators. The House Subcommittee on the ESA Reauthorization Coalition, will be working to get the ESA, one of our most important wildlife laws, reauthorized in the 100th Congress.

The problem addressed by the ESA, the decline and extinction of many animals and plants, is critical for everyone, since these species form the life-support system on which human existence depends. If human beings continue to destroy habitat and kill wildlife at their present rate, by the year 2000, the world will be losing one animal or plant species every hour of every day.

The ESA is our main tool in stemming the flood of species extinctions. The act makes it illegal to kill, collect, or injure animals listed under federal law, and establishes critical habitats where the bulk of the endangered and threatened species live.

Keeping the Heat on Pound Seizure

On January 27, Rep. Robert J. Mrazek of New York introduced the Pet Protection Act. The bill, now identified as H.R. 778, includes all of the provisions he introduced in H.R. 4871, and gives some of the endangered species protection that had been weakened by the ESA's protections and made it easier to hunt for threatened species such as the wolf and grizzly bear. The bill states that "it is illegal to sell or give away any animal or any plant species used in athletic shoes, children's shoes, cowboy boots, purses, wallets, belts, reins, and novelties. Activists must now fight to halt the steady flow of kangaroo products into the United States.

"To be sure to write your representatives and senators opposing the bill. Ask them to send your letter to the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, to which H.R. 138 has been referred. Tell them that the park service has banned trapping based on its legal responsibility to protect wildlife, that the federal court upheld this decision, and that no amount of study will make trapping acceptable in this National Park Service area.
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How can we promote the development of a humane ethic in ourselves and others? How can we more effectively work to change attitudes and practices that perpetuate abuse and suffering to animals? What are the obstacles to these developments and how can we overcome them? Those of us who meet this year in Phoenix will explore these questions and, together, search for answers.

This year, the pre-conference symposium focuses on humane education, as The HSUS’s National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education sponsors “Humane Education: Crucial Lessons for Today’s Children” on Wednesday, October 14. Look for the complete program details, registration form, and cost information in the Summer issue of The HSUS News, mailed to our membership early in July.

No Refuge

As part of our ongoing defense of the National Wildlife Refuge System (NWRS), The HSUS has objected to a planned deer hunt at the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge on the coast of Massachusetts. In a letter to John Fillio, the refuge manager, The HSUS called the proposed hunt illegal because it shows no positive benefit for the animals or their habitat and because it violates the purpose of the NWRS—the protection, not the destruction, of wildlife.

Project WILD Fails

A proposed bill to appropriate $20,000 in public funds to implement Project WILD, the controversial wildlife-study program, failed to gain the approval of the environmental committee at the Connecticut state Capitol early this year. The bill was introduced at the request of the Connecticut Sportsmen’s Alliance.

New England Regional Director John Dommers gave legislators materials detailing HSUS objections to the teaching program. Mr. Dommers made it clear that The HSUS would not approve plans to implement Project WILD until balancing materials are included with the teaching materials.

Zoo Scheduled to Close

For several years, the New England Regional Office has urged New London, Conn., city officials to close the Bates Woods Zoo because of deteriorating conditions at the facility. Mr. Dommers told local authorities that the zoo is antiquated in design and has serious problems in security, sanitation, and animal housing. In early February, the city council voted to close the zoo and dispose of the few animals left in as humane a manner as possible.

A local group, Friends of the Zoo, obtained a court injunction barring the closing, citing problems in relocating a 200-pound chimpanzee that has been at the zoo since 1960. Mr. Dommers will be working with the Friends of the Zoo and local officials to resolve the matter.

Puppy Mill Closed

Responding to a request for assistance from the Monadnock Region Humane Society, New England regional program coordinator Frank Ribaudo investigated an illegal dog-breeding operation in Westmoreland, N.H. The large kennel was under investigation by local officials because no permits or zoning applications had been approved.

Mr. Ribaudo discovered that 276 dogs and puppies were being housed in a two-story, tin-covered warehouse structure lined with small wooden and wire cages. The kennel owner had originally planned to keep up to 500 dogs at the kennel with the hope of selling puppies throughout the Boston area.

Mr. Ribaudo discovered that the kennel owner did not have a USDA license to breed and sell dogs wholesale. Apparently, the animals had been moved from New Jersey without the interstate health certificates required under New Hampshire’s Department of Agriculture regulations.

The New Hampshire owner had purchased the dogs with problems of its own. It had been criticized on a local television program for its health and breeding practices, and the town of Hopewell, N.J., had declared the operation a nuisance last summer, ordering it closed.

Contact with the American Kennel Club revealed that there were discrepancies between papers and dogs at the kennel as well.

A crowd of Westmoreland residents appeared at a zoning board hearing in January to oppose the kennel operation. Local officials denied a permit for operation and issued a "cease-and-desist" order. The kennel was to be moved by mid-March.

The regional office will work to block any moves to reestablish this operation or others similar to it in the region.
**Workshops Past and Future**

A recent Alabama workshop sponsored by the Southeast Regional Office of the HSUS, Cape Coral, drew more than eighty participants. This successful event included sessions on cruelty investigations, legislation planning, animal-control programming, goals and objectives, shelter standards, and fund-raising.

**Georgia Advances**

Animal shelters in Georgia are not required to have adequate facilities and acceptable euthanasia methods for destroying surplus pets. The Southeast Regional Office has documented instances of impounded pets being killed by gunshot, electrocution, paralytic drugs, hot engine exhaust, and the decompression chamber, even though twenty-nine other states have banned the latter. The Georgia Coalition for Animal Protection has identified a house sponsor for a bill designed to regulate shelter euthanasia. We are working with this representative to draft language that will mandate death by sodium pentobarbital-type drugs or bottled carbon monoxide gas.

There will be no horse or dog racing in Georgia in the foreseeable future. A proposed constitutional amendment to allow such activities was recently defeated by a house committee. This is not the first time attempts to legalize these activities in Georgia have failed. We wish to thank Gov. Joe Frank Harris for his strong opposition to horse and dog racing. He has been largely responsible for many of the defeats suffered by the racing industry.

**Hearing in Hillsborough**

On January 5, 1987, The Hillsborough County (Florida) Board of Commissioners held a public hearing on a proposed ordinance to allow the sale of impounded pets to research facilities. This board sought the next ordinance to circumvent a court-imposed injunction against the release of shelter animals for research (see the Winter 1987 HSUS News).

A crowd of nearly 1,500 opponents of the practice, so-called pound seizure, attended the public hearing. Animal-protection leaders from local, state, and national organizations testified against the measure, as did doctors, nurses, lawyers, former researchers, and laboratory workers. The measure drew the expected endorsement of a handful of medical students and researchers from the University of South Florida, which acquires approximately 800 dogs and cats each year from the Hillsborough County Pound.

The board of commissioners chose to delay action on the ordinance until after a voter referendum on the issue on March 9, 1987. At press time, we learned that the voters had turned thumbs down on a proposal to ban pound seizure in Hillsborough.

**North Central**

Keeping Watch

For the past few years, The HSUS has conducted an ongoing investigation of exotic-animal auctions held in the United States. In October, HSUS Captive Wildlife Specialist David Herbet and North Central Regional Director Frantz Dantzler attended the largest of these auctions, held in Cape Girardeau, Mo., where approximately 8,000 animals were sold. Barasingha, Pere David's, fallow, sikia, and axis deer, gnu/bock, springbok, blackbuck; eland; yak; African elephant; and American bison were among the species auctioned off to private collectors.

The humane treatment of exotic animals sold at auction is a major concern of The HSUS. Animals sustain injuries either during the movement from their pens to the auction ring, or within the ring itself and are kept in cages inadequate for their needs before, during, and after the auction process. We will continue to investigate.

An elephant chained by both a front and hind leg awaits sale at the exotic-animal auction held in Missouri in October.

Southeast Regional Office has documented instances of impounded pets being killed by gunshot, electrocution, paralytic drugs, hot engine exhaust, and the decompression chamber, even though twenty-nine other states have banned the latter. The Georgia Coalition for Animal Protection has identified a house sponsor for a bill designed to regulate shelter euthanasia. We are working with this representative to draft language that will mandate death by sodium pentobarbital-type drugs or bottled carbon monoxide gas.

**Anger and Sorrow**

"Euthanasia: The Human Factor," a workshop dealing with the stress of performing euthanasia, was held February 6 and 7, 1987, in Morristown, N.J. Hosted by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office and partially funded by St. Hubert's Giraldis Animal Welfare and Education Center, The Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, and the New Jersey Department of Health, the session drew a capacity crowd each day.

Bill Hurt Smith, director of the HSUS Animal Control Academy, counseled attendees to learn to separate anger from sorrow. "Anger may you forget," Smith stated at the workshop, "but not the sorrow."

Elephants were among the species auctioned off to private collectors, as noted in our region within the next several years," predicts Gulf States Regional Director Bill Meade. Our Gulf States office is organizing a massive campaign to find legislators who will support anti-cockfighting laws. The Gulf States Regional Office is keeping a majority of the legislators pathetic to this cruel blood sport. The Gulf States Regional Office has supported this legislation in past sessions and will continue to work for its passage.

We urge our Texas members to write their representatives and ask them to sign on as co-sponsors to a model bill. The plan is to have a majority of the legislators banded together and committed to the passage of the bill before it is introduced.

In past years, anti-cockfighting bills have been blocked by a few legislators who have been sympathetic to this cruel blood sport. The model bill will prohibit promoting, sponsoring, or furnishing a location for a cockfight; owning birds for purposes of fighting; and possessing training equipment. It would make being a spectator at a fight a violation, among other provisions. Members in the region are urged to write their state senator and representative and ask them to become a sponsor or cosponsor of this extremely important model bill.

Trapped in Texas

State Representative Debra Dunburg has introduced a bill to restrict the use of the steel-jaw leghold trap in Texas counties with a population of 200,000 or more. Our Gulf States office has supported this legislation in past sessions and will continue to work for its passage.

We urge our Texas members to write their representatives and ask them to support to pass Rep. Dunburg's legislation.

**We Can Help!**

When an alert HSUS member heard a radio news report about the Oklahoma city of Stillwater's plan to poison nuisance birds, he asked us to take action.

We contacted the city manager of Stillwater and provided him with our comprehensive material on nonlethal methods of control and poisoning nuisance birds, he asked us to take action.

We provided the city manager of Stillwater and provided him with our comprehensive material on nonlethal methods of control and abandoned its poisoning plans.

Any community having problems with nuisance animals should contact The HSUS—we can help!
To Protect the Mountain Lions
Since January 1, 1986, existing law has authorized the taking of mountain lions in California if a hunting license is obtained from the state Department of Fish and Game (DFG). This year, public hearings are being held to determine whether the fish and game commission will allow the trophy hunting of 210 mountain lions, as it has proposed. The West Coast Regional Office has urged our California members to oppose the DFG’s proposal.

California Animal Rights Member Tom Bates Area has introduced A.B. 467, which would reclassify the mountain lion as a nongame animal. We have asked our members to support this bill and to let Gov. George Deukmejian know that we strongly disagree with his statement, “that it is unnecessary to statutorily treat the mountain lion differently from other game animals.”

The West Coast Regional Office has begun an anti-lion campaign, “Children to Save the Mountain Lion,” to increase the California public’s awareness of the mountain lion to the state’s precious wildlife population.

Past and Present
At its gala fund-raising event held in San Francisco in March, a member of the Animal Welfare Society presented West Coast Regional Director Char Drennon with an award for 35 years of help in pursuing problems involving performing and exotic animals. The West Coast Regional Office has fueled the organization’s director, Pat Derby, write and pass A.B. 1620, which became law January 1, 1987. The new law sets standards and inspection procedures for exotic animals to ensure that they receive humane care and treatment.

State Sen. David Roberti has appointed Ms. Drennon to the California State Animal Health Technician (AHT) Advisory Board. The board develops and administers the state examination for AHTs, as well as proposes regulations. Ms. Drennon and the West Coast regional staff were involved in the legislation to set up the animal health technician training and certification in 1975. Since the law came into being, more and more rural organizations and animal control agencies are employing AHTs, assuring a higher standard of care, particularly in those facilities that cannot afford a fulltime veterinarian.

Brought to Justice
A district judge placed a former owner of a Doctor Pet Center in Overland Park, Kansas, on two years’ probation for allowing hamsters without proper care.

Veterinarian Ernest Tomas was originally charged with eleven counts of cruelty to animals as a result of an investigation conducted by the Overland Park Police. Those officials had received a tip from a Denver, Colo., humane society and Arkansas for Animals (the HSUS Midwest Regional Office). They, in turn, had been contacted by former employees of the pet store who had quit their jobs rather than tolerate seeing animals mistreated. Dr. Tomas was also the subject of a local television series that accused him of killing and mistreating sick animals.

Dr. Tomas was not required to admit any wrongdoing as a result of entering a special plea guilty. He was sentenced to devote 100 hours to community service within the next year. As a result of this district attorney requested that Dr. Tomas be sentenced to county jail and fined $1,000, the judge did not order him to pay a fine.

Since encountering the negative publicity resulting from this case, Dr. Tomas sold his Doctor operation and moved to Topeka, Kansas, where he had purchased a kennel.

Fight No More
The nineteenth legislative session in Nebraska opened with the introduction of a bill that brings new hope to those who want to see an end to animal fighting. L.B. 170, a revised statute creating felony penalties for any persons engaged in animal fighting, and including spectators, was introduced by Sen. Donald Wesley.

Bob Downey, executive director of The Capitol Humane Society in Lincoln, Nebr., organized a group of supporters to testify in favor of the legislation. Among those testifying before the state Senate Judiciary Committee were HSUS Field Investigator Bob Baker and Mr. Downey.

During his visit to Lincoln, Mr. Baker appeared on a local early morning television show with State Sen. Donald Wesely and American Humane Association staff member Rich Meyer and was interviewed by radio, television, and newspaper reporters.

If this bill becomes law, Iowa will be the only state remaining in the four-state midwest region without a felony animal-fighting law.

No Drugs and Live Lures!
Kansas’s house Federal and State Affairs Committee recently completed hearings on implementing legislation for horse and dog racing.
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From left, The HSUS’s Bob Baker, Takara Shaye, and Wendell Maddox join AHA’s Rich Meyer and Capitol Humane Society Executive Director Bob Downey to discuss strategy for the fight against animal fighting in Nebraska.

State Rep. Ginger Barr was successful in inserting a section of state legislation prohibiting administration of drugs to racing animals and the use of live lures in the training of greyhounds. Violation of those provisions will carry felony penalties.

In his testimony before the committee, Midwest Regional Director Wendell Maddox stated, “The position of the legislature to prohibit any form of drug administration to all animals involved in pari-mutuel racing is excellent. We sincerely hope that this will remain a part of the legislation and become law.”

As a further means of defense, however, the committee bowed to the pressure from racing organizers and softened its stance on the use of drugs. The bill was passed with a new amendment allowing limited use of laxic and phenylbutazone (“bute”) for thoroughbred racing only.

And now will move through the legislature, we will continue to fight all efforts to allow drugs for racing animals.

Cruel Racket
Cruel Racket Enterprises, Ohio, resident, Sue Darcy, has been charged with cruelty to animals after fifty-three animals were found in filthy cages on her property, according to the Overland Park, Kansas, Police Department. Joan Fluharty, humane agent for the Salem Area Humane Society, described the conditions that this will remain a part of the legislation and become law.”

As a further means of defense, however, the committee bowed to the pressure from racing organizers and softened its stance on the use of drugs. The bill was passed with a new amendment allowing limited use of laxic and phenylbutazone (“bute”) for thoroughbred racing only.

And now will move through the legislature, we will continue to fight all efforts to allow drugs for racing animals.

Cruel Racket
Cruel Racket Enterprises, Ohio, resident, Sue Darcy, has been charged with cruelty to animals after fifty-three animals were found in filthy cages on her property, according to the Overland Park, Kansas, Police Department. Joan Fluharty, humane agent for the Salem Area Humane Society, described the conditions in which the animals were found only a few dogs on the premises. As we gathered more information, however, we learned that Ms. Darcy had been buying dogs from numerous counties, breeding them, falsifying American Kennel Club papers, and selling animals to pet stores. The investigation is continuing.

Getting Together to Oppose Bunching
The Great Lakes Regional Office has begun to survey the entire region in order to determine exactly how many pounds and shelters are doing business with animal bunchers—people who buy pets from various sources and then resell them for a profit to research facilities. We have begun by writing all county commissioners in Ohio where we know have dealt with bunchers to determine if they are still doing business. We are also planning a planning session with people who live in counties where bunching exists. We would like to hear from county and city governments to halt the practice. If the county is involved, we would like to hear from you.

Tracking Thieves
The Great Lakes Regional Office has begun keeping extensive records in order to possibly stolen dogs in response to a dramatic increase in reports of such incidents throughout the region. We are exploring working with sheriff’s departments in every county to develop a network to combat dog thefts and develop leads on stolen animals. If you have positive information on stolen pets in Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, or West Virginia, contact the Great Lakes Regional Office at 735 Haskins Street, Bowling Green, Ohio 43402-1006.
In December of 1986, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) published its final rules implementing Section 227 of the Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1985, which provides for the ownership and keeping of common household pets in certain federally assisted rental housing.

Under the law, no owner or manager of federally assisted rental housing for the elderly or handicapped may prevent any tenant from owning a pet or discriminate against tenants or applicants because of their ownership of pets.

Review of the final rules reveals several significant developments in the law that are generally favorable to tenants who want to keep pets.

A significant change in the final rule pertains to security deposits, which could have been a major barrier to pet ownership by many tenants. While considering all conceivable costs attributable to the presence of pets in projects, HUD rejected proposed policies, which ranged as high as $2,000, and set an initial pet-deposit limitation of $300.

This limitation is far less than the deposits that many project owners and managers had imposed on an interim basis before the final rules were published. HUD believes that this $300 limitation will provide adequate security to project owners without imposing an unreasonable financial strain on tenants. HUD also recognized that payment of a pet deposit in a single lump sum may cause financial hardship for some tenants and has provided that, in certain projects, tenants would be permitted to accumulate the deposit through an initial payment of up to $50 and subsequent monthly payments of up to $100. Any unused portion of the pet deposit must be refundable to the pet owner within a reasonable time after the tenant moves from the project or no longer owns or keeps a pet in the dwelling unit.

In addition, HUD has ruled that project owners and managers are prohibited from requiring tenants to obtain pet-liability insurance. HUD believes that this liability insurance is not only too costly but also could be discriminatory if required by project rules.

HUD’s final rules also protect tenants by prohibiting local housing rules that would make pet owners strictly liable for all damages caused by the pet or that would require indemnification to project owners for certain pet-related litigation.

Other areas of pet rule-making policies—such as pet restraint, inoculation and licensing requirements, pet size, weight, and type limitations and standards of pet care—were generally left to the discretion of project owners and managers. However, HUD intends to provide guidance to project owners and managers to ensure that local rules in these areas remain reasonable.

Tenants should report any rules they consider unreasonable or discriminatory to the local and regional HUD offices. The HSUS will continue to monitor closely HUD implementation of the statute.

Whose National Forest?
The incident occurred on November 7, 1986. "Mr. S" was walking his dog down a roadway in the Coots National Forest, near Flagstaff, Ariz. Suddenly, the dog, at the man’s feet, yodeled in pain. It was caught in a leghold trap. The man was horrified. He dropped to his knees and cradled the still-crying dog between his chest and the trap. Mr. S knew nothing about traps, but he was determined to free his pet. Working feverishly while trying to hold and comfort the dog, he freed the animal but got his hand caught and injured in the process. Finally, he freed himself and returned, bleeding, to his camper.

The owner of the trap reported Mr. S. to the Arizona Fish and Game officials for disturbing a trap. Fish and game officials presented the case to the county prosecutor, who declined to go forward. This did little to comfort Mr. S. or his dog. He was angry, and his dog had been injured. He had been injured. All of this had taken place on public lands. Who, Mr. S. asked, would be responsible? Who would pay for the damages, and for the dog’s and the veterinarian’s bills? What of the pain, anguish, shock, trauma? What of the safety of other people and their pets in national forests?

That's when The HSUS was contacted. We are helping to arrange appropriate legal and other actions to help make public lands safe for people and pets and fix responsibility for damages inflicted by leghold traps.

Space is limited, so make your reservations now!

Turtle-Ban Enforcement Intensifies
The federal government is showing renewed interest in enforcing the ban on the sale of small turtles as pets (see the Winter 1987 HSUS News). Many, if not most, turtles are carriers of Salmonella bacteria and are particularly hazardous to young children. The HSUS supports the ban because turtles, like most exotic animals, are usually not properly cared for by consumers. Anyone seeing turtles having a carapace (shell) length of under four inches for sale in pet stores should contact the nearest office of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the local health department and ask those agencies to investigate.

Visit James Herriot Country with HSUS President John A. Hoyt and Meet Dr. Herriot
No one who has enjoyed James Herriot’s vivid portrayal of the beautiful North Yorkshire countryside in his many best-selling books, including All Creatures Great and Small, will want to miss a unique opportunity to tour Herriot Country this summer with HSUS President John A. Hoyt. You will experience firsthand the settings depicted in the series of the filming of the BBC series “All Creatures Great and Small” and attend a special recognition dinner with 1986 Joseph Wood Krutch medalist James Alford Wight—James Herriot himself—as the honored guest.

Special Tour of James Herriot Country
July 26–August 5, 1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Passport Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Passport Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deposit: $150.00 per person
Balance due May 26, 1987
Tour price: $1,879.00 per person, double occupancy

Mail to: The Corporate Travel Center, Inc.
1210 Knouse Avenue
Knoxville, TN 37919
Phone: (615) 523-6899
US: (1-800-64-7086

Note: Anyone who has reserved space on one of the previously announced Herriot Country tours may choose this tour instead if he so wishes. Reservations for all tours are still available.

The Humane Society News • Spring 1987
NOW AVAILABLE

The Institute for the Study of Animal Problems announces the publication of ADVANCES IN ANIMAL WELFARE SCIENCE 1986/87, edited by Dr. Michael W. Fox and Ms. Linda D. Mickley. The third volume in an annual series, ADVANCES IN ANIMAL WELFARE SCIENCE includes discussion of ethics and use of animals in biomedical research, farm animal and equine behavior and welfare, and wildlife conservation. Papers from a recent symposium at Moorhead State University, "Animals and Humans: Ethical Perspectives," are also included.

Each softcover copy is $15.00, including postage. The three-volume set (1984/85, 1985/86, and 1986/87 editions) is $30.00, while supplies are available. Use the coupon below for your order. Please allow six to eight weeks for delivery. All foreign orders must be paid at the current U.S. dollar exchange rate.

Mail to:

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________
City ________________________________
State __________ Zip Code ______________
Telephone __________________________

Please enclose this coupon and your check in an envelope and return to: The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037

Send me ______ copies of ADVANCES IN ANIMAL WELFARE SCIENCE 1986/87 at $15.00 per copy, or the three-volume set at $30.00 per set (includes postage). I've enclosed a check in the amount of $________

Please make checks payable to The Humane Society of the United States.

Save Time!
- Affix label to wallet envelope or order coupons in magazine
- Use it to change your address
- Use it when writing about a membership problem