Mobilizing for Animals

As you will read elsewhere in this issue of The Humane Society News, The HSUS has joined with numerous other national and local animal-welfare organizations in mobilizing concerned individuals to take part in one of four mass demonstrations protesting the excesses and suffering involved in animal experimentation. Scheduled to coincide with World Day for Laboratory Animals, April 24, 1983, these demonstrations may well mark the beginning of a new era in the history of animal protection. Never before will so many individuals from so many organizations and persuasions have gathered in a united action of this magnitude on behalf of animals.

The HSUS is proud and pleased to be one of several major sponsors of this initial activity of Mobilization for Animals. But our participation as an organization is only as effective as our success in enlisting your personal support and participation in this historic event. Consequently, I enthusiastically urge you to attend and participate in one of the four rallies to be held that day. Your physical presence is greatly desired and needed.

So also is your financial support. Already, The HSUS has contributed several thousands of dollars to help ensure the success of this important happening. Yet we will need money for newspaper ads and other materials. If you cannot participate through your personal attendance, every dollar you can contribute will be used to promote this activity and alert the public to the suffering of laboratory animals. Mark your contribution “Primate Center Rally”; checks should be made payable to The HSUS.

It is impossible to anticipate the impact and effectiveness of this united endeavor on behalf of animals. In the final analysis, that will depend upon the number of individuals who make some form of commitment to this activity and the response of the administrators of the various primate centers and federal agencies. It is our greatest hope that the nine objectives set forth by Mobilization for Animals (reprinted on page 20) will be realized. But even if nothing else were to happen than what has already taken place, this mobilizing for animals will have demonstrated that diverse groups can unite for a cause more important than their exclusive priorities and more encompassing than their personal differences.

John A. Hoyt

president's perspective
Another Round on Whales

As we predicted, the historic vote of February 4, 1983 of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) to ban all commercial whaling beginning in 1986 (HNS News, Fall, 1982) sparked formal objections by a number of whaling nations. By filing the objections, Japan, Norway, Peru, and the U.S.S.R., have notified the IWC that they do not intend to abide by the commission's decision.

IWC members had 90 days following the ban, which actually sets zero quotas for whaling in 1986, in which to file their objections. Once a country objects, the commission legally extended another 90 days, so other member nations have until February 4 to express any objections to defy the ban.

While the IWC has no mechanism for enforcing its decisions, the U.S. has two tools by which it can level unilateral trade sanctions against countries that refuse to abide by the rulings. Under the Pelly Amendment to the Fisherman's Protective Act passed in 1972, the U.S. can embargo imports of fish products from any country that violates a whaling agreement. Under the 1979 Packwood-Magnuson Amendment to the Fishery Conservation and Management Act, a nation certified to be in violation of whale conservation measures will automatically lose 90 percent of the amount of fish it is allowed to take in the U.S. coastal waters.

No decision has yet been made on whether to invoke such sanctions against any or all of the nations that have filed objections; however, 66 senators (two thirds of the U.S. Senate) signed a letter in August to Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige urging him to impose such sanctions "in order to avoid any thought that the U.S. can be faced down on the whaling issue." And in a December letter to Senator Robert Packwood responding to his inquiry about Japanese fishing allocations, the State Department said, "We are also prepared to use available laws and regulations, beginning this spring [when the fishing allocations are given], to prevent Japan from thwarting the IWC cessation decision.

The legislation has been introduced in seven other state legislatures. We suppose we should be pleased that the animal-welfare movement is being taken so seriously these days that such foolish over-reactions by hunters are finding their way into state law-making bodies. Whether anyone will ever be prosecuted under these bizarre statutes is anyone's guess.

Dolphins Face Disaster

Unless the international animal community is able to mobilize its forces to rally, it may face the extinction of three species of dolphin in the Black Sea, according to an investigation recently completed by Great Britain's People's Trust for Endangered Species.

The organization's representatives Allan Thornton, in the U.S. to seek help for the endangered sea mammals, reported the little-publicized massive slaughter of dolphins each year by Turkish hunters. While there is widespread outrage over the Japanese slaughter of dolphins, few people know that in the last 15 years, the Turks have killed more than 900,000 dolphins to make chicken feed and obtain oil, which since there are few markets for the product, is currently being stockpiled. The hunters, who are completely unregulated by the Turkish government, don't kill the animals for the money; most hunters speak as if killing dolphins is a religious or patriotic duty. According to Mr. Thornton, the kill continues because of tradition and because the dolphins are accused—wrongly—of cutting into the fish stock in the Black Sea.

The three species that inhabit the Black Sea—the common and bottlenose dolphins and the harbor porpoise—have been hunted for over 100 years. When the stocks showed a dangerous population crash in the 1960's, the U.S.S.R., Bulgaria, and Romania banned all hunting of dolphins in the Black Sea. That the dolphin catch has declined from highs of 166,000 in 1969 to less than 25,000 in 1981 is strong evidence that a similar population crash is currently taking place.

As long ago as 1976, the Marine Resources Committee of the U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization reported, "It is possible that the present population of all three (dolphins and porpoises) species may be undergoing exploitation in the Turkish fishery at such high levels that they will not be able to survive for more than a few years. Action is urgently needed to close the Turkish fishery or substantially reduce the catch." To urge the ambassador to the U.S. to take such action, Mr. Thornton, HSUS Vice President Malcolm Baldrige, and Animal Welfare Institute President Christina Stevens met with Turkey's ambassador to the U.S. in Washington in November. The ambassador told the delegation he would contact his government to try to end this totally unnecessary slaughter but that it would not be an easy task to accomplish.

Letters of encouragement from animal-welfare proponents could help convince the Turkish government that this activity must be stopped, and that sentiment world-wide is in favor of protecting, not harvesting, our marine mammals. We urge you to write to Ambassador Sukru Elekdag, c/o Embassy of Turkey, 1506 23rd St., NW Washington, D.C. 20005, State your opposition to the dolphin killings. Urge the ambassador to continue pressing his government to end the hunt and close down the state-owned factory that processes the dolphin catch. The single facility would eliminate what little economic incentive remains for the dolphin hunters and could save the dolphins in the Black Sea.

B.C. Bans Leghold Trap

British Columbia has become the first province in Canada to impose a ban on certain uses of the leghold trap. The ban was pushed through with some speed by a committee of the B.C. Legislative Assembly, which recently called anti-harassment legislation "ringing bells or firing guns on the opening day of hunting season will not stop animals [or] hunting human scents" would be illegal and punishable by a fine of $500 or 30 days in jail. The legislation allows a judge to issue an injunction preventing any person who has performed such acts in the past and from whom "it is reasonable to expect that under similar circumstances [they] will be repeated" from going into any area where wild animals could be hunted legally. The legislation provides for the awarding of damages to "in­clude expenditures of the affected person [hunter] for license and permit fees, travel guides, special equipment, and supplies, to the extent that such expenditures were rendered futile by preven­tion of taking of a wild animal."

The legislation has been introduced in seven other state legislatures. We suppose we should be pleased that the animal-welfare movement is being taken so seriously these days that such foolish over-reactions by hunters are finding their way into state law-making bodies. Whether anyone will ever be prosecuted under these bizarre statutes is anyone's guess.

Hassled Hunters

The nation's sport hunters are using a new tactic to keep anti-hunters out of the woods during hunting season. In response, apparently, to criticism by a general public increasingly aware of its wild­life's right to life, Louisiana, Ar­izona, and Michigan have passed so-called anti-harassment legislation that makes it a crime to "disturb a wild animal... with intent to pre­vent or hinder its lawful taking."

According to the model legis­lation, developed by the Wild­i­legislative Fund of America (which describes itself as created for the purpose of protecting the American sportsman's hunting, fishing, and trapping heritage), such activities as "ringing bells or firing guns on the opening day of hunting season to scare away animals, or loiter­ing near a hunting area" would be illegal and punishable by a fine of $500 or 30 days in jail. The legislation allows a judge to issue an injunction preventing any person who has performed such acts in the past and from whom "it is reasonable to expect that under similar circumstances [they] will be repeated" from going into any area where wild animals could be hunted legally. The legislation provides for the awarding of damages to "in­clude expenditures of the affected person [hunter] for license and permit fees, travel guides, special equipment, and supplies, to the extent that such expenditures were rendered futile by preven­tion of taking of a wild animal."

The legislation has been introduced in seven other state legisla­tures. We suppose we should be pleased that the animal-welfare movement is being taken so seriously these days that such foolish over-reactions by hunters are finding their way into state law-making bodies. Whether anyone will ever be prosecuted under these bi­zarre statutes is anyone's guess.
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A NEW ASSAULT ON RODEO

The HSUS launches a grassroots effort to end animal abuse in an all-American sport.

by Julie Rovner

Many rodeos offer crowd-pleasing, non-traditional events in addition to roping and riding. In the wild horse race, cowboy teams compete to capture, saddle, and ride unbroken horses. The chaos is colorful but it can lead to accidents.

In calf roping, the animal is released into the rodeo arena so a cowboy can chase, rope, and throw it. The young calves are in the holding chute at the Pendleton Rodeo.

Waving flags, pretty cowgirls, fancy roping and riding, these are all part of rodeo tradition. Although many people may think there is no more to rodeo than pageantry, color, and harmless amusement, The HSUS knows many rodeo events are just another form of animal cruelty. Now, we have launched a new campaign to educate the general public about the commonplace mistreatment of rodeo livestock.

The HSUS has opposed rodeos since the Society's founding in 1954 "because the way in which they are conducted today inevitably results in injury, pain, torture, fear, or harassment being inflicted upon the participating animals," according to our rodeo policy statement. It continues: "Exposure of children to the atmosphere of violence in rodeos...almost surely teaches them tolerance of inhumane treatment of animals in the name of competition."

It's not hard to see how rodeo abuses animals. Popular events feature roping, tripping, dragging, and wrestling animals to the ground or tying ropes or straps around bulls' and horses' sensitive abdominal regions, then using electric cattle prods to shock them—literally—into giving exciting performances. Yet, most rodeo audiences fail to notice the cruelty and continue to think of rodeo as good, clean, family entertainment.

For years, The HSUS has been working to increase public awareness of the suffering endured by rodeo livestock. With animal issues reaching more people than ever before, we decided it was time to take on rodeo anew and encourage local citizens to become involved in ending this cruel excuse for sport. First, we created a whole new set of materials for distribution nationwide. Now, we are urging local groups and concerned individuals to end rodeo by encouraging the general public not to patronize events that mistreat animals in the name of amusement. By using these materials, animal advocates can work to outlaw the cruellest rodeo event; they can write to sponsors of major rodeos to urge that they cease supporting institutionalized animal cruelty; and they can counter the most common arguments used by rodeo proponents to defend their activities.

Our opposition to rodeo was given a boost in 1982, when The HSUS issued a joint rodeo-policy statement with The American Humane Association (AHA), an organization that had previously helped draft guidelines designed to make rodeo more humane. (The full statement appeared in the Summer 1982 HSUS News.) According to that statement, "The HSUS and AHA contend that rodeos are not an accurate portrayal of ranching skills; rather, they display and encourage an insensitivity to and acceptance of brutal treatment of animals in the name of sport."

Over the years, rodeo advocates have cited the differences among animal-welfare groups' attitudes towards the sport as evidence of its inhumaneness. To emphasize our new unity on the issue, The HSUS and AHA sent the joint statement to many animal-welfare societies last summer asking them to join in supporting it and adopt it as their own. More than 100 local societies—from Arizona to Rhode Island and from urban areas such as Cleveland, Ohio, to rodeo strongholds such as Boulder, Colorado—have officially accepted the statement.

"We signed on because we agree with The HSUS and AHA that rodeos are inherently cruel," said Jim Kovics, vice president of Defenders of Animal Rights, of Baltimore, Maryland. "Not only are we concerned about the immediate problem—the abuse of animals during the events—but the conditioning of rodeo by local governments also tells people that it's all right to treat animals this way."

Last winter, The HSUS joined with Defenders of Animal Rights to support an ordinance before the Baltimore County Council which would have banned flank straps, electric prods, and other painful devices associated with rodeo. Strong opposition from local cowboys and their associations prevented the ordinance from being enacted in full, but the council did ban the use of electric prods on rodeo animals while in the holding chute prior to individual rides.

"Even though we didn't get everything we wanted, we did give the issue some visibility and get some people thinking," Mr. Kovics said. He predicted that his group would continue to seek ways to end rodeo in Baltimore County.

In Grand Rapids, Michigan, the local humane society effectively protested rodeo by picketing and pass-
of our tradition as is rodeo is an encouraged because rodeo is thought ing, riding [sic] bucking horses are these skills with wild horses and money bear little resemblance to modern cowboys seldom, if ever, what this official didn’t know is that works a ranch and is required to learn animals are bred and raised for performance for fusions to act on a legal complaint counter truly wild horses or cattle (in docile than the Texas longhorns of group planned guarding cruelty at a local rodeo the local animal-matters board to represent our western heritage. In commercial purposes .... The cowboy who by-gone years) and that the skills a performance that abuses animals for activity that abuses animals for discontinue sponsorship of an by sending a stamped, self-addressed envelope to us at 2100 L St., NW, Washington, D.C. 20037. Be sure to ask for the rodeo order form. Then let us know how your local efforts do. Together we can make this American tradition no more than a sad memory.

Rodeo enthusiasts often claim bulls buck because they are mean, but to make sure a constant gets plenty of action during his eight-second ride, bulls are stung with electric prods as they leave the chute.

A horse is dragged off the Pendleton Rodeo grounds after breaking its leg during a rodeo event. It was later destroyed.

Rodeo stock may stand for hours, packed like sardines, before and after their few minutes in the ring.
The Hunt That Wasn't: The HSUS Plays a Major Role in Halting the National Zoo Deer Hunt

McMaster: "I believe that a public hunt, utilizing bows and arrows and shotguns is grossly inhumane...and inappropriate both for the facility itself and the integrity of the National Zoo," Grandy told the subcommittee before a hearing room packed with hunters and animal-welfare advocates. Dr. Grandy also pointed out that the zoo's proposed solutions would not solve its alleged problem. The planned hunt would only reduce the deer population by an estimated 25 percent; wouldn't logic dictate only a total eradication of the white-tailed deer would eliminate the problem if that was what was wanted? Culling the population by 25 percent, argued Dr. Grandy, would conveniently put the population right back to "critically high" levels again next year and provide reason for another hunt.

Washington was engulfed in the deer-hunt controversy. Dr. Grandy led the public fight against the hunt and Smithsonian Assistant Secretary David's front Royal) to come into the area and hunt deer. The zoo dis­

The National Zoo, headquartered in the National Zoological Park, Washington, D.C., is a national institution, overseer of the zoo and its programs. Dr. John Grandy, vice president for wildlife and the environment, spoke out against the hunt in numerous radio, television, and print interviews. President Johnson received a strongly-worded letter of protest from Smithsonian Secretary S. Dillon Ripley.

The National Zoo, described by Washington Post as "the nation's most popular zoo," was caught in a controversy over its plan to cull its population through hunting. The controversy centered around the zoo's proposal to conduct a deer hunt on its property in Front Royal, Virginia, in November 1982.

The HSUS placed this ad in the Washington Post, the Washington Times, and USA Today. More than 3,500 readers responded.

How could the country's only national zoo, which receives millions of dollars a year through federal funds and private donations, refuse to carry out a plan that would threaten its unique white-tailed deer population? Dr. Grandy believed that the zoo's decision was motivated by the desire to control the deer population and protect the zoo's other species.

The proposed hunt was met with public outrage and criticism. Dr. Grandy argued that the proposed methods of control were inhumane and ineffective. He called for a more humane approach to managing the deer population.

The controversy sparked a national debate on the ethics of hunting and wildlife management. Dr. Grandy's efforts to halt the hunt were seen as a victory for animal welfare advocates.

The Zoo's Slaughter of Endangered Deer

The special issue of The Humane Society News Winter 1983 features a comprehensive report on the controversial hunt at the National Zoo. A leading advocate for animal rights, Dr. Grandy played a central role in the debate over the proposed hunting program.

The HSUS placed this ad in the Washington Post, the Washington Times, and USA Today. More than 3,500 readers responded.

Officials, while on the one hand claiming that the deer could jump the fence and cause destruction, were quick to respond to the public's concerns. In the end, the hunt was postponed and the zoo committed to finding a more humane solution to the deer problem.
The Veterinary Profession Are Their Differences Irreconcilable?

The Humane Society

by Deborah Salem

Why, if veterinarians and humane organizations are equally dedicated to improving the lives of animals, are there so many conflicts between them over how that goal can best be achieved?

The veterinary profession must become increasingly involved in such issues as hunting, sealing, trapping, and domestic-animal welfare....

The Humane Society News • Winter 1983

The Dole bill is supported by The HSUS and numerous other national animal-welfare organizations. Some veterinary opposition is found on state and local levels. Charles Drennon, HSUS west coast regional director, terms the CVMA’s opposition to Dole’s bill that would have authorized limited pound seizure in California “very disappointing.... You would think that since veterinarians treat pets, they would want to see pets protected from laboratory experimentation,” he says. With this experience, individual veterinarians are no more humane than are their representatives. They might privately agree with a position taken by humane societies, but their fear of criticism by colleagues, their fear of competition, and their complete lack of communication with one another is familiar for state and federal officials. Because the two groups are so polarized, cooperation is limited...
Dr. Robert Miller, writing in Veterinary Medicine/Small Animal Clinician, used this commonly-accepted criterion for the support or condemnation of activities involving animals: In sports involving the use of animals, the intent of the sport should be considered. If the intent is to inflict pain and injury, as in bullfighting, dogfighting, and cockfighting, the sport should be prohibited. If the sport (though risky) does not intentionally inflict pain and suffering on the animal, it should be legal. Such sports include horse and dog racing, steeples, and立て, and hunting. (Although not always possible, it is the sportman’s intent to make a swift kill.) Supervision by qualified experts is necessary to prevent abuses.

Dr. Miller then goes on: “Mankind should be concerned about animal welfare... As humane beings, we should recognize our kinship with all life, the fragility of our ecosystem, and the need to treat animals humanely.”

This kind of rationalization is not new to veterinarians, to be sure, but it makes communicating the subtleties of the humane-society point of view difficult. It is this dilemma that some within the veterinary community are trying to deal with.

In the summer of 1981, the AVMA Executive Board authorized the creation of a new animal-welfare committee. The nine-member panel was, over the next two years, to study and make recommendations on issues which the AVMA already had encountered fierce opposition from veterinary groups and from the public. They feel that they are more profitable...oriented than we are. The AVMA is as receptive to cooperation and accommodation.”

Veterinarians and human societies are on a collision course on one issue—the operation by humane societies of full-service veterinary clinics providing low-cost medical care.

Veterinarians and human societies...are not terribly far away from basic interests of humane groups...,” echoes the AVMA’s Dr. Decker. “I don’t feel outside of a concern for the health and welfare of animals. The AVMA does not feel outside of a concern for the health and welfare of animals. It is just that, many times, humane societies and veterinarians have not discussed the issue.”

A national symposium exploring the role of humane societies, veterinarians, and government in providing health care for companion animals...” Veterinary clinics are held in Chicago, Illinois, June 9-10, 1983. This symposium will be co-sponsored by the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Animal Hospitals Association, the American Humane Association, and The Humane Society of the United States. Details will appear in the next issue of The AVMA News.

The Full-Service Humane-Society Clinic: Boon to Animals, Threat to Veterinarians

“Veterinarians and human societies...are not terribly far away from basic interests of...”

Dr. Jeff Wolff, supportive of the full-service clinic idea, draws financial contributions from the AVMA and individual practitioners. He wants to supply all member veterinarians with literature on animal welfare issues for their clients.

Veterinarians and human societies are on a collision course on one issue—the operation by humane societies of full-service veterinary clinics providing low-cost medical care.
Reinspections by Senior Staff
Reveal Violations of the Animal Welfare Act

APHIS requested from The HSUS the names and addresses of those dealers visited by Mr. Baker during the spring of 1981. The HSUS, for our part, was more than willing to comply with the APHIS request but we wanted to return a commitment by the agency that it would act on the information in a constructive manner and not just use it for its own internal purposes. After extensive negotiation, HSUS and APHIS officials agreed to the seven-point plan for action:

1. APHIS would review the information on the almost 900 puppy mills Mr. Baker visited and rank them in order of priority for re-examination. This review would be based on what Mr. Baker had observed. Most of the USDA-licensed dealer operations, Mr. Baker believed, seemed to be in violation of the Animal Welfare Act (AWA), the law APHIS inspectors are supposed enforcing during frequent, unannounced on-site visits. These violations often did not appear on the inspectors’ reports or, if they did appear, were apparently not being corrected. Dealers evidence of such violations were frequently not being prosecuted as required by the law.

2. APHIS would supply any additional information needed by APHIS for its evaluation of those breeders.

3. APHIS would inform APHIS of how many breeders were in each reinspection category and what the APHIS goals for reinspection would be for those categories.

4. Reinspection would be undertaken by Animal Care Specialists rather than regular APHIS inspectors.

5. APHIS would keep The HSUS informed through timely reports of the agency’s progress on the reinspection.

6. APHIS would supply The HSUS with copies of the reinspection reports as submitted by the inspectors.

7. APHIS would make every effort to initiate and complete enforcement proceedings against breeders who evidenced violations of the AWA regulations and inform The HSUS of its progress on such proceedings.

APHIS has now, in accordance with this agreement, informed The HSUS of reinspection findings, and, in many cases, recommendations for corrective action.

Reinspection

In September of 1982, its officer found 11 violations—a far cry from the 1-25 its people had found previously! APHIS personnel inspected another Kansas dealer nine times in 1980 and 1981, with an average of 33 violations per visit. Mr. Baker had noted 14 violations in January of 1981. Upon reinspection by APHIS animal-care specialists in September of 1982, the officers found 33 violations. At a reinspection in Arkansas in September of 1982, the Regional Animal Care Specialist found “all but 7 [of 26] houndstandards” deficient. “Many of the violations I cited in my reports were appalling—beal material piled two feet high in dog runs, puppies’ feet trapped by wire-mesh cage flooring, the use of dog carcasses as feed for other dogs, and extreme overcrowding,” said Mr. Baker.

“Regardless of the magnitude of each violation, these were not being noted by APHIS inspectors paid—and trained—for the purpose of assuring compliance with an act specifically designed to help the animals in these facilities.”

The APHIS report agreed. “Major deficiencies in cleaning, sanitation, housekeeping, and pest control were cited during the reinspection of the [name deleted] premises,” the report stated in its evaluation of one Missouri puppy mill. “The reinspection of the [name deleted] premises revealed 12 major deficiencies,” it noted in another case. “According to Dr. Keith Sherman [an APHIS senior inspector], “this kind of facility can be very embarrassing to the Department of Agriculture because it is the kind of operation the Animal Welfare Act was passed to prevent.” In the opinion of the examining inspector, those same premises “could not be brought back into compliance without being completely rebuilt....Highest priority should be given these premises.”

The dealer in question had sold 261 dogs for a gross income of almost $84,000 according to her most recently filed annual report.

How and why was such poor performance tolerated by APHIS personnel for so long? No one person is to blame. For years, AWA inspections have taken a back seat to those thought to have more immediate applications for human health. “In the past, I couldn’t give adequate attention to the animal-care program,” admitted Dr. E.C. Sharrar, Assistant Deputy Administrator of APHIS. “With the appointment of Dr. R.L. Riisler as my new assistant, I’ll be able to give the program the attention it deserves. I have a commitment to this program you wouldn’t believe,” he continued. “We think we are on the way toward solving the problems in the field. It will take time, but within a few months, major problems [with the inspection program] should be addressed. We have a renewed commitment to the inspection program, one that we want to be felt right down to the people in the field.”

The HSUS is gratified to see that APHIS has prepared a candid, thorough report of its own activities as a result of our extensive investigation on puppy mills, and we anxiously await the first of the prosecutions of violators of the AWA. Although there is not yet a schedule for such prosecutions, Dr. Sharrar stated, “If we can get correct data, we will move ahead with prosecutions.” In any case, this is not the end of this report.”
1983
The Year of the Seal?

The Chinese calendar says that 1983 is the year of the pig, but activities planned around the world to increase protection for seals may make it their best year since the U.S. banned the import of seal products with the passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act in 1972.

In Europe, efforts are continuing to ban the import of young harp- and hooded-seal pelts and products into EEC member nations. As the ten member nations of the European Economic Community, while, here at home, the U.S. Congress, acting on the request of the Humane Society of the United States, is making plans for our third International Day of the Seal on March 1.

Regardless of whether or not the EEC ban is implemented, several countries are working to achieve increased protection for seals at the meeting of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), a major international treaty organization that bans trade in more than 440 species of highly endangered plants and animals and restricts the trade in hundreds of other populations. The HSUS is sending Vice President for Wildlife and Environment John Grandy to the April CITES meeting in Botswana, Africa, to work on seals and other endangered species' behalf.

In many respects, the CITES treaty functions as an international version of our own Endangered Species Act. Trade in products from plants and animals listed on Appendix I of the treaty is expressly prohibited. Trade in the products of animals and plants listed on the treaty's Appendix II is prohibited unless it is subject to strict regulation in order to avoid utilization incompatible with their survival.

Those regulations include requiring export permits that may be granted only when a scientific authority from the nation of origin advises that such trade would not be detrimental to the survival of the species and when a management authority from that same nation is satisfied that the products or animals were obtained legally. If the subject of trade is a live animal, CITES also provides regulations for humane transportation.

Gambia has proposed that hooded seals, some 15,000 of which are shot each year off the northernmost coast of Canada in conjunction with the harp-seal clubbing, be listed on Appendix I of the treaty. "It is apparent that hooded seals are being heavily exploited with little knowledge of their capacity to bear commercial hunting," states the Gambian proposal. That country has also proposed that the harp seal be listed on Appendix II of the treaty because, according to the proposal, it "has certain biological characteristics which make it particularly vulnerable to the activities of modern man." A proposal offered by West Germany would list all the seals except those already on Appendix I or Appendix II of the treaty.

While U.S. and international animal-welfare groups will be supporting these proposals at the April meeting, it is not yet certain how the official U.S. delegation will vote. It appears unlikely that the U.S. would support any proposal to list the harp seals, since our scientific authority making CITES recommendations rejected a similar proposal before the 1981 meeting. Another indication is that the administration officials are currently working with the Canadians to try to remove protections for the lynx and bobcat. To support seal listings would undoubtedly irritate the Canadians and threaten that alliance.

Under U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), all seal products are already banned from import into this country. The act also directs the government to "initiate the amendment of any existing international treaty for the protection and conservation of any species of marine mammal to which the U.S. is a party in order to make such treaty consistent with the purposes and policies of this act." Such amendments to CITES as the listing of seals seem consistent with the MMPA.

Public and Congressional pressure is urgently needed to convince the U.S. government that it must support and work for the Gambian and West German proposals in order to carry out the mandate of the MMPA. Please write to President Reagan (Washington, D.C. 20500) urging that he direct the U.S. CITES delegation to support all proposals to list seal species on Appendix I or II of the treaty. Also, write your U.S. representatives and senators, encouraging them to urge the Reagan administration to support the proposals. (See page 31 for addresses.)
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Countdown to April 24:
The HSUS Joins the Mobilization for Animals and Its Mass Mobilization against Primate Centers

More than 100 animal-protection organizations in 11 countries are, right now, planning one of the largest, most visible mass activities ever undertaken on behalf of animals. On April 24, 1983, The HSUS and its supporters will join these organizations in a protest against the excesses and waste involved in all animal experimentation by demonstrating in peaceful mass rallies at four of the nation's seven tax-supported regional primate centers. These institutions (see sidebar on page 18) represent the largest individual block grant for animal use in the country and symbolize the massive use—and misuse—of animals by science. (For a complete discussion of the regional primate center system, see the Fall 1982 HSUS News.)

At the New England Regional Primate Center in Southboro, Massachusetts; the Wisconsin Regional Primate Center in Madison, Wisconsin; the Yerkes Primate Center in Atlanta, Georgia; and the California Primate Research Center in Davis, California, mass rallies featuring speakers, performers, and animal-welfare officials will bring into sharp focus all animal-welfare concerns about the treatment of laboratory animals.

"The mobilization against primate centers will be a worldwide moral and ethical statement," explains Richard Morgan, national coordinator for Mobilization for Animals, the coalition sponsoring the primate center rallies. "It will give the media, government, and industry a sense that laboratory-animal welfare is an issue that must be integrated into modern daily life."

Our tax dollars support the research done at seven regional primate centers. Thousands of primates such as these are part of a system of experimentation in existence over 20 years.
The idea of a nationwide mobilization grew out of the concerns expressed at animal rights conferences in 1981. The feeling of a number of animal-welfare activists was that a single effort, one which many groups with differing approaches and concerns could support, would be the most effective way to demonstrate the animal-welfare community's commitment to the goal of ending animal suffering. In October of 1981, Richard Morgan announced the goal of organizing mass protests against primate centers on April 24, 1983, World Day for Laboratory Animals. For over a year, organizers have been contacting national animal-welfare organizations and small humane societies, environmental organizations and anti-vivisection groups, to gain support for the mass mobilization.

"We feel the Mobilization will be very important in drawing humane groups together by focusing on a specific, individual action on behalf of animals, one undertaken at a specific time. It will also help to train a network of activists nationwide who will have learned important skills—how to organize constituents, speak out to the media, and coordinate activities for other humane issues in the future. It will show the outside world that humane groups can act in union and cooperate in a unified effort. This is something the outside world has long doubted," observes Mr. Morgan.

The primate centers action will be a legal, peaceful, mass demonstration. The rally at each of the four locations will last from three to five hours. Nationally known personalities from the entertainment and art worlds will be at each rally, as will be spokespeople for the major groups supporting the action. Literature on the Mobilization, the primate centers' activities, and the individual groups participating will be available at displays and booths. Every effort will be made by Mobilization organizers to ensure a controlled, lawful atmosphere while at the same time emphasizing the commitment of animal-welfare supporters to ending laboratory-animal exploitation and suffering.

A great deal of international participation in the mobilization is planned and more is under consideration in countries throughout the world.

**The Regional Primate Centers**

- **The Yerkes Primate Center** in Atlanta, Georgia, affiliated with Emory University and specializing in neurobiology, behavior, physiology, and immunology, and reproductive biology;
- **The Wisconsin Regional Primate Center** in Madison, Wisconsin, affiliated with the University of Wisconsin and specializing in primate behavior, reproduction, and neurosciences;
- **The New England Regional Primate Center** in Southborough, Massachusetts, affiliated with Harvard University and specializing in infectious diseases, primate pathology, behavioral biology, cardiovascular diseases, and nutrition;
- **The California Regional Primate Research Center** in Davis, California, affiliated with the University of California, Davis, and specializing in studies on the adverse effects of the environment on human health;
- **The Delta Regional Primate Research Center** in Covington, Louisiana, affiliated with Tulane University and specializing in infectious diseases, neurobiology, and biomedical research;
- **The Oregon Regional Primate Research Center** in Beaverton, Oregon, affiliated with the Oregon Health Sciences University and specializing in reproductive biology, cardiovascular, metabolic, and immune diseases, and cutaneous biology; and
- **The Regional Primate Research Center at the University of Washington** in Seattle, Washington, specializing in biomedical research on primates.

Demonstrations and rallies will be taking place at facilities similar to the regional primate centers in at least six other countries, perhaps more. It seems at this date likely that demonstrations in Australia, New Zealand, England, Sweden, Switzerland, and Germany will take place; others in India, France, Norway, and countries in South America are possible.

"This international participation should lead to much greater inter-national cooperation among humane groups in the future. The Mobilization will show the outside world that the public demands that action on behalf of animals be taken. Demonstrations are an integral part of the legislative process. The visible presence of mass moral outrage through public action, followed by responsible legislation, is the way to see things changed," says Mr. Morgan.

What impact will the April 24th action have? Morgan believes the size of the turnout and the resulting media exposure in the four key locations (see map on page 18) will have a great deal to do with the success of the Mobilization but there may be other benefits to be gained no matter how large or small the crowds. He anticipates some concessions by experimenters, concerned about public pressure on their grant-funding institutions, will occur. An even greater expansion of some of the kinds of activities major groups have done independently themselves—lobbying, publications, etc.—should be another by-product. Finally, the creation of the Mobilization for Animals, a structural framework for future activities should allow much greater unified work on a national basis in all areas of animal exploitation.

"This will be a day on which everyone who cares about the future will come together, united for one purpose," explains Mr. Morgan. "This day represents the strength of the entire movement to the politicians, the public, and to ourselves. There is no moral alternative for animal-welfare concerns—this is what our message must be. The Mobilization and other activities like it will bring animal welfare into the international spotlight. Every additional person who comes to the Mobilization on April 24 will add that much more pressure for change."

**The HSUS's Role in the Mobilization**

The HSUS is one of the major organizations supporting the Mobilization through financial commitment, professional staff support, and publica-

The HSUS has also made the commitment to send four of its senior officers, President John A. Hoyt, Vice President for Program and Communications Patrick Forkan, Scientific Director Michael Fox and Director for Laboratory Animal Welfare Andrew Rowan, to each of the four sites on April 24. Support staff will accompany these representatives and act as liaisons with the rest of the Mobilization team and with the general public.

An up-to-the-minute mailing on the precise locations, times, and activities to take place at each location will be mailed to all HSUS members in late March. If you wish to begin planning now to attend one of the mass demonstrations, contact one of the Mobilization for Animals coordinators for information on transportation, accommodations, and activities.

Many primates are kept tier upon tier in sterile cages at the nation's regional primate centers.
MOBILIZATION FOR ANIMALS (MFA)
Statement of Objectives

Treatment of Animals
1. Establishment as immediate policy, and not mitigating against implementation of any other terms in this request, that all animals in all primate centers and related facilities will receive anesthesia and analgesics in pre-operative, experimental, and post-operative situations in every case where there is actual or potential pain, suffering, or deprivation involved.
2. Housing and transportation of primates used for teaching, testing, or research shall provide for their physical, social, and psychological well-being. Minimum standards shall be those delineated by AAALAC (American Association for the Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care), with the addition of fulfillment of psychological and behavioral needs.

Access and Review
3. Establishment of an office (to be supported by NIH (National Institutes of Health) as part of a block grant) in each primate center within one year, to be staffed by MFA-designated individuals acting as representatives for the welfare of animals within each facility. Staff of this office shall have access, on a regularly scheduled basis, to all areas, rooms, and facilities within each primate center, as well as to all records of past and current experiments, and all records on procurement, breeding, euthanasia, and treatment of animals in the facility. The review of this office shall extend to behavioral and psychological research facilities and other institutions with links to or cooperative programs with any of the primate centers.
4. Within each primate center and related facility, and at NIH, all policy-making, review, and advisory committees concerned with treatment and care of animals, conduct of experiments, pain classifications, and funding requests shall have 25 percent permanent, voting, MFA-designated membership.

Nature of Experiments
5. No initiation of new projects, and a phase-out of existing projects over a period of one year, as follows:
   a. all behavioral experiments which do not have current, easily demonstrable clinical applications, with the exception of naturalistic studies of wild populations.
   b. all experiments which are redundant or are being duplicated elsewhere.
   c. all experiments for which alternatives to live-animal use exist.
6. Abolition of stereotaxic devices and other methods of restraint which do, or can, cause distress in animals.
7. Grant funds saved by item #5 (a,b,c) shall be used to train resident researchers in alternatives to live-animal use, to fund development of additional methods utilizing such alternatives, and to provide living conditions as specified in #2.

Primate Center Operations
8. Complete closure within one year of the Oregon Regional Primate Center (Beaverton, Oregon) and the Delta Regional Primate Center (Covington, Louisiana), for reasons of relative mortality rates, geographical redundancy, and duplication of work. Funds previously committed to those centers shall be used to repatriate resident primates to natural habitats or wildlife refuges, or to place them in MFA-approved research facilities, under the direction of MFA member groups working with the staffs of the centers, and all experimentation and breeding operations at the two centers shall cease.
9. All employees, volunteers, and others at all primate centers and affiliated facilities must participate in a course on ethics and animals to be conducted by a Mobilization for Animals group instructor.

The Mobilization for Animals: How to Become Involved
For more information on the Mobilization for Animals and the Primate Center Mass Mobilization itself, contact the appropriate office below:

National Office
Phyllis Fischer
P.O. Box 337
Jonesboro, TN 37659
(615) 928-9419

Eastern Region
including Massachusetts, New York, New Hampshire, Washington, D.C., Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Connecticut
Ingrid Newkirk, Annette Pickett, and Alex Pacheco
P.O. Box 56272
Washington, D.C. 20011
(202) 726-0156

Central Region
including Wisconsin, Illinois, Ohio, Minnesota, Iowa, Indiana, and Michigan
Pam Johnson and Susan Anderson
P.O. Box 2184
Madison, WI 53701
(608) 437-8769

Southern Region
including Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas
Dawn Thacker and Carol Morgan
P.O. Box 5393 EKS
Johnson City, TN 37601
(615) 282-8099

Western Region
including California, Washington, Oregon, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico
Carol Gage and Virginia Handley
1008 10th Street, Box 513
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 488-0181

“Protecting Animals in Today’s World”
The HSUS 1982 annual conference combined information, debate, and dialogue during a week filled with New England flavor.
“Design for Rainbows”

Excerpts from the keynote address of Amy Freeman Lee at the 1982 HSUS annual conference

...Enormous advancements have been made in science, no one in his right mind could possibly deny that. But I want to run through in summary fashion with you some of the dreadful prices we paid for those advances. It wasn’t necessary to pay in the coin of the spiritual realm but we have done it. In the process of our worship of science—not our respect for it, not our admiration, nor our knowledge, nor our understanding, but our worship of it—we have largely dehumanized ourselves. We have all become statisticians.

We are doing head counts: how many people can we serve in the square footage that we have, not how many spirits of the students are we going to touch? How can we turn out more people professionally and vocationally prepared, not how many students have we helped learn to live on the level of a human being? First you have to learn to live as a human before you can learn to make a living. What good does it do to be a doctor, no matter how superb a technocrat, if you don’t know what it is necessary to serve? Whatever you do should be a ministry.

We have had along with this worship of science a love affair but it has been a negative and destructive one. It has been a love affair with brutality and cruelty and violence. Worship of science has been a terrible price for us to pay. We not only need knowledge of science, admiration and respect for it, but also objectivity, a consciousness, and a conscience about how we use it. And that has to have an underpinning of a value system....

...We need to take into account the direct effect on our actions, on the physical and biological patterns that we have inherited in this universe. We are moving fast toward a global view of our total planet. Every scientist, every leader, be he political, economic, social or religious, must work with this new global concept and contribute to the development of a higher sense of mankind, a planetary sense of human life in the biosphere. Morality is simply the expression of the highest interest of the group, this time of the entire humanity, living in a planetary home. Spirituality is a personal search for a total consciousness and union with the cosmos.

If you look outside the windows wherever you are and you look with your inner eye and your whole self, you will see the evolution of the beginning of the rainbow. We are working on it. We have begun to complete that circle through our compassion. It is my honest belief that organizations like The Humane Society of the United States personify by people like you will promulgate that design, will finish it, will carry it globally in a way that will not only nourish this very beautiful planet but will also illuminate it.
Texas in '83

The HSUS will hold its 1983 annual conference from October 12 to October 15, 1983, in Fort Worth, Texas. Why not make your plans now to join members, friends, and nationally known animal-welfare experts for an information-packed week in the friendly Southwest? Program details will be in the Spring and Summer issues of The HSUS News.

ALICE MORGAN WRIGHT—EDITH GOODE FUND
TESTAMENTARY TRUST

December 31, 1981

Statement of Assets and Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust Corpus 12/31/80</td>
<td>$1,268,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 Income from Investments—Net</td>
<td>106,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss: Distribution of 1980 Income</td>
<td>$1,374,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(117,194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,257,157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Represented by

- Cash
  - $81
- Accrued Interest Receivable
  - 9,607
- Investments—Securities at Book Value
  - 1,247,469

Balance 12/31/81

- $1,257,157

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981 Income from Investments—Net</td>
<td>$106,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disbursements

- Grants of 1981 Income to Organizations Listed Below
  - $106,135

Organizations Receiving Aid From Alice Morgan Wright—Edith Goode Fund 1981 Trust Income

- American Prostate Maintenance Committee, Boston, Massachusetts
- Animal Cruaders, Inc., Everett, Washington
- Animal Kind, Inc., Kansas City, Missouri
- Animal Protective League, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
- Association for the Prevention of Cruelty in Public Spectacles, Barcelona, Spain
- Association for the Protection of Fur Bearing Animals, Vancouver, Canada
- Association Uruguaya De Proteccion A Los Animales, Montevideo, Uruguay
- Breeder Hospital for Animals Old Warhorse Memorial Hospital, London, England
- Bund Gugla Des Minerekch Der Thre E.V., Munich, Germany
- Columbia/Green Humane Society, Hudson, New York
- Defenders of Wildlife, Washington, D.C.
- Dublin Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Dublin, Ireland
- Eastern Slope Animal Welfare League, Conway, New Hampshire
- Fero Animal Sanctuary, London, England
- Humane Society of Lackawanna County, Scranton, Pennsylvania
- Irish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Dublin, Ireland
- Lehigh County Humane Society, Allentown, Pennsylvania
- Missouri Anti-Vivisection Society, St. Louis, Missouri
- Montana-Idaho Humane Society, Missoula, Montana
- National Equine Defense League, Carlisle, England
- National Humane Education Society, Sterling, Virginia
- Nijag Animal Wellness Society (Nijag Animal Sanctuary), Tainlusa, South India
- Nordic Society Against Painful Experiments on Animals (Nordiska Samfundet), Stockholm, Sweden
- People's Dispensary for Sick Animals, London, England
- Scottish Society for the Prevention of Vivisection, Edinburgh, Scotland
- Society for Animal Rights (National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare), Clark Summit, Pennsylvania
- Somerset County Humane Society, Inc., Somerville, New Jersey
- Tierschutzverein Fur Berlin Und Umland Corp., Berlin, West Germany
- Wayside Waifs, Kansas City, Missouri
- World Society for the Protection of Animals, Zurich, Switzerland

Mark L. Van Loucks introduces his wife Eva to Saturday’s banquet audience. The Van Loucks announced plans for a nationwide telethon for animals, to be produced on cable television networks in 1983, at the HSUS conference.

HSUS President John Hoyt presents certificates of appreciation to (from left) Roger W. Galvin, Montgomery County (Maryland) assistant state’s attorney; Richard W. Swain, Montgomery County police department; and WCBS-TV (New York) reporter Arnold Diaz. WDHO-TV (Toledo, Ohio) was also honored. Messrs. Galvin and Swain were honored for their work during the prosecution of researcher Edward Taub; WCBS and WDHO for their puppy-mill exposés.

HSUS staff members (from left) Kathy Savesky, Frantz Dantzler, Sue Pressman, John Hoyt, and Phyllis Wright field questions during Saturday’s “Open Forum.”
1982 Resolutions

Each year, those who attend the HSUS annual conference offer and vote upon resolutions proposed for adoption. These resolutions set forth a course of action the HSUS strives to follow during that and subsequent years. Resolutions from previous years remain valid so long as they are appropriate.

Animal Events and Contests

Whereas in addition to rodeo, dogfighting, and cockfighting, many animal games and contests, such as bloodless bullfights, armadillo races, greased pig contests, donkey basketball, cockroach contests, turkey drops, rabbit roping, and all the other similar sports and events cause harassment, pain, injury, and, sometimes death to the animals; and
Whereas exploiting animals and inflicting stress and pain for no purpose other than the entertainment of people cannot be justified, even though the proceeds might be donated to charitable causes; and
Whereas young people are thereby led to believe that the abuse of animals is an acceptable practice in our society; and
Whereas these animal events frequently require the capture of the animals from the wild; and
Whereas those people participating in these events are often unknowingly exposed to diseases and other hazards; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The Humane Society of the United States increase its exposure of these events, informing the public of their cruel nature and encouraging HSUS members and other concerned citizens to contact local animal event sponsors, government officials, and responsible law enforcement and game agencies to prevent their recurrence.

National Wildlife Refuges

Whereas National Wildlife Refuges were established primarily as natural sanctuaries to protect, preserve, and benefit wildlife; and
Whereas hunting, trapping, commercial grazing, and other harmful activities are inconsistent with the concept of a national system of sanctuaries for wildlife; and
Whereas the current policy of the United States Department of the Interior favors commercial activities to the detriment of wildlife protection with the result that many refuges are operated as no more than hunting preserves where wild animals are inhumanely destroyed by hunters and trappers; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS seek legislative and judicial remedies to assure that wild animals on refuges be treated in a manner that assures their well-being and halts the destructive exploitation of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Pound Seizure

Whereas The Humane Society of the United States has always opposed the release of animals from shelters for research because this widespread practice results in many cruelties being inflicted upon the cats and dogs so used; and
Whereas it has been demonstrated that the release of impounded animals to research weakens the incentive for municipalities to take humane measures to reduce pet over-population and to promote responsible ownership; and
Whereas many people will abandon pound animals rather than surrender them to a shelter that releases animals for research, thus undermining effective animal-control efforts in the community; and
Whereas The HSUS has demonstrated that these “random-source” dogs and cats make unreliable subjects for research; and
Whereas the easy availability of these animals fosters the belief that animal life is cheap thus discouraging researchers from developing non-animal research alternatives; and
Whereas several states in the past few years have recognized these abuses and sought to correct them by repealing “pound seizure” provisions of their state codes, and several others have banned outright the release of shelter animals for research; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS make the prohibition of the release of shelter animals for research a legislative priority, and lend its support to concerned local and state animal-welfare organizations working to achieve these bans.

Wild Animal Auctions

Whereas increasingly, menageries are acquiring the sale of their surplus animals to members of the general public by means of wild animal auctions; and
Whereas these sales have caused animals that require highly specialized care, handling, and housing to fall into the hands of persons who have neither the knowledge nor the facilities to care for them properly; and
Whereas wild animals have suffered greatly and many have died as a result of deliberate or inadvertent mishandling by these persons; and
Whereas improperly kept wild animals cause a serious danger in the community; and
Whereas it has been amply demonstrated that wild animals sold at public auctions end up in private zoos as pets, in hunting preserves and in roadside menageries, all of which uses have long been condemned by The HSUS; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS work towards the banning of these auctions and, in that connection, enlist the support of local humane societies, the United States Department of Agriculture, the United States Department of the Interior, state fish and game departments, and the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums.

Primate Centers

Whereas the seven primate centers established under the jurisdiction of the National Institutes of Health have been continually criticized for conducting substandard research; and
Whereas millions of dollars of federal funds are devoted annually to supporting these centers; and
Whereas thousands of primates and other research animals have suffered and died as a result of experimentation or inadequate care in the primate centers; and
Whereas little or no attempt has been made to develop more humane environments for primates in the centers; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS actively support the efforts of the Mobilization for Animals to Close Delta and Oregon Primate Centers and to encourage the National Institutes of Health to reallocate to develop research alternatives; and be it
FURTHER RESOLVED that The HSUS encourage its members and the general public to support the goals and aims of the Mobilization for Animals with respect to the Primate Centers and participate in the Primate Centers Mass Mobilization on April 24, 1983.

Seal Ban

Whereas The HSUS has long contended that the clubbing of harp and hooded seals off the coast of Canada each year should be prohibited as both cruel and unnecessary; and
Whereas it was this strong belief, in part, that led to our insistence on a ban on the import of seal products into the U.S. by passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act in 1972; and
Whereas the major markets for these products are the European nations belonging to the European Economic Community (EEC); and
Whereas the Parliament of said EEC in March of this year passed an overwhelming margin a recommendation for a ban on the import of products from young harp and hooded seals; and
Whereas in October of this year, the European Commission of the EEC recommended that the EEC adopt a ban on the import of Canadian seal products; and
Whereas it is incumbent upon The HSUS, therefore, to be
RESOLVED that the constituents of The HSUS here gathered in annual conference commend the actions of the European Parliament and the European Commission for working to end an and the Canadian seal hunt, and urge in the strongest possible terms that the EEC’s Council of Ministers move with all due haste to implement the ban prior to the 1983 seal hunt; and be it
FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be transmitted to the Humane Society of the United States, acting at its annual conference in Boston, Massachusetts, during the winter of 1982, forthwith communicated to said Council of Ministers in Brussels.

Whereas the seven primate centers established under the jurisdiction of the National Institutes of Health have been continually criticized for conducting substandard research; and
Whereas millions of dollars of federal funds are devoted annually to supporting these centers; and
Whereas thousands of primates and other research animals have suffered and died as a result of experimentation or inadequate care in the primate centers; and
Whereas little or no attempt has been made to develop more humane environments for primates in the centers; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS actively support the efforts of the Mobilization for Animals to Close Delta and Oregon Primate Centers and to encourage the National Institutes of Health to reallocate to develop research alternatives; and be it
FURTHER RESOLVED that The HSUS encourage its members and the general public to support the goals and aims of the Mobilization for Animals with respect to the Primate Centers and participate in the Primate Centers Mass Mobilization on April 24, 1983.

Whereas improperly kept wild animals cause a serious danger in the community; and
Whereas it has been amply demonstrated that wild animals sold at public auctions end up in private zoos as pets, in hunting preserves and in roadside menageries, all of which uses have long been condemned by The HSUS; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS work towards the banning of these auctions and, in that connection, enlist the support of local humane societies, the United States Department of Agriculture, the United States Department of the Interior, state fish and game departments, and the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums.

Whereas the seven primate centers established under the jurisdiction of the National Institutes of Health have been continually criticized for conducting substandard research; and
Whereas millions of dollars of federal funds are devoted annually to supporting these centers; and
Whereas thousands of primates and other research animals have suffered and died as a result of experimentation or inadequate care in the primate centers; and
Whereas little or no attempt has been made to develop more humane environments for primates in the centers; therefore be it
RESOLVED that The HSUS actively support the efforts of the Mobilization for Animals to Close Delta and Oregon Primate Centers and to encourage the National Institutes of Health to reallocate to develop research alternatives; and be it
FURTHER RESOLVED that The HSUS encourage its members and the general public to support the goals and aims of the Mobilization for Animals with respect to the Primate Centers and participate in the Primate Centers Mass Mobilization on April 24, 1983.
Black Duck Suit Doesn’t Halt Hunting Season

On November 29, the HSUS saw a suit it had brought in an attempt to halt the 1982 black duck hunting season rejected by a judge in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

The HSUS had warned the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior (see the Law Notes in the Fall 1982 HSUS News). The HSUS had warned the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) that, if it failed to take strong affirmative action to protect the black duck in its east coast habitat, we would have no choice but to bring suit to halt the hunting season.

The FWS response to that threat was to file a last minute foot-dragging suit. The agency admitted that the black duck population had declined and recognized hunting as a cause of that decline, but it proposed to take protective action in 1983 rather than in 1982.

Back Again in ’83?

In two recent actions, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has moved to reinstate the use of 1080. The FWS response to that threat was to file a suit to halt the breeding season. In March of 1982, EPA began legal efforts to approve the use of 1080, primarily for predator control and also to other non-target species.

On December 18, 1982, EPA Administrator Anne Gorsuch, in a final ruling on EPA’s use of the poison by December 19, 1982. Until then, massive efforts were made to reduce pain and suffering of animals during experimentation; protect rats and mice for the first time; and set up stricter guidelines to stop, or at least greatly reduce, the number of animals used in research and to set up stricter guidelines to stop, or at least greatly reduce, the number of animals used in research and to set up stricter guidelines to stop, or at least greatly reduce, the number of animals used in research and to set up stricter guidelines to stop, or at least greatly reduce, the number of animals used in research.

Law Judge Spencer Nissen to collect the enormous body of evidence amassed by parties on both sides of the issue. The HSUS and numerous other groups actively participated in these hearings to address both the scientific and the legal aspects of the case.

After months of testimony, Judge Nissen handed down his decision on October 22, 1982. He ruled 1080 should be re-registered for private individuals’ use in toxic collars worn by sheep and for single-lethal-dose baits to be openly placed in designated areas.

The judge made his ruling despite the fact that 1080 did not reduce livestock losses in 1980, the year it was used, and that the toxic collar is unlikely to reduce predation on birds in the open range, where it is alleged that most serious coyote-predation problems occur. He also acknowledged the existence of risks to humans and the environment from potential misuse of 1080.

EPA Administrator Anne Gorsuch was less hopeful about single-lethal-dose baits containing 1080 being spread in three western states as an experiment. The FWS has failed to appeal Gorsuch’s decision in favor of a continued ban on 1080.

In a separate action—despite the judge’s decision to allow 1080—EPA granted an “experimental use permit” that would allow 8,000 single-lethal-dose baits containing 1080 to be spread in three western states as an experiment. The FWS has failed to appeal Gorsuch’s decision in favor of a continued ban on 1080.

Close Call for House Lab Bill

Thanks to swift action by animal-welfare groups, Congress passed H.R. 6928, which would require the regulation and use of alternatives to animal testing and assure of some protection in ’83. The Interior Department would realize it would be a judge’s call this year if it failed to take necessary protective action. We also reasoned that if the judge’s call would be made after the hunt for 1982 would have to be canceled, so much the better.

The judge did not close down the 1982 season (which was almost over by the time of the ruling on November 29). As we had hoped, she did base her decision on the FWS promise to take protective action in 1983.

While the HSUS wasn’t able to help the black ducks flying down the open field last year, our action will eventually help tens of thousands of the birds in the years to come.

As introduced, S. 2948 would—

* direct money into the development and validation of non-animal research and testing methods;

* step, or at least greatly reduce, the number of plans for painful research projects before they begin;

* set up stricter guidelines to reduce pain and suffering of animals during experimentation;

* protect rats and mice for the first time; and

* set up an animal-studies committee, which would include some outside the facility to represent animal-welfare concerns.

Sen. Robert Dole of Kansas has introduced a revised version of the bill to promote the development and use of alternatives and establish much higher standards of humane care and treatment for research animals. S. 2948 is the first Senate bill on alternatives ever to be introduced and is very similar to the House version, H.R. 6928. It is supported not only by The HSUS but also by the Animal Protection Legislation, the American Humane Association, the Fund for Animals, the National Anti-Vivisection Society, and the American Fund for Alternatives to Animal Research, among other organizations.

The introduction of S. 2948 gave a boost to H.R. 6928 and set the stage for a full committee hearing in the House to get these bills passed. Since no bill can become law unless it is passed by both the House and the Senate, Sen. Dole took a crucial step for laboratory animals and gave animal-welfare supporters hope for some real help to come from Congress.

More APHIS Funds Sought

More than eight months of hard work by HSUS staff and members paid off this fall when we successfully forestalled federal budget cuts that would have, for all intents and purposes, ended enforcement of the federal Animal Welfare Act (AWA), the most comprehensive of all federal legislation protecting animals, the AWA regulates the care and treatment of animals in zoos, circuses, puppy mills, and research facilities and sets standards for the humane treatment of laboratory animals in commerce. It is administered by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, whose staff regularly inspects animals to be sure they are in compliance with the requirements of the act.

Last February, when the Reagan administration recommended a 70 percent cut in APHIS’s budget (from 4.9 to 1.5 million dollars), the staff set out to make certain that we were in compliance with the requirements of the act.

As introduced, S. 2948 would—

* direct money into the development and validation of non-animal research and testing methods;

* step, or at least greatly reduce, the number of plans for painful research projects before they begin;

* set up stricter guidelines to reduce pain and suffering of animals during experimentation;

* protect rats and mice for the first time; and

* set up an animal-studies committee, which would include some outside the facility to represent animal-welfare concerns.

Sen. Orrin Hatch of Utah, chair-
over to the states and local humane societies. This solution would have been ridiculous—the individual states have neither the authority nor the funds to carry out necessary inspections, and humane societies have no legal right to enter places such as research facilities!

The only way to prevent what was sure to result in the destruction of the AWA was to convince members of the House and Senate Agriculture Appropriations subcommittees how important funding would be to maintain even the minimum standards required under the AWA. The HSUS Action Alert members in subcommittee members’ home districts were asked to write or call their representatives to express their concern about the animal suffering certain to result from the proposed budget cuts and that funding be restored to 1982 levels. The HSUS Director of Legislation Martha Hamby and Director of Investigations Frantz Dantzi testified before hearings in the Senate and House, for the same purpose.

Subcommittee members and their staffs were bombarded in person and by phone to make sure each had all the necessary background information. We were fortunate Bob Traxler of Michigan was on the subcommittee in the House since Rep. Traxler and his staff were indispensable in shoring up support for the AWA with other members. Our work in the House paid off in August, when Subcommittee Chairman Jamie Whitten recommended reinstatement of every penny cut from APHIS’s 1983 budget. The other members, led by Rep. Traxler, quickly concurred.

In the Senate, budget figures restoring the funds worked out by Chairman Thad Cochran and Sen. Tom Eagleton were adopted by the subcommittee. Both House and Senate appropriations bills were adopted by full committee and sent to the floor, where they were expected to pass with little debate and be signed by President Reagan.

The HSUS is optimistic about APHIS money being restored to the budget. If this saga is any indication of congressional concern about animal issues, then animal welfareists can take heart. We’ll have to—since the appropriations battle for 1984 will start all over again when the new Congress opens in January.

Thank You and Goodbye

When the 93rd Congress convenes in January, animal-welfare supporters will be seeing some new faces and missing some others. Nineteen of our animal-legislation copromoters will be back in Congress after December, including two primary copromoters and one sponsor. We feel the loss already. The HSUS spotlight is on three new legislators:

• Rep. Rentals Holdin in T.H. Res. 805, legislation to study problems caused by factory farming. He was also a coponsor of the lab animal legislation:

• Rep. Margaret Heckler of Massachusetts, primary copromoter of H.R. 6928, the legislation for laboratory animals. Rep. Heckler coordinated minority action on this bill in the Committee on Science and Technology and held together minority support;

• Rep. Peter McCloskey, Jr. of California who as ranking minority member of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee shepherded legislation to protect marine mammals.

Our sources say that some of our champions plan to return to Congress. We hope that those who do not will continue their fine work for animals in the private sector.

Time Marches on

Just as everyone was getting used to the animal-legislation bill numbers memotized, time ran out on the 97th Congress. If action is to continue on our issues, each piece of animal legislation must be introduced again during the 98th Congress. The HSUS is already scouting for and securing commitments from sponsors for the legislation that has kept alive hopes for federally authorized humane treatment of animals.

Although, technically, every bill dies unless it has been passed and enacted by the time Congress adjourns, the legislative history acquired by each bill when it goes through hearings and markup in committee remains in effect if a bill is reintroduced. Thus, although the whole process starts over again, repeating hearings and committee processes, some of our legislation has a head start in the new term. Please remember that bill numbers will change when the legislation is re-introduced. We will keep you posted on the status of all legislation affecting animals in the months ahead.
Companion-Animal and Farm-Animal Issues Highlight Institute's Autumn

Dr. Michael Fox, director of The HSUS's Institute for the Study of Animal Problems, and Associate Director Kathy Savvsky spoke at a number of important talks on issues affecting pets, farm animals, and laboratory animals during the autumn. In September, Dr. Fox presented the keynote address and chaired a seminar on cat and dog behavior at The HSUS's regional workshop held in Schaumburg, Illinois. He presented this same seminar, which included methods of evaluating animal welfare according to behavioral and other criteria, to veterinary students at Tufts University in Boston, Massachusetts, later in the month. In October, Dr. Fox spoke to members of the Tri-state Poultry Producers' Association in Fort Wayne, Indiana, on the relationship between farm-animal welfare and the economic crisis facing independent farmers today. Dr. Fox also gave the keynote address at the University of Florida, Gainesville. That a symposium on the use of animals in research held at the University of Denver; and presented a paper at a symposium on agriculture, change, and human values held at the University of Florida in Gainesville. That a symposium on this latter topic was held at all is an indication that academicians are beginning to recognize intensive agriculture and factory farming methods are not only jeopardizing farm animals' welfare but also consumer health and environmental quality. Dr. Rowan spent the autumn working on various HSUS laboratory-animal projects, including the laboratory-animal bill pending in the House of Representatives, the pound-seizure issue, and the HSUS position on the nation's regional primate centers (all reported upon in the Fall 1982 HSUS News). In October, he addressed the National Research Sources Advisory Council on the need to support the development of alternatives to use of laboratory animals and was the keynote speaker at the special scientists' workshop on alternatives in toxicology testing. The Institute also served as host for two foreign students, the Netherlands's Françoise Wemelsfelder, who is writing a report on animal boredom, and Mexico's Laura Barocio, who is reviewing the status of various euthanasia techniques.

NAAHE Emphasizes Teachers' Meetings

As part of its continuing effort to reach classroom teachers, the staff of The HSUS's National Animal Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) spent much of its time this fall in teachers' meetings and symposia. In October, NAAHE Director Kathy Savvsky spoke at a symposium at Providence College sponsored by the Volunteer Services for Animals under a special grant from the Rhode Island Foundation. The symposium had as its focus the role of humane education in the broader scope of public education. It inaugurated a year-long pilot project that will involve, among other things, the use of People and Animals, the NAAHE curriculum guide, in selected schools around the state. Also in October, Ms. Savvsky and Kind Editor Charles Herrmann assisted the staff of St. Hubert's Giralda in Madison, New Jersey, in conducting a day-long humane education workshop for teachers from surrounding communities. While in New Jersey, Ms. Savvsky appeared on "Education Forum," a half-hour television program produced by Kean College of New Jersey. In November, Ms. Savvsky spoke at "Animal Kind 1982," a humane education symposium organized by the Bide-A-Wee Home Association in New York. This symposium concentrated on the human/companion-animal bond and its significance for educators. More than 200 people attended this event co-sponsored by NAAHE and the New York State Humane Association.

Mid-Atlantic

Zoo Visits Reveal Woes

Acting on complaints The HSUS had received over a period of time, Regional Director Nina Austenber and Jeanna Roush, assistant to the director of captive wildlife protection, traveled over 1,000 miles to inspect zoos in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania this fall. The complaints were well-founded. Ms. Austenberg and Ms. Roush found at one facility three behaviorally-disturbed baboons in a tiny, barren cell with only a single shelf to occupy their interest; at another, an obese monkey three times its normal weight because of uncontrolled feeding by the public; and lions and other large zoo animals cramped in areas half the size of their previous enclosures.

Follow-up meetings with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and fish-and-wildlife and park officials in these states have been scheduled at which The HSUS will demand that remedial action be taken to improve these totally unacceptable conditions.

Staff Speaks in N.J.

The New Jersey animal-welfare organization St. Hubert's Giralda recently sponsored a seminar on puppy mills that featured HSUS Investigator Bob Baker soon after his appearance on the WCBS-TV (New York) new show, "Remedies of Cruelty." Mr. Baker addressed the New Jersey Dog Federation and the New Jersey animal-welfare representatives on a topic now receiving concentrated media attention nationwide.

Southwest

Animal-Control Academy

The Great Lakes Regional Office will act as a co-host to the HSUS Animal-Control Academy at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, May 16-27, 1983. The academy offers training for animal-control officers and animal-care professionals working in animal control. Those who successfully complete the academy will be awarded certification by the academy. Continuing education units of credit will be awarded through the University of Alabama, the academy headquarters institution.

Better Dog Law Due

The Michigan Federation of Humane Societies has been at work for several years attempting to update that state's antiquated Dog Laws of 1919. The federation has drafted the Animal Welfare Act of 1982 which updates, consolidates, and strengthens the present animal-related statutes. All Michigan HSUS members should support this important piece of legislation. For further information, contact Regional Director Sandy Rowland of the Great Lakes office.

1983 Workshop Scheduled

"Solving Animal Problems in Your Community," a three-day workshop to be held in Cherry Hill, New Jersey, on April 14-16, will include The HSUS's John A. Hoyt, Michael Fox, Phyllis Wright, and Sue Pressman as speakers. Contact the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office for details.

Great Lakes

Greased pig contests continue to be a problem in the Great Lakes region. In an effort to halt this unnecessary animal exploitation, Field Investigator Tim Greyhavens has photographed and documented the cruelties involved to prove to organizers that the treatment of these animals is neither humane nor necessary. This is the first step towards persuading organizers to find other forms of fund-raising and community entertainment.
Gulf States

Left Behind

Remember the “African Safari Zoo,” the traveling menagerie that made the rounds of Texas shopping malls without a lease (see Around the Regions, Summer 1982 HSUS News)! In August, a Harlingen, Texas, mechanic contacted the Gulf States office to complain that the owner of that very same “African Safari Zoo” had abandoned two grown lions and two grown bears, housed permanently in a transport trailer, on the mechanic’s premises. The owner of the animals had hired the mechanic to repair the vehicle himself for almost five months. He had tried repeatedly to contact the safari-zoo owner, but without success and was ready to file charges of non-payment against him for his services. Investigator Bernie Weller contacted the Wild Wilderness Drive-Thru Safari Zoo in Gentry, Arkansas, whose owner agreed to take the animals. The bears were no better off. Investigator Weller tries to convince one of the bears a better life is on the other side of that transport cage. The animals’ move to comfortable quarters at a well-run facility. The owner of the “African Safari Zoo,” who surfaced long enough to receive a renewal of his license from USDA, is once again unavailable for questioning or prosecution.

West Coast

No Veal in San Diego

After the head of sales for the Holiday Inn Embarracadero in San Diego, California, had requested, received, and reviewed information on The HSUS’s “No Veal This Meal” campaign, he reported to the West Coast Regional Office that “the chef has taken milk-fed veal off the menu."

More Sakach Studies

Investigator Eric Sakach has completed studies on three more separate animal-control programs and shelter facilities (see Around the Regions in the Fall 1982 HSUS News). After receiving requests from officials in these jurisdictions, Mr. Sakach made unannounced inspections of the City of Las Vegas (Nevada) Animal Care and Control Center; the Placer County Division of Animal Control; and Mendocino County’s animal-control program in Ukiah, California. He sent complete reports of his findings, along with HSUS recommendations for improvements, to the officials involved.

Investigator Weller tries to convince one of the bears a better life is on the other side of that transport cage. The animals’ move to comfortable quarters at a well-run facility. The owner of the “African Safari Zoo,” who surfaced long enough to receive a renewal of his license from USDA, is once again unavailable for questioning or prosecution.

New England

Conn. Funds New Gun

Regional Director John Dommers and former Connecticut State Representative Everett Smith have sharply criticized the decision of the state bond commission to approve a grant of $599,000 for the development of a new semi-automatic hunting weapon by a Connecticut firm. Rep. Smith, who is also a member of The HSUS’s board of directors, voted against the project, explaining, “Many people in the state don’t believe in the killing of live animals for fun and recreation. They would find it abhorrent to use state tax money to develop that kind of product.”

Mr. Dommers called the state’s decision “disturbing” and “a waste of taxpayers’ money.” He noted, “There are dozens of semi-automatic weapons already on the market for sport hunting. Why is it necessary to spend taxpayers’ hard-earned money to develop a new one?”

Mr. Dommers has contacted O.F. Mossberg and Sons, the gun’s manufacturer, and state officials, to request additional details on such an inappropriate expenditure during lean budgetary times.

Pound-Seizure Hope

Oklahoma humane societies are fighting the University of Oklahoma’s right under state law to take animals for experimentation from the Oklahoma City shelter. The HSUS mailed hundreds of letters to its state members, contacted each city council member and a number of university officials, and mailed news releases urging the university not to take this cruel and unnecessary step. Unfortunately, the efforts were not successful: the university proceeded with its plans. The city council, however, has indicated it will pass a resolution supporting state legislation to end pound seizure. If Oklahoma animal-welfare groups continue to stand united on this issue, pound seizure could be made illegal in the next legislative session.

Southeast Office Opens

The HSUS has opened a new regional office in Tallahassee, Florida. The Southeast Regional Office will monitor activities in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, bringing the total number of HSUS regional outposts to seven. Marc Paulhus, who has served as an HSUS investigator in the Washington, D.C., office since 1977, has been appointed regional director. The office is located at 335 John Knox Road, Building E, Suite 203, Tallahassee, FL 32303.
Your Family Pet and Suspected Veterinary Malpractice

People whose pets have died or been seriously injured as a result of alleged mistreatment by veterinarians or who are otherwise unhappy with services they receive from their veterinarians frequently ask The HSUS for advice on how to handle their complaints. Without in any way impugning the competence or the integrity of the veterinary profession, we would like to offer general guidelines for dealing with such unhappy situations.

As soon as you are notified that your pet has unexpectedly died while at a veterinary hospital or that the treatment has otherwise not produced the result intended, attempt to obtain as much information as possible about what happened from the veterinarian and/or the veterinarian's assistants, who frequently have as much, or more, contact with the animals as the veterinarian. Talking to more than one person on a veterinary hospital staff often produces incon­sistent versions of events. These should you make note of for later use. Insist upon obtaining a complete copy of the written medical history and any other documents concerning your animal. If the pet has died, do not permit the body to be disposed of; instead, take it to another veterinarian for an autopsy. Ask to have a written autopsy report prepared and the body preserved, at least temporarily. Do not sign a release of liability (or any other document the implications of which you are uncertain) until you have had a chance to consult with an attorney who frequently have as much, or more, contact with the animals as the veterinarian.

If you are seriously contemplating a lawsuit and are prepared to pay the price, you should make note of for later use. Insist upon obtaining a legal opinion. These administrative bodies empowered to receive complaints of malpractice, discipline the veterinarian involved, or mediate your claim with the veterinarian. These ad­ministrative remedies are usually faster, less expensive, and less frustrating than going through the courts and can produce a more lasting and satisfactory result.

Remember that not all unhappy experiences in an animal hospital result from negligence or mal­practise on the veterinarian's part. Some operations or treatments are inherently risky and involve difficult medical judgments, particularly when the animal is severely ill to begin with. If a healthy animal unexpectedly dies from a routine operation or procedure, such as spaying or neutering, however, an inquiry may be called for.

Be aware that under most state laws, the amount of money you can recover for wrongful animal death (called "money damages" or "dam­age awards") is limited to the "market value" of the animal itself. In the case of many pets, this is a nominal amount, a few hundred dol­lars at most. These damage awards are hardly enough to cover your attorney's fees, and it is not likely that you will recover your attorney's fees from the veterinary hospital even if you win. (These uncollectible attorney's fees, at a normal hourly rate, in a fully prosecuted civil suit can amount to thousands of dollars.) Under certain circum­stances, larger damage awards may be possible.

Where the particular facts of a case call for an award beyond the traditional market-value measure, some courts have shown a willingness to recognize that a family pet is not merely an item of personal property and that what has been destroyed is not property but is an "animal lover" and any attorney with experience in personal injury cases or medical malpractice should be able to handle such a case.

We're glad we can count you as part of The HSUS, but we find many people aren't aware of the variety of periodicals we publish to serve the many different and important — interests of those in animal welfare. All of these publications are prepared by The HSUS's nationally experienced professional staff.

Shouldn't you order one for yourself—or a friend?

The HSUS News
Quarterly membership magazine of The Humane Society of the U.S., with up-to-date reports on HSUS activities in national, international, and regional animal-welfare issues. $10 minimum membership contribution.

Shelter Sense
A lively, unique, informative newsletter for animal-sheltering and -control personnel that offers answers to community animal problems. Ten times a year. $5 per subscription.

Humane Education
A practical, colorful publication of The HSUS's Institute for the Study of Animal Problems designed to increase our basic knowledge of animal needs—physical, behavioral, and environmental—and to explore the social and political factors involved in the exploitation of animals in modern society. Quarterly. $25 per year.

We would like to receive these periodicals of The HSUS:

I would like to receive:
The HSUS News. Enroll me as a voting member of The HSUS ($10 for one year) and send me four issues. I enclose

Shelter Sense. Enter a subscription to Shelter Sense ($5 for one year) and send me ten issues. I enclose

Humane Education. Enter a subscription to Humane Education ($7 for one year) and send me four issues. I enclose

The International Journal for the Study of Animal Problems. Enter a subscription ($25 for one year) and send me four issues. I enclose
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HSUS Periodicals:
Many Ways to Stay Informed About Animal Welfare
"Protect Our Pets From Research" Package
Now Available

The HSUS has prepared a complete action kit to assist individuals and humane organizations in their state, city, and local campaigns to prohibit the selling of shelter animals to research institutions.

Included in each kit are: a fact sheet (questions and answers about the use of shelter animals in research); an action sheet (how you can reduce the number of shelter dogs and cats used in research); an animal-control sheet (how "pound seizure" undermines efforts of animal shelters); a state legislation sheet (how you can change your state or local law); a summary of present state laws; a media pamphlet with tips on how to publicize your point of view; "Releasing Pets for Research: Opposition Mounts to "Pound Seizure" (reprinted from The HSUS News); and a background briefing paper with complete information on the history of "pound seizure."

The full campaign kit, including one each of the above eight items in an attractive, sturdy, two-color folder, is available in the following quantities:

1  $3.50
3  $10.00
4 or more  $ 3.00 each
50 or more  $ 2.75 each
100 or more  $ 2.50 each

Prices for quantities of each printed piece in the "Protect Our Pets from Research" campaign pack are available on request.

Enclose your payment (by check made out to The Humane Society of the United States) and mail to The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

Please send me ___ of the complete "Protect Our Pets From Research" campaign kits at $____ each for a total of $_______.

Name ____________________________
Address __________________________
City __________________ State ______ Zip ______

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