There has been loud grumbling in the senate halls recently about regulations setting minimum standards for living conditions and care for a variety of dogs, cats, and primates used for laboratory experiments. In July the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) passed its new standards for the care and housing of laboratory rabbits, guinea pigs, and hamsters. These new standards, intended to implement Animal Welfare Act (AWA) amendments passed in 1985, contain important loopholes concerning cage-size requirements. Research facilities are allowed to bypass the minimum standards requirements of cages spelled out in the AWA with the approval of an in-house review board. The USDA's new standards also allow researchers to continue using existing small cages until they wear out. (A stainless steel cage can last more than twenty-five years.) New minimum-care standards for dogs, cats, chimpanzees, and monkeys were expected as a result of the 1985 AWA amendments. Five years later, the USDA still has no such specific regulations finalized to carry out Congress's intentions regarding these animals.

Congress passed the 1985 amendments, called the Improved Standards for Laboratory Animals Act, "because of the demonstrable and persistent unsatisfactory animal-care conditions in the nation's laboratories," senators stated at that time.

Congressional intent is being undermined not only by the USDA but also by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), an agency responsible only to the president of the United States. The OMB is trying to force the USDA to delay the issuance of its regulations and to make them so vague as to severely limit their enforceability.

As a result of the USDA's inadequate standards and the OMB's delaying tactics, this summer many senators sent letters to both OMB Director Richard Darman and Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter demanding that the regulations include language making the Animal Welfare Act strictly enforceable and emphasizing that "implementation must lead to measurable improvements in animal care."

The HSUS and six other humane groups, representing 2,260,000 members and constituents, united to send our opinion to Mr. Darman and Mr. Yeutter that clear, enforceable, and strong regulations are absolutely necessary and that they be issued without further delay. The HSUS plans to take this message to senior administration officials in face-to-face meetings.

**ADC Program Needs New Focus**

For eight years, the federal Animal Damage Control (ADC) program has sought to "control" wild animals that interfere in any way with human activities. To achieve this "control," federal ADC agents annually kill hundreds of thousands of coyotes, wolves, mountain lions, bears, prairie dogs, foxes, and birds of all kinds. The public pays for the wasteful destruction with federal tax dollars.

The USDA, responsible for administering the ADC program, recently issued a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) that would set ADC policy for the next ten years. Commenting on the deficiencies in, and inadequacies of, this draft, The HSUS has recommended that the USDA withdraw or rewrite the document.

The deadline for comments on the DEIS was August 31. But the HSUS still urges you to let the USDA know that you do not approve of the ADC's relentless and senseless slaughter of wild animals. Instead, the USDA should emphasize nonlethal methods, such as fencing and guard dogs, that have proved to be effective in reducing wildlife-caused problems without unnecessarily killing wildlife. Please write to or call:


**Break-in Bills Mean Hide Abuses**

Laboratory break-ins and threats to the lives of biomedical researchers and their families have resulted in several bills being introduced in Congress that are intended to address this issue. The HSUS has submitted testimony to congressional committees stressing our long-standing and firmly held position that any legislation that is passed must contain language protecting animal-protection statutes. We believe that such acts do not advance the cause of animal protection. Nevertheless, we have expressed deep concern about H.R. 3270, sponsored by Rep. Charles Boren of Oklahoma, and six other bills that could have the inadvertent effect of scaling off research and farm facilities from public scrutiny, thereby impeding the legitimate exposure and reporting of violations of animal-protection statutes. We have recommended that this legislation should contain, among other provisions, protection for whistleblowers and standing to sue on behalf of animals.

H.R. 3270 is being considered by the House Agriculture Committee. A similar bill, S. 722, introduced by Sen. Howell Heflin of Alabama, was passed by the Senate last year.

The HSUS will continue to work with members of Congress in an attempt to ensure that any legislation that is passed contains language protecting persons who report violations of animal-protection laws in addition to protecting laboratories and researchers from violence.

**Tuna Labels to Carry Warning?**

The April announcement by H.J. Heinz that its affiliate, StarKist Seafood Company, would no longer purchase or sell tuna caught via methods known to kill dolphins and would label its canned tuna "Dolphin Safe" gave added momentum to proposed tuna labeling legislation backed by The HSUS. These bills (H.R. 2929, sponsored by Rep. Barbara Bower of California, and S. 2926, sponsored by Sen. Joseph Biden of Delaware) now have 170 cosponsors in the House and 26 cosponsors in the Senate and would ensure that consumers can make an educated choice at the supermarket. They would require that the label of any tuna product containing tuna caught while swimming with dolphins or caught in ocean drift nets display the statement: "The tuna in this product was caught with methods that kill dolphins." Other tuna products may be labeled "Dolphin Safe." After being approved by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, H.R. 2926 is now being considered by the House Energy and Commerce Committee, where a hearing was held in July. A hearing on S. 2924 was also held in the Senate Commerce Committee. The HSUS is a member of the Dolphin Coalition, a group of thirty-seven organizations that testified in support of S. 2924. The HSUS is pushing to get this legislation through Congress before adjournment.

**Thank You**

The HSUS extends its appreciation to the following members of Congress who have recently taken the lead in promoting legislation on behalf of animals:

- **Sen. Harry Reid of Nevada**
- **Rep. Toby Roth of Wisconsin**
- **Rep. Barbara Boxer of California**
- **Rep. Richard Darman and Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter**

Sen. Harry Reid
Sen. Joseph Biden
Sen. Charles Bennett of Florida
Toby Roth
Barbara Boxer
Richard Darman and Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter

The HSUS has long been advocating laws that would help protect dolphins from methods known to kill dolphins and would label products caught in such a manner with a label stating, "Dolphin Safe." The HSUS has had success in getting legislation through Congress that would require tuna products containing tuna caught via methods known to kill dolphins to be labeled "Dolphin Safe." The HSUS continues to work with members of Congress to ensure that such legislation is passed and that it is enforceable.

The HSUS is a member of the Dolphin Coalition, a group of thirty-seven organizations that testified in support of S. 2924. The HSUS is pushing to get this legislation through Congress before adjournment.
The Senate’s Farm Bill emphasizes alternative practices to intensive-raising methods such as those seen here.

ALTERNATIVES TO ANIMAL TESTING

D ean Martin Stephens, HSUS director of laboratory animals, participated in a con­gressional briefing on August 1 on the use of animals in product and cosmetic testing.

This briefing, the third in the 1990 series sponsored by the Congressional Friends of Animals caucus, was conducted by the caucus’s cochair, Rep. Jim Bilbray, R-Calif. The briefing proved the construction of telescopes on Mt. Graham despite information showing that they would clearly jeopardize the squirrel, which has already lost much of its habitat because of logging, road construction, and development.

The USFWS, the Forest Service, and the Justice Department have yet to mandate the use of nonan­imal tests wherever possible. Sen. Reid cited previous HSUS testimony as he introduced his amendment. Despite receiving considerable support from senior senators, the amend­ment is not included in the current version of the Farm Bill.

To combat pet theft, the senate Farm Bill requires that pets bought and sold by dealers must have identifying paperwork.

Unfortunately, prior to final passage of the senate bill, an amendment proposed by Sens. Howell Heflin and Charles Mathias was adopted, which would remove important language on legal transactions.

The House adopted a farm bill (H.R. 3950) that also includes authorization for re­search and education in sustain­able agriculture practices. On the floor, three other animal­protection amendments were considered.

Reps. Peter DeFazio’s amendment was passed, establishing national standards for foods labeled as organic. The amendment is less exten­sive than the corresponding provision in the senate bill. Rep. Charles Bennett’s amend­ment to provide for the humane destruction of veal calves was defeated on an unrecorded “voice vote.” Under a pro­cedural ruling, consideration would establish stricter fines and penalties for illegal transactions.

Despite the near absence of enforcement of the LD-50 test on animals, the Idaho Conservation Act of 1990 was enacted this May. It now authorizes a number of constructions from the LISA pro­ject. But that was clearly not the intent of Congress in passing the measure. In re­spect to congressional over­sight hearings, including crit­i­cal testimony by the Govern­ment Accounting Office, a team of USFWS biologists recently recommended a new study of the project’s effect on the Mt. Graham red squirrel population.

A second head-on assault by the Bush administration on a species protected by the ESA involves the northern spotted owl. The admin­istration has at­tempted to argue “owls versus jobs” in the Pacific Northwest when the issue is really about bad forest planning, with, owls, jobs, and ancient forest all at risk. The administration has at­tacked the Bush admin­istration for the first time on the basis of a blue­ribbon panel of leading scien­tists, which recommended pro­tecting enough old growth forest to preserve the spotted owl. Instead, the administration has called for a task force to propose changes in the ESA as an apparent attempt to place economic interests well above those of species survival.

Unless the Bush administra­tion changes its current tone and the president becomes a real “environmental president,” an apparent attempt to place economic interests well above those of species survival.

As a result of the ruling, federal agencies that are fund­ing or carrying out activities such as construction projects must consult with the USFWS if any project may adversely affect endangered species abroad. Where the survival of a species or population would be put in jeopardy, the project may not go forward as planned. Less harmful alternatives would be required.

Refuge Reform Gains Speed

As a result of a large, effect­ive public-education cam­paign, The HSUS continues to add members of the House of Representatives to the list of cosponsors of H.R. 1693, the Refuge Wildlife Protection Act. Sponsored by Rep. Bill Green of New York, the bill now has 67 cosponsors, 18 of whom have signed on since March.

Fighting to restore the Na­tional Wildlife Refuge System (NWRS) to its original pur­pose, H.R. 1693 would end recreational hunting and com­mercial trapping on refuges, thereby returning them to “inviolate sanctuaries,” do not offer any safety to white-tailed deer during hunting season.

Wildlife refuges, originally intended to be “inviolable sanctuaries,” do not offer any safety to white-tailed deer during hunting season.

As a result of the ruling, federal agencies that are fund­ing or carrying out activities such as construction projects must consult with the USFWS if any project may adversely affect endangered species abroad. Where the survival of a species or population would be put in jeopardy, the project may not go forward as planned. Less harmful alternatives would be required.