

Amory—have reached scores of millions of Americans through radio, television, magazines and newspapers.

In the meantime, some of our most influential Directors and members have been and are working quietly but exceedingly persuasively with members of Congress and high officers of the federal government.

No matter how effectively and diligently the HSUS may work, however, this campaign cannot succeed without the unity of which our Chairman, R. J. Chenoweth, spoke to you earlier today. The Randall bill can become law. Of that I am utterly confident. But the Randall bill will become law only if Congress feels an enormous grass-roots demand for this kind of legislation.

To get this message to Congress we need active participation in the campaign by the 800 local humane societies of the country.

I urgently recommend that every local humane society immediately establish a special committee to campaign for the Randall bill. I suggest that each local humane society give to its special committee for the Randall bill a small emergency fund with which to buy HSUS folders on this subject and to pay for mailing such folders to all members of the local society and to influential other citizens of the community. The special committee should aim specifically at inducing hundreds or thousands of local citizens to write to their own Congressmen in support of the Randall bill.

The HSUS will be happy to work with every such committee.

Because of the current legislative log-jam in Congress, with which all Americans are familiar, enactment of a federal law to protect laboratory animals probably cannot be achieved this year. I have no doubt whatever, however, that an effective law—a law that will genuinely protect millions of animals every year from cruelties that now are inflicted on them—can be enacted in 1964. I say in all sincerity that this law not only can be enacted, but will be.

Analysis of the Battle to Protect Laboratory Animals—Part II

By Clarence E. Richard, Chicago, Ill., Managing Director,
The National Anti-Vivisection Society

While driving from Chicago to this meeting, Fall was in the air. The muggy warm of summer has given way to the crispness that marks the new season.

Fall means different things to people. But perhaps one of the most important things it means is the biannual political elections. This time next year both political parties will be at one another's throat and nail throughout the country.

I mention political elections because they illustrate the point I hope to bring to you during this discussion today. It's a point never fully understood in countries where there are dictatorships or where democracy has become stagnant or decadent. The point is this: No matter how divided the Republicans and Democrats seem in their attacks on one another, no matter how much they challenge each other in public or private, they are united behind one goal. That goal is perpetuation and improvement of the American way of life.

Their difference is simple. One political party wants to achieve the same goals in a different manner from the other. Their argument is not *whether* action is necessary. Their argument is what specific actions are necessary. The debate is how to implement their programs, how to improve the American way of life.

Members of the National Anti-Vivisection Society are intelligent people, dedicated to one thing—elimination of the cruel, inhumane vivisection practices in the United States. Likewise, I am certain, members of the Humane Society of the United States have the same dedication, the same zeal to help animals now suffering in laboratories throughout the country.

In other words, we agree on a major point. Both the NAVS and The HSUS want to eliminate suffering which invariably results from vivisection. This is a basic belief which binds us, one to the other, despite any tactical differences which might arise as to how to eliminate the suffering.

We have another common ground, although disputed by some. NAVS members believe that it is morally wrong to practice vivisection on *any* animals. I emphasize *any* animals because we do not believe that some

species are more equal than others. Even at this, there is generally little disagreement.

The basic difference is this. Many humanitarians believe that federal regulation of vivisection practices would be “a step in the right direction.”

Recently the NAVS Board of Directors decided to recheck our position, to poll our members, thereby determining whether they favored a federal regulation bill as a step toward elimination of vivisection.

Ballots were sent directly from members to an independent auditor. They were counted. Emphatically, by a two-to-one margin, NAVS members reaffirmed our stand that they favored only total, complete, abolition of vivisection. They opposed regulation as a half-way step.

Why was the vote overwhelmingly against regulation? Not because we're against a step toward elimination of animal suffering. Can anyone really believe we want animals to continue suffering?

Let me use one analogy to show why we are against proposed federal laws. Then we'll get down to specifics.

In the mid-19th century, many Americans were convinced that our Negro slaves suffered, that their living conditions often were appalling. Other Americans felt that slavery was morally wrong. It was counter to everything our nation believed in. In other words, all slavery had to go, despite the fact that some plantations were run with adequate facilities.

But, cried plantation owners, the South cannot survive without slaves. As you recall, slavery was abolished. The South today is in unparalleled prosperity.

Would slavery ever have been abolished if the slaves had been given tile bathrooms, wall-to-wall carpeting, and all the other modern conveniences? Would that moral wrong ever have been abolished? There is strong doubt. Much of the nation's moral indignation would have been lulled if plantation owners could say, “There's a federal law against abusing our Negroes.”

Thus it is with vivisection. Will vivisection, a definite moral wrong, ever be abolished if we improve laboratory conditions? Will it be abolished if we give the animals lavish kennels and yards full of grass while they await experimentation? Will it be abolished if we manage to eliminate the greatest amount of suffering? Never. Vivisection would become accepted in practice and thought, with the moral question neatly tucked away the same as slavery well might still exist.

Now, let's get away from the analogies and talk about specific objections raised by our members to the regulation bills now pending before Congress.

First, regulation laws don't work. Example. The so-called restrictions of the British Act of 1876 still permit the infliction of horrible suffering. Yet the Research Defence Society, which holds much the same position in Great Britain as the National Society for Medical Research in America,

declared: “Such use of animals in British laboratories is strictly controlled by Act of Parliament and involves no cruelty whatsoever in spite of allegations to the contrary by those who would like to bring this sort of medical research to an end.”

Let's for the moment disregard the experience of British regulation. Let's assume everyone favored some sort of regulation. In looking at the bills now pending before the Congress, each one has a basic and horrendous flaw. Each permits the vivisector to act as prosecutor, judge, jury and executioner. Each one permits the vivisector to decide whether suffering is necessary to the experiment. If he feels a specific experiment should be done without the use of anesthetics, his judgment almost certainly will prevail. Our members, who are just as humane as HSUS members, recognize this as a complete farce.

Second, let's assume that a regulation bill passes the Congress and, by some miracle, it is signed into law by the President. The result would be instantaneous. A cry would echo from every laboratory, “There is no cruelty here. There's a law against it.” This is exactly what occurred in Britain.

It wouldn't happen here? It already is happening merely because bills have been introduced in Congress. On May 29, 1960, just 11 days after S. 3570 was introduced in the U. S. Senate, I was debating on Florida television station WFLA with two doctors, one a medical man and the other a veterinarian. The physician declared: “However, because it has been realized that in some remote parts of research there has been some cruelty to animals in the past, there is now a federal law which is required for all animals, for all laboratories who undertake animal research under federal grant. This law demands that all animals be completely anesthetized.”

This facility for the perversion of the truth has been a feature of the pro-vivisection campaign throughout its history. It is to be deplored. The physician further said the cruel experiments which I had described happened a long time ago and were performed by unqualified scientists. Every person here today knows that extreme cruelty still exists widely in laboratories. If you failed to believe this, you would not be in this room today. And yet, every cruelty which we have seen and heard about still could exist with the bills now before Congress.

Third, there can be no middle ground about vivisection. It is morally wrong. Should America 100 years ago have regulated that moral wrong—slavery? And right now, should we attempt to regulate other moral wrongs that exist in this country? Moral wrongs such as drug addiction and prostitution? I cannot believe anything less than total abolition of a moral wrong is acceptable to you.

These points are the ones that divide us, and I believe that we don't

really disagree about them. But what about the points that unite us? How can we work together for a common goal?

We can and must work together. We are few enough in number. For there are far more people throughout the world who are concerned only with the benefits of drugs than those interested in the elimination of animal suffering.

We—and I mean every person in the humane movement—must have Ben Franklin's fire bell in the night. We must have a clarion in a loud and single note calling us to action together. Once a clarion rings true and clear, other notes of our medley will follow in a call to action.

What is the note we need? Where will it come from? Perhaps it can come from this meeting today. So let me venture forth with a different note from those that have been muffled in the past.

I propose a single step in the right direction as a start—a step, a note, that we all might follow.

As we know, thousands of pets are stolen each year for vivisection. The NAVS knows this. And so does the HSUS as noted in your last newsletter. A man comes to town and offers to buy all dogs offered. In small towns Spot and Rover aren't missed for hours. They have been quietly and quickly collected, herded into trucks and shipped into the next state beyond local law. The dogs then are retailed to laboratories without a question asked. Every one of us has heard of such cases. Do you agree that this is wrong? Certainly. So does the NAVS. Do you want to do something about it? So do we. Is there common ground here to support federal legislation to eliminate such practices? Certainly. Let's back legislation to prohibit interstate transportation of dogs and cats for vivisection. With this as a start, we'll find other areas in which we can cooperate for the common good of animals.

Let's pretend this is the day after the election campaigns are over. Again, we are together under one flag, with one cause. That cause is the elimination of suffering of animals during the practice of vivisection.

Animal Shelter Programs and Policies

**By Edwin J. Sayres, Madison, N.J.,
Executive Vice-President, St. Hubert's Giralda**

A discussion of policies and programs that, ideally, should be followed by humane societies in the operation of shelters and the limitations that are imposed by finances, local circumstances, and other factors is a substantial undertaking. I would like, first, to give you some background information about St. Hubert's Giralda and hope that what I have to say will contribute something to people confronted with the problems of shelter management and animal control programs.

Our methods and approach were basically acquired from material available through national and state organizations in this field. We are especially indebted to the Union County SPCA Kindness Kennels in Rahway, New Jersey, for their help when it was decided that St. Hubert's Giralda would offer a pet animal warden service to our community.

After a survey we found that the most needed service to our local municipalities was an agency that would and could handle the pets and small animal problems. Since 1958 we have enrolled eight municipalities, covering an area of 90 square miles with a human population of 120,000, 7,500 licensed dogs, an undetermined number of cats, and an undetermined number of strays. We handle about 2,500 animals per year.

We found that most existing laws were antiquated, impractical, and useless. I believe I can safely say that this holds true in virtually every community around the country. A hodge-podge of legislation relating to animal control has accumulated through the years, pertinent at the time of enactment, but most of it now rendered almost unenforceable by the very extent of its detail. A new approach of placing responsibility where it belongs—upon the owner rather than the animal—has long been advocated, as you know, by The HSUS. St. Hubert's Giralda took the opportunity to put it into practice.

Our first step was to suggest control laws that would not cause hardship to the pet owners or the animals themselves and would also include benefits to the non-pet owner and the general welfare of the community.

In our explanation in support of good animal control laws we emphasized that pets kept under control are not exposed to injury and death on the roads, do not cause traffic problems, nor are they apt to come in