(No. 03) -- The Measure of a True Humanitarian

Humane Information Services, Inc.
Some of our critics claim that many animal lovers are people who seek to fulfill a need for affection or companionship which is denied to them in human relationships. Their devoted pets serve as substitutes for people. The supposed animal lover really loves humans personified in certain kinds of animals, not animals for themselves. The animal objects of their love must be "cute", and imitative of human traits. Dog owners proudly claim, "Sometimes he seems almost human."

These criticisms are much too harsh, but contain an element of truth as applied to the love of animals by some people. This shows up clearly in our humane work. Just try to get the help of many dog and cat societies in promoting some humane program! Humane societies seeking support for laboratory animal legislation always feature dogs, cats and monkeys in their horror stories, almost ignoring the suffering of far greater numbers of rats and mice. Although they claim to be equally interested in helping all animals, it frequently is very difficult to get them to participate in any humane program not involving dogs and cats. Most of our "humane" societies in the United States really are dog and cat societies. When we examine the combined activities of these societies we find that probably 99 percent of all funds spent by them is in behalf of dogs and cats. In contrast, of the total amount of acute suffering undergone by animals, it is doubtful that dogs and cats account for one percent of the total. It is probably not an exaggeration to say that 99 percent of humane effort is exerted in attempting to reduce less than one percent of the animal suffering. This is one of the most justifiable criticisms that can be made of the humane movement.

Those who make this criticism do not advocate that humane funds should be used in behalf of different animals in proportion to their numbers or the total volume of suffering involved. The relative costs of conducting the different types of humane programs must be taken into account. It requires far more money to provide local animal shelters to care for the surplus dogs and cats than it does, for example, to conduct a campaign for humane slaughter or laboratory animal legislation which affects larger numbers of animals. The critics merely want to correct the present maldistribution of effort which results in using only a minute proportion of our humane resources both money and time, for animal programs of tremendous importance.

The present unbalanced distribution of effort must be blamed primarily on the members of humane organizations. Directors and officers naturally are inclined to take the line of least resistance. They move in the direction of easy acquisition of members and contributions. Getting a single frightened cat down from a tree, properly publicized, will bring in more contributions than passing a state humane slaughter law. But another reason for over-emphasis on dogs and cats is the fact that humane societies in general are directed and staffed by people who have come out of the local animal shelters and are intimately acquainted with the problems of dogs and cats but know little or nothing about many other humane problems, or about appropriate methods of dealing with such problems. They know how to operate an animal shelter, but not how to end inhumane practices in food animal production and marketing.

This is one of the principal reasons why Humane Information Services was established. It was recognized by our founders that it was too much to expect other humane organizations to deal realistically, vigorously and effectively with these other tremendously important humane problems. During many decades of operation they have failed to do so. True, they have printed a few leaflets denouncing the cruelties of bullfights and such, but these are designed more to generate
Indignation and contributions than to actually accomplish reform, which requires much more aggressive action. Humane Information Services has been deliberately set up to fill this void, to deal with the relief of animal suffering where it is most prevalent and acute, regardless of the kind of animal involved, the location of the problem, or the nature of the cruelty. We will not neglect cats and dogs, but we certainly will not devote ourselves exclusively or even mainly to them. Our objective is not to build a large organization by doing what is most pleasing to prospective members and contributors. Nobody connected with Humane Information Services is trying to make his job or salary bigger, or to enhance the prestige of its officers or of the society by doing what is most popular. We exist solely to reduce the suffering of animals, and by that we mean all animals.

In Report to Humanitarians No. 2 we listed a number of very important humane problems to which little more than lip service has been given in the past, and said that future reports would deal with these problems. This announcement evoked a reply from one of our more perceptive members, Mrs. Harold T. Griffin, who lives in the far-off Asian country of Thailand. She accompanied her substantial contribution with one of the most delightful letters it has ever been our privilege to read. The engaging pixy-like quality of her letter is partly lost by condensation, but we can only give excerpts from her letter:

"I was floored when I read that you would like to bring about a gentler way to do away with rats. That took courage. I really have misgivings that we are ever going to stir many people to the welfare of rats. You will be laughed at and ridiculed -- you may even lose some of your present contributors."

"Of course, I'd like to see better ways of rat control. I've learned through personal experience of their nature -- affectionate, playful, remarkably smart. However, many of the most truly devoted humanitarians can't stand the sight of a rat and would not care one way or the other how the little animals are eliminated. Few people can think of them in any category except somewhat as they do cockroaches. As it happens, my children and I don't feel that way."

"Our little family of animals here includes two cats and two dogs. We also have a ridiculous parakeet which eats at the table with us whether we like it or not and enjoys riding around on our heads. Another pet is Baby Rat, which was removed from a nest by a Thai man when he was only a few days old, quite blind and naked. I didn't need another pet, but we took him in."

"Baby rats get hungry at least as often as new baby humans, and they must have their formula warmed, too. So there I was, feeding him around the clock every two or three hours. He adored his formula, and would grasp the eye-dropper with his tiny pink hands... In time we did away with his heating pad and the stuffed sock which had served as a mama substitute to cuddle when he was alone. In about two and a half months Baby Rat appeared to be mature. He is a fine-looking young animal, his round black button eyes sparkling with fun."

"What is a rat really like? A wild rat, which hasn't been exposed to man's diseases, nor his sewage and garbage, is a paragon of cleanliness. You can expect to see him going over his coat, smoothing his fur and washing his face at frequent intervals. He must wash his hands, then each tiny hindfoot, and takes enough time to do it properly... The old notion is that rats are sinister and sly. I wish anyone who doubts the capacity of rats to be affectionate could see Baby Rat come bounding to me when I call him. Down from the ledge over the window, or out of a desk drawer, or out from under the bed -- wherever he has been playing -- swiftly and trustingly he runs to us. An extended arm provides a ramp to our shoulders, or the hands cupped make a good rat elevator. Held thus in my two hands, he relaxes completely, his little head up, like a dog does, to enjoy being scratched under the chin or behind his ears. Obviously in Heaven, he closes his eyes."

Perhaps, after reading these experiences and observations of a true humanitarian, our readers will be willing to continue on with this report, which is about the tremendous suffering undergone by billions of rats and what can be done to alleviate it.
RATS AS A HUMANE PROBLEM

In terms of numbers of animals involved and the average amount of suffering undergone by the animals, rats constitute the greatest of all humane problems. No one knows how many rats there are in the world. Estimates even for such advanced countries as the United States vary widely. Some "experts" claim that in this Country there are two rats for every person, although other estimates are as little as half this number. Taking the more common estimate, it would mean about 400 million rats, or about 200 million females. These have from five to ten litters annually, with five to eight baby rats per litter. This means an average of about 40 rats born annually for each female rat in the continuing rat population, or a total of about 8 billion rats per year. Only about half of the rats born survive infancy. This would leave about 4 billion mature rats, more or less, to be destroyed annually, in order to maintain the continuing or permanent rat population of 400 million. Whatever the exact figure, it is very large.

But the United States is a comparatively clean country in which rats have been almost eliminated from many urban and rural areas. What about other countries? It has been estimated that the continuing rat population of India alone is about 4.8 billion, and still growing. Obviously the number of rats in the world must be greatly in excess of the number of any other mammal, with the possible exception of mice, and the annual rat "crop" must be relatively even larger.

Economic losses attributable to rats run into billions of dollars annually. The United Nations World Health Organization has issued a grim warning that there has been a sharp increase in the number of plague victims, and that there is the ever-growing menace of a new outbreak which might extend geographically far beyond the limits of the plagues renowned of old, which occurred before the advent of rapid transportation and international communications. As the dangers to human health and wealth from this rapidly-growing world rat population increase, so does the amount of animal suffering involved in eradicating the billions upon billions of rats born each year.

The rat population is held at a more or less constant level, as in the United States, or is prevented from increasing so rapidly as to get entirely out of hand, as in India, by natural as well as man-contrived controls: (1) environmental conditions which limit supplies of food and water and suitable nesting and living places for the rats; (2) other animals which prey upon rats, including cats, dogs, ferrets, wild animals, and birds of prey; (3) traps and poisons used by man for rat eradication. Of the latter, poisons are the most important, and give rise to the greatest amount of suffering. Many of these poisons cause excruciating pain to which man does not subject any other living creatures in such large numbers.

CONGRESS APPROPRIATES MILLIONS FOR RAT CONTROL

Despite the tremendous importance, from both the public health and humane standpoints, of rodent control measures, Humane Information Services would have postponed consideration of this problem had it not been for the passage by the Congress of the United States last December of Public Law 90-174 (which before passage had been H.R. 6418, 90th Congress). This law, which is extremely complicated and almost impossible for a layman to decipher, is called the "Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967". Among many other things, it contains provisions for the $40 million rat eradication program which received so much publicity at the time it was proposed. Our readers may recall that many members of Congress ridiculed the idea of the Federal Government engaging in rat control, and at first refused to consider the measure seriously. But in response to the public uproar which followed, they incorporated the rat control funds in the law referred to above. The language of the law does not specifically earmark the $40 million for rat extermination, but gives this money to local communities to be used as they see fit under the health programs (for this interpretation of the law we are indebted to Congressman William C. Cramer, of Florida).

Thus, it is not known at this time how much of the $40 million actually will be used for rat eradication. In view of the intent of Congress in passing this Act, however, and of the great amount of publicity which was given to the health problem presented by rats and the demands from
important segments of the public that something be done about it, it seems quite probable that expenditures for rat control programs in the United States will vastly increase during the next several years. It seems highly appropriate, therefore, that any program designed to bring humane considerations into rodent control activities be implemented now, before patterns of expenditure and control methods become more fixed.

This is not a problem which can be cared for by writing a letter to Congress. In this Report to Humanitarians No. 3 we offer a concrete program for the humane eradication of rats which, if activated effectively, would serve to greatly reduce animal suffering. But this requires the participation of humanitarians to a certain extent, and in order to effectively participate they must understand the problem and be able to intelligently discuss the principal points involved. Unless, therefore, the reader finds this whole discussion too repulsive to bear, it will be necessary to labor through some facts which are essential to understanding what needs to be done and how to do it.

**RAT POISONS**

There are two general types of poisons for controlling rodents: (1) fast-acting, one-shot, single-dose poisons; (2) multi-dose anticoagulant chemicals.

**Single-Dose Poisons**

Most single-dose poisons usually kill rats within 20 minutes to 48 hours, but in some cases it requires up to eight days of suffering. These toxicants affect the heart, central nervous system, or respiratory system, and are characterized by violent action, usually shock and/or convulsions. They are practically all very painful, some extremely so. In order to spare the feelings of those readers who can't stand to read about animal suffering, we will omit the harrowing clinical details.

Red squill, obtained from the root of a tropical plant, is a fantastically cruel poison. It inflicts intense suffering which lasts up to a period of six days. The British Bureau of Animal Population reports that red squill inflicts "a very painful, prolonged and dirty death, and if cruelty is a consideration red squill should never be used". The Universities Federation for Animal Welfare, of London, states: "Certainly any normally compassionate person who actually saw this horrible business would, if he had not been hardened by habituation, feel an intense desire that it should be brought to an end." Yet, red squill has been one of the most commonly used poisons, both in the United States and other countries, because it is cheap and effective.

Other frequently or occasionally used one-shot poisons are: yellow phosphorus, which causes great suffering during a period of from two to seven days; organic compounds of fluorine (commonly known as 1080), which cause animals to exhibit fear, extreme excitement and hypersensibility (a man who accidentally took fluoro-oleic acid suffered hypersensibility such that even a slight stimulus caused extreme pain); arsenic; thallium sulphate; Antu; strychnine compounds; and zinc phosphide. Nearly all of these one-shot poisons are very dangerous to other animals and man, in addition to causing extreme pain for the rats. Many pet dogs and cats have been cruelly poisoned by accidentally ingesting one of these rat poisons. Zinc phosphide is the least objectionable, from a humane standpoint.

A comparatively new poison, known in England as Norbormide and sold in the United States under the trade name of Raticate, is relatively quick-acting, has no discernible ill effects on other animals and humans, and is much more humane than other acute poisons. The Universities Federation for Animal Welfare states that their observations "do not suggest that great pain or suffering is felt by the poisoned rats." An article in the April 24, 1964, issue of Science, however, reports that "Struggling, labored breathing, and, in some instances, a mild convolution preceded death." Nevertheless, it would appear that Raticate is by far the best poison, from the standpoint of both safety and humaneness, except the slow-acting chronic poisons described in the next section. It is, however, used very little because it is said to give somewhat erratic results and it is more expensive than the other one-shot poisons, although no more so than the
multi-dose poisons described in the following section (prices for Raticate recently have been reduced). This is an important obstacle to its use in a country where humane considerations do not influence methods of rodent control.

**Multi-Dose Poisons**

The second group of poisons, the multi-dose anticoagulants, not only are far more humane than the one-shot poisons with the possible exception of Raticate, but also have only occasional harmful effects on other animals such as dogs and cats which may accidentally ingest them. They carry little danger for humans. These poisons also are referred to as "chronic" poisons, in contrast to the "acute" poisons of the one-shot variety referred to above.

The anticoagulants are known under the trade names of "Warfarin", "Fumarin" and "Pival". These anticoagulants not only are more safe and humane, but also have the practical advantage of not producing bait-shyness, since a non-lethal dose does not cause pain. People subject to arterial disease involving the danger of blood clots are given mild doses of such chemicals to avoid obstruction of the arteries. In the rat, death from internal bleeding appears to occur without warning or pain.

**USE IN THE UNITED STATES**

Although the safe and humane chronic poisons (anticoagulants) are used by far the most extensively in the United States, practically all rodent control agencies, private and public, use the inhumane and dangerous one-shot poisons in greater or less degree. Raticate is infrequently used, partly because its early promotion led to expectations of miraculous results and later disappointment.

The supposed need for using the dangerous and inhumane single-dose poisons is almost entirely economic. The anticoagulants require baiting over a period of time. Although the baits used with these poisons are less expensive than those required in connection with some of the one-shot poisons, the repeated baitings take more labor. This is especially important when quick action is desired, and in eradicating rats in places where they are relatively inaccessible or where conditions are unfavorable to the keeping quality of the baits. For example, in sewers the baits are subject to moisture, erosion and mold, and placing the baits in the sewers requires much labor. However, pre-baiting is required for most one-shot poisons, so the amount of labor required really is not much different, and deterioration of the bait can be prevented by use of mold-inhibiting substances or paraffin-coated bait.

Even the best experts in rodent control, such as those with the Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service at Atlanta, Georgia, recommend the use of one-shot poisons as a part of a complete rodent eradication program. For example, in its generally excellent publication "Rodent Eradication and Poisoning Programs", the Public Health Service discusses the use of nine one-shot poisons, with no reference whatever in the publication to the inhumane aspects of these poisons. It probably is not too much to say that although the toxic effects of rat poisons on other animals and humans have been an important influence governing selection, nowhere in this Country has any serious consideration been given to the humane aspects of rodent eradication. It simply does not enter the minds of those conducting the control programs or of the general public which uses and benefits from their services.

**ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF MAKING RAT ERADICATION PRACTICES HUMANE**

There are two alternative ways of eliminating or reducing the use of inhumane and unsafe rat poisons in favor of the multi-dose anticoagulants and the single-dose Raticate: (1) through legislation and regulation; (2) through education and persuasion.

**The British Cruel Poisons Act of 1962**

In Great Britain, the attitudes of both the general public and of those engaged in rodent control...
are quite different than in the United States. They are very much concerned with the humane aspects of the problem. The British Parliament passed a law, The Animals (Cruel Poisons) Act of 1962, which has been implemented by regulations of the Home Office, Regulation 1963 No. 1278, which prohibits the use of phosphorus, red squill and strychnine for the eradication of rats.

The Universities Federation for Animal Welfare, after a great deal of research on all of the poisons which had been used in Great Britain, recommended the total prohibition of the use of 1080 and other compounds of fluoride, red squill, phosphorus, strychnine (except for moles), arsenious oxide and sodium arsenite, barium carbonate, thallium sulphate, Antu, and sulphur dioxide and other choking gases. It recommended that zinc phosphide be prohibited for sale to the general public, but that it be used under certain conditions by official rodent operatives. At the time these recommendations were made, Raticate was dismissed from consideration as being too expensive.

In the United States, with present public attitudes toward rats and rodent control, it would be quite unrealistic to attempt to obtain a law such as the British have, although this might be done later. All we can hope for in the near future is to see that as great as possible reliance is placed on the humane chronic poisons and Raticate, which resort to the inhumane one-shot poisons only where rat infestation is extremely severe or environmental conditions make exceptionally difficult or costly the use of the anticoagulant poisons.

Education and Persuasion

Education and persuasion also will not be easy. Anyone advocating humane treatment of rats is most likely to be considered a "nut", not to be taken seriously.

Ignorance about rat eradication methods and indifference to the humane aspects of the problem are so widespread that the usual method followed by humane societies of printing and distributing leaflets describing the cruelties of rat poisoning would require decades to become effective in even a small degree. Humane societies for years have been putting out such leaflets on all kinds of humane problems, with little or no success except where this so-called educational material has been combined with an organized and united campaign to achieve a specific result. The leaflets serve to obtain some new members for the societies and to keep contributions coming in from old members, but few other tangible results. In order to achieve success, concentrated and coordinated effort is needed. This is especially true of promoting more humane rat eradication methods.

Humane Information Services offers a carefully-worked-out plan of action having this objective. It is practical and potentially effective. But it will require some participation by humanitarians -- really, just a little effort -- and some cooperation by humane organizations. With such cooperation, there is no doubt that it will be possible to eliminate more animal suffering than could result from any comparable effort by humanitarians in almost any other area.

**Steps in a Coordinated Campaign to Reduce Cruelties in Rodent Control**

In order to reduce space and reading time required, this program is printed below in outline form. The major points of reference are the agencies involved, rather than methods or actions.

A. Public rodent control agencies

1. National and state agencies

   a. Seek cooperation to take into account humane aspects of eradication methods in formulating control policies and programs.

   b. Try to get bulletins, handbooks and instructions revised to eliminate recommended use of inhumane poisons, and to emphasize safety and humaneness as well as effectiveness of poisons.
c. Give the cooperative agencies the support of humane organizations in regard to appropriations and distribution of funds.

2. County and city control agencies
   a. In interviews and in technical publication, to be given pertinent facts, reasons why shift in policy is desirable from their standpoint, and suggesting specific changes in poisons used for different purposes.
   b. Support to agencies that cooperate. Bring pressure on others through local government officials, news media, civic clubs, etc.
   c. Follow-up to check results.

B. Private pest control firms
   1. Trade associations (national and state)
      a. Seek cooperation same as for public national and state agencies.
   2. Local firms
      a. Send technical report designed for them, giving facts and advantages of shift in policy, and specific suggestions.
      b. Possible award of "seal of approval" to firms signing pledge to follow humane methods, which could be used in advertising. (The complications of this approach are fully recognized.)
      c. Follow-up to observe extent of cooperation.

C. Humane societies
   1. National
      a. Print and/or distribute leaflets.
      b. Urge members (both individuals and local societies) to take action suggested for individual humanitarians.
   2. State federations
      a. Urge cooperation of local societies.
   3. Local societies
      a. Appoint one representative to act as liaison on rat control problems.
      b. Distribute leaflets to mailing list.
      c. Contact local public control authorities.
         1) Distribute technical leaflet to personnel.
         2) Seek formal cooperation.
         3) If cooperation is received, get local news stories printed and broadcast about new program, praising agency as progressive.
4) If cooperation lacking, put on local campaign to bring compliance, working with Mayor, Council or Commissioners, news media, civic clubs, etc.

5) Follow-up.

   d. Do same for private pest control firms as for local public agencies.

D. Individual humanitarians

1. All who are interested

   a. "Talk up" the program among other humanitarians, so as many as possible know about it.

   b. Distribute popular leaflet among public.

   c. Try to get local society to participate as per previous section of this outline.

2. Active participants (those who are selected -- see bottom of page)

   a. Obtain essential facts about local control practices; send to HIS, Inc.

   b. Take analysis of these facts by HIS, Inc. back to control agencies and try to obtain their cooperation.

   c. Same as D1 above.

   d. Same as C3c above, if local society does not cooperate.

Careful study of this outline surely will show the advantages of a coordinated campaign over the kind of hit-or-miss, everybody-for-himself campaigns which have featured the battle for humane objectives in the past. True, it calls for placing the welfare of the animals above petty organizational interests, for sharing credit for any accomplishments, and for some coordination and timing of effort.

However, to only a limited extent does the action plan outlined above depend, for the success of any one part, upon successfully carrying out some other part. If only one humanitarian or only one local society decides to cooperate, their work will be almost as fruitful as it would have been if all others had cooperated. Only the sum total of these efforts will be reduced by lack of response by other humanitarians.

Humane Information Services will prepare and print suitable informational leaflets as called for in the outline. It will be glad to furnish either available facts or suggested written material for use by any other humane society that might not wish to distribute our leaflets, and want to print their own. As with any other material prepared by Humane Information Services, any other society is free to use it without credit to us. Any use made of our materials, with or without credit, all goes for the benefit of the animals. In fact, if at any time any other national society with the will and the resources wishes to take over completely any humane program developed by Humane Information Services, we would be happy to discuss it. All we want is to see that the program is carried out as needed, either by some other society or by us.

**PARTICIPATION BY INDIVIDUAL HUMANITARIANS AND LOCAL SOCIETIES**

Before final plans and materials can be worked out, we must know if humanitarians agree with us that we should concern ourselves now with the humane aspects of rat poisons, and the number of individual humanitarians and local humane societies that are willing to participate in such a program. The work involved would consist mainly of interviewing a few public officials and private pest control firms to obtain specific facts and persuade them to read and heed our technical leaflet. So, if you think enough of this project to want to participate, please write us at the address given on the cover sheet or on Page 1. Thank you.
RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN LABORATORY LEGISLATION

Since our Report to Humanitarians No. 2 giving information on the Rogers-Javits bill for the protection of laboratory animals during research and testing, very encouraging progress has been made. There seems to be little doubt that if this bill could be brought to the floor of the Senate and House for a vote, it would pass. Members of Congress as well as many humanitarians who had been confused by conflicting reports are becoming increasingly aware of the fact that at the present time laboratory animals have no protection whatever during research, and that additional legislation is needed now to close this gap.

What is preventing progress in the Senate is the action of a single Senator in "putting a hold on the bill", thus preventing it from being referred to committee for hearings and recommendation. Perhaps the action by this Senator was the result of the influence of Mrs. Christine Stevens, of the Society for Animal Protective Legislation, who has been fighting the bill for reasons difficult to decipher.

In the House of Representatives, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which Congressman Harley O. Staggers, of West Virginia, is Chairman, has not yet held hearings on the Rogers bill, H.R. 13168. It is essential that these hearings be scheduled immediately.

The attacks on the Rogers-Javits bill, which continue to stir opposition mail to Congress, center on two things: (1) the delusion that only the Department of Agriculture can be trusted to administer and enforce a law for the humane treatment of laboratory animals; and (2) the delusion that P.L. 89-544, the so-called "Petnapping Act", covers nearly all problems of housing and care of animals in research and testing laboratories.

The facts relating to the controversy over the administrative agency for the laboratory bill were brought out in our Report to Humanitarians No. 2. Either the Department of Health, Education and Welfare or the Department of Agriculture could be trusted to carry out the wishes and purposes of Congress conscientiously and capably. In fact, Congress, through Congressional oversight of the programs, has ways to insure that the department involved does carry out the purposes of the act.

DEFECTS OF P.L. 89-544

Some people continue to be deluded that P.L. 89-544 covers nearly all problems of housing and care of animals in laboratories. Communication after communication from a few "leaders" in the humane movement continue to refer to P.L. 89-544 as the "Laboratory Animal Welfare Act". These "leaders" know full well that P.L. 89-544 provides only a limited protection, for only certain laboratory animals, in only a limited number of the research laboratories across our nation. To be more exact, it protects only about 5 percent of presently used laboratory animals, in approximately 20 percent of the research laboratories, and protects these few animals only for the periods prior to and after research, not during research.

Furthermore, P.L. 89-544 stipulates that the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish "minimum" requirements with respect to the housing, feeding, watering, sanitation, ventilation, shelter from extremes of weather and temperature, separation by species, and adequate veterinary care. The use of the word "minimum" in the Act prevented the Secretary from establishing "optimum" requirements. Because of this, the standards for housing and care of those laboratory animals and laboratories which are covered by the Act are the rock-bottom minimum that could be set (these are the standards, apparently, which are the basis for the opponents' claim that four-fifths of P.L. 89-544 would be repealed by passage of the Rogers-Javits bill, which actually would strengthen these minimum standards).

If this isn't bad enough, P.L. 89-544 has certain weaknesses and loopholes that serve to largely defeat the original purpose of preventing the stealing of pets for sale to laboratories:

(1) The definition of interstate commerce under P.L. 89-544 is the short-form rather than the long-form definition, and is not, therefore, broad enough to cover the "bunchers", "collectors",.
or "sellers". Approximately 178 dealers now are licensed under the new law. However, it is believed that there are several thousand "bunchers" who "deal" in animals for sale to research facilities but who do not come under the law because of the definition of interstate commerce. As a result, some individuals who are well acquainted with the situation believe that pet stealing is as prevalent as before passage of the Act.

(2) Because of the word "live" as applied to dogs and cats in the Act, biological supply houses that supply dead animals for dissection do not come under the law. Such biological supply houses in the United States supply many thousands of cats each year but are not required to keep the records that were intended under the Act to stop the sale of stolen animals.

(3) The purpose of the record system of P.L. 89-544 has been thwarted. The words "previous ownership" have been interpreted to mean, "who had the dog or cat in his or her possession prior to its purchase by a dealer or research facility". Only if the system of records enables the Secretary to trace all known previous ownership, as far back as can be known, can the record system be effective in tracing and thereby preventing the sale of stolen pets.

And so, P.L. 89-544, this "marvelous law" which is supposed to care for nearly all the problems of laboratory animals, because of its defects cannot adequately prevent even pet stealing. The stealing of pets continues, and humane treatment of the limited numbers of animals covered by the Act is assured only at the rock-bottom "minimum" level, with no protection during the research, experiments, or tests. This, then, is the law that a few "leaders" in the humane movement believe "should be given a chance to see what it will do"! While laboratory animals continue to suffer unnecessary pain in research, we are advised to "wait a few years and see".

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM READERS**

**Question:** I have heard about an advertisement by United Action for Animals, Inc. which described what are called "outdated and unscientific tests on animals" required by the Food and Drug Administration regulations as a basis for determining the safety of drugs, and the "massive animal suffering" which results. What do you think of this?

**Answer:** The objective of United Action for Animals is to encourage the use of substitutes for live animals in medical research, teaching and testing where possible. We agree with this objective. Not only are non-sentient materials more precise, less expensive, and more efficient, but the use of these materials is a direct means of reducing suffering of animals. We believe, however, that the most effective approach is not to place advertisements in newspapers, but to establish a government agency with both scientific prestige and authority, directed to encourage substitution as widely and in as many areas as possible. The Rogers-Javits bill would do this.

Yet, in its blind opposition to the bill, the UAA completely misinterpreted for its readers the intent of Sections 8 and 9 of the bill, which are designed to accomplish the very objectives for which that organization was established. This is a good example of the uninformed, almost hysterical statements opposing the Rogers-Javits bill which appear in the humane literature.

**Question:** I have written to my Congressman and Senators in support of the Rogers-Javits bill, but I want to do more. How can I help most now?

**Answer:** At the present time, what is most needed are letters to the President urging him to support the Rogers-Javits bill and to do what he can to have the bill passed in this session of the Congress. Address: The President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D. C. 20500.

It would also help to write Senators Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Mike Mansfield, of Montana; and Lister Hill, of Alabama, urging that the Javits bill, S. 2481, be assigned to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare immediately so that hearings can be held. Address all Senators at: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. 20510.

Even those who previously wrote to Congressman Harley O. Staggers, of West Virginia, Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, could well do so again, urging that hearings be scheduled on the Rogers bill, H.R. 13168. Address him at: House Office Building, Washington, D. C. 20515.
COME, SHED A TEAR FOR POOR STOKELY

She was a female cat, a stray our kindhearted neighbors had found on the highway. They named her Stokely, because she was black and had a big mouth. From this emerged a continuous stream of cat talk which the neighbors, not being cat people, didn't understand. They fed her beefsteak, roast pork and bacon, but Stokely only nibbled halfheartedly. She remained puny and light as a feather.

Stokely soon discovered the HIS, Inc. house and office next door, which was temporarily without a cat. Here she was offered only complete understanding and a dry cat food always kept on hand for visiting cats. The pet food people claim this delicacy needs supplementing only with love. Stokely proved a glutton for both, rapidly gaining weight and size and a decided preference for our President. In the way cats have, she soon adopted him, and the neighbors had lost a cat.

Stokely was not a humanitarian, taking great pleasure in catching and eating poor little chameleons. And it must be admitted that she was not a very well-behaved cat. She had a compulsion for getting into and onto things not intended for cats, and for tearing valuable papers with her sharp claws and teeth. She did everything possible to interfere with the work of HIS, Inc., demanding constant attention and continuous use of the rather bony Presidential lap. At bedtime, she would suddenly develop a great need to play with the dangling pull-cords of the window drapes, making a tremendous racket despite stern admonitions. Finally, she would plop like a chunk of lead on the bed, make a circle tour of the pillow with her purr-motor running full blast, then settle heavily against the Presidential posterior for the rest of the night. Nothing unusual -- just like any other cat.

And, like any cat, Stokely was a ham. She had a very good act, in which she chased her tail with tremendous vigor, ending with a loud flop against the baseboard. She would perform this act only in the narrow hallway opposite the bathroom door, when she had a captive audience. A spectacular floor show.

HIS, Inc. does not believe in confining cats entirely indoors, although it seems to work for some. Stokely had a big yard in which to chase leaves, with several convenient trees and other places of refuge in case of danger. She always stayed close to home. But one evening Stokely disposed of a hearty meal and jauntily made her exit -- to a fate we shall never know. Hardy the time for a petnapper to be working, but a thorough search of the entire area disclosed no sign of a black cat, dead or alive.

Poor Stokely. She was a homely cat, compared with the beautiful long-haired tabby named Pooty who graced the Presidential mansion for the previous decade. But Stokely was a cat, which is quite enough. We loved her, as you have loved your cats over the years.
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(Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces below and return in a stamped envelope to: Humane Information Services, Inc., 675 Pinellas Point Drive, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705.)

(1) I wish (do not wish ) to be kept on the mailing list for future Reports to Humanitarians (you do not have to become a member or contribute in order to continue receiving them)
(2) My name, address and zip code used on the reverse side are (are not ) correct.

If not, the correct name, address and zip code are: 

(3) I wish: (a) to become an Associate Member and enclose $1 annual dues ;
(b) to become a Patron Member and enclose $ (any amount over $1).

(4) I am (am not ) able and willing to write occasional letters and report local con-
ditions to you on request, in connection with various programs for the protection of animals.
We hope that if Stokely now is dead, she did not go through the kind of suffering which millions of other cats experience every year in the medical laboratories. Perhaps her fate will serve to remind all of us of these other poor kittens, whose suffering could be prevented or greatly ameliorated by passage of the Rogers-Javits bill. What a load must rest on the consciences of those who have mistakenly opposed this bill because they accepted some poorly-informed person's advice without taking the trouble to get the facts. A very influential small group of people who have opposed the bill recently told a mutual friend that they had not realized P.L. 89-544 does not cover animals under experimentation, and only after his detailed verbal explanation had they come to realize the need for additional legislation. Surely, nobody could have read our Reports Nos. 1 and 2 with an open mind and still thought that P.L. 89-544 covers animals during experimentation. This shows the need for a continuing flow of informational services relating to laboratory legislation. When the latter finally is passed, it will require a continuing educational effort to check on performance by the administering agency, since the most important provisions relate to such things as the substitution of non-sentient materials for animals, which will require a lot of prodding.

Funds are badly needed to pay the heavy expenses connected with our continuing informational services related to the use of laboratory animals, which extend much beyond these Reports to Humanitarians, and which will continue regardless of Congressional action in 1968. If you love cats, send your contribution to our Stokely Fund, which will be used for this specific purpose. It will be tax deductible (we are officially listed as a tax-exempt charitable organization by the Internal Revenue Service). Address: Stokely Fund, Humane Information Services, Inc., 675 Pinellas Point Drive, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705. You may wish to use the coupon on the back of this page.

IMPORTANT--Some of our readers evidently have confused this society, Humane Information Services, Inc., of St. Petersburg, Florida, with The Humane Society of the United States, of Washington, D. C. They sent the Return Coupon from Report No. 2 to the HSUS at Washington, together with their dues or contributions. The latter were retained by the HSUS, and never reached us. We don't mind this, as the HSUS is a worthy organization. However, we have no organizational connection whatever with the HSUS, although we cooperate on humane programs as much as possible. Humane Information Services avoids duplicating the work of any other society, including the HSUS. The type of humane work we do is different -- and, we hope, more effective in our field -- than that of any other society. So, please send in the Return Coupon on the back of this page even if you are already a member of HSUS or any other organization. No dues or contributions are necessary in order to receive these reports, although we will try to make really effective use of any money you send. Thank you.