

WellBeing International

WBI Studies Repository

6-1971

(No. 16) – Humane Education Digest

Humane Information Services, Inc.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.wellbeingintludiesrepository.org/rephum>

Recommended Citation

Humane Information Services, Inc., "(No. 16) – Humane Education Digest" (1971). *Report to Humanitarians*. 14.

<https://www.wellbeingintludiesrepository.org/rephum/14>

This material is brought to you for free and open access by WellBeing International. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of the WBI Studies Repository. For more information, please contact wbisr-info@wellbeingintl.org.



BILL WOULD REDUCE CRUELITIES OF SLAUGHTER FOR U. S. MEAT IMPORTS

Report to Humanitarians No. 15 described the extremely inhumane methods of slaughter in some foreign countries, particularly South America. A plan for dealing with this problem was suggested.

Since that Report was published by Humane Information Services, the National Association for Humane Legislation has begun an action program designed to do something about this deplorable condition.

Millions of Animals

In order to show the magnitude of the problem, an attempt was made to convert pounds of meat and meat products imported into the United States into the equivalent number of head of livestock. Primarily because the available import statistics are not broken down sufficiently, only approximations can be made. These estimates indicate that the equivalent of nearly 2.5 million head of cattle and calves, 2.3 million hogs, and nearly 2 million sheep, lambs and goats are imported into this country annually. This makes a total equivalent of well over 6 million head of livestock. No matter what the unavoidable errors in this conversion, it is evident that the number of animals and the amount of animal suffering involved is huge. Obviously, the volume of our imports is sufficiently large that the United States, even without the cooperation of other importing nations, is in an excellent strategic position to affect slaughter policies in exporting nations.

Agree on Legislation

Dr. Frederick L. Thomsen, representing NAHL, met with Messrs. Patrick B. Parkes and Frank J. McMahon of the Humane Society of the United States and Mr. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., Washington representative of the American Humane Association, in the latter's office. Agreement was quickly obtained on the wording of an amendment of the federal humane slaughter act proposed by Dr. Thomsen. Later, Mr. John C. Macfarlane, vice president in charge of the livestock department of the Massachusetts SPCA, indicated his agreement with the purpose and wording of the proposed amendment, which follows:

"SECTION 7: No meat or meat products shall be imported into the United States unless such meat or meat products are derived from animals that have been slaughtered and handled in connection with slaughter by methods that have been designated and approved by the Secretary as humane under Section 3 of this Act, and the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to provide for the inspection and certification of the methods used to comply with this section, or for the approval of such certification by appropriate agencies of the government of the country in which such animals are slaughtered."

Enforcement No Problem

We can assure all concerned that enforcement of such an act would not constitute a problem, for reasons that were given in Report to Humanitarians No. 15. No knowledgeable person will argue against the measure on the grounds of difficulty of enforcement.

The representatives of the HSUS and AHA present at the meeting indicated their support of this project, and it is believed that other societies also will support it. Such quick agreement, reached without any controversy or bickering, shows how humane societies can work together in harmony when the issues involved are understood and knowledgeable leaders put their heads together.

Other Support for Legislation

It is probable, also, that cattlemen would give their support. Already, one influential rancher has urged a number of nationally-known cattlemen to write to a prospective sponsor in favor of the bill. Cattlemen have the right to demand that their overseas competitors, already enjoying the advantages of lower labor and other costs, should not be allowed the additional advantage of freedom from humane slaughter requirements. It seems probable, also, that packinghouse workers' unions in this country would support such a measure.

(Continued in second column)

REPORT TO HUMANITARIANS

No. 16 - June, 1971

EDITORS:
Dr. Frederick L. Thomsen
Miss Emily F. Gleockler

Humane Information Services
Incorporated

A NON-PROFIT SOCIETY FURNISHING INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS
FOR USE IN PROGRAMS FOR THE HUMANE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS

4521 - 4th Street South, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705

Sponsors Sought

The first hurdle to be vaulted is the obtaining of influential sponsors for the amendment in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. This will not be an easy task, but is not insurmountable. In discussing the problem with important Congressmen, Dr. Thomsen found no specific disagreement with the general purpose of the proposed bill, to which few people in the United States could object.

Two Obstacles

The big obstacles to be overcome are:

(1) United States producers of many products from shoes to iron and steel, including meat producers, have been demanding quotas or other increased protection against the severe competition from imports. Members of Congress who have been resisting this pressure because of the general belief in the advantages of free international trade may not take kindly at this time to any measure restricting imports.

(2) Some members of Congress are opposed to any action by the United States which might appear to constitute interference in the domestic affairs of other countries. This aversion has increased as a result of public feeling about the Vietnam war and foreign aid tied to do-

(Continued in third column)

(Continued in third column)

domestic action by other countries

These two obstacles were cited to us by Congressman Poage, of Texas, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, as reasons why he would hesitate to sponsor the proposed bill at this time. Further evidence of their importance is to be found in the recent introduction of a bill, H.R. 17444, which would require all imported frozen meats to be thawed for inspection and all cans opened. This in effect would stop most importation of meat into this country, and probably result in substantially higher domestic meat prices, without affecting conditions of slaughter in the exporting countries. Although we sympathize with the reasons why livestock producers and meat processors in the United States may seek such legislation, we do not believe that it has any real chance of passage. Nevertheless, so long as the possibility exists, livestock and meat interests will be less inclined to support the humane slaughter requirement, and some members of Congress might be inclined to push all bills containing import restrictions under the table for a while.

The second of the two obstacles is exemplified in a letter received from Mr. Terry L. Claassen, the legislative assistant to Congressman Purcell, of Texas, chairman of

the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, who has been considering introduction of our proposed bill. Mr. Claassen says that be-

Humane Legislation Digest

Humane Information Services, Inc., is a non-profit, tax-exempt national humane society which under IRS regulations is not permitted to devote a substantial part of its activities to influencing legislation. However, it can report to its members what others are doing in this field. These quarterly Reports to Humanitarians will contain such information, prepared for us by our sister society, the National Association for Humane Legislation, Inc., a non-profit but not tax-exempt organization which is actively engaged in promoting better legal protection for our animal friends. Throughout this Digest the National Association for Humane Legislation may be referred to for brevity as NAHL.

We are aware that the efforts of HHS to stay entirely out of the legislative field, and of NAHL to see that all of its efforts are independently financed by non-tax-exempt contributions, may appear to some humanitarians to be unnecessarily meticulous compliance with federal regulations. It may give some local or other societies the idea that they should not even urge their members to write letters to legislators, or take any other part in influencing legislation. Not so. A local society devoting most of its budget to operating an animal shelter will find that it can do everything necessary to take an effective part in the campaigns for humane legislation without violating the limitation that this must not constitute a "substantial" part of its total activities or budget. Similarly, a national society that devotes a large part of its total budget to paying the salaries and expenses of field men, writers, etc., may find that its expenditures on legislation represent a less-than-substantial part of its activities.

HIS, a relatively new, tax-exempt national humane society, with a comparatively small annual budget, and a very small payroll because of the use of volunteer workers, is not in such a fortunate position. In terms of money spent, if HIS did the legislative work performed by NAHL, it would represent a substantial proportion of its budget. So, HIS cannot use any tax-deductible contributions for legislative activities. We hope that contributors who use the standard deduction for their income tax returns, and are not interested in tax deductibility, will keep this in mind and contribute as generously as possible to NAHL, especially during the coming year of work on humane slaughter legislation.

fore making any decision on matters of this kind it is Congressman Purcell's policy to contact the department involved for its preliminary reaction. He says that it is the opinion of the Foreign Agricultural Service of the USDA that the proposed language of the bill would seriously affect our trade posture. That is, it can now be said to foreign meat exporting countries that "we don't require anything of you that's not required of domestic producers". The Foreign Agricultural Service contends that the present federal humane slaughter act is optional with regard to private marketing transactions in the United States (it applies only to meat packers who sell meat to the federal government).

NAHL believes that this is only a technicality. Actually, the federal act applies to all packers of any real importance in the meat processing trade in this country, except kosher plants. It would be easy for the Secretary of Agriculture, in promulgating regulations under the terms of our proposed bill, to exempt all of the smaller plants of the kind that in this country do not come under the present federal act, which would not in any event be engaged in the export trade in meat products. Thus,

(See MEAT IMPORTS, page 2, column 1)

June, 1971

Non-Profit Org.
U. S. Postage
PAID
St. Petersburg, Fla.
Permit No. 5675

REPORT TO HUMANITARIANS No. 16

HUMANE INFORMATION SERVICES, INC.
4521 - 4th Street South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33705

**Postmaster: Address Correction
Requested, Forwarding and
Return Postage Guaranteed**

HUMANE LEGISLATION DIGEST — from page 1 —

MEAT IMPORTS — from page 1 —

the requirements for domestic and foreign plants would be fully comparable. We hope that such technicalities are not allowed to interfere with the passage of this proposed bill, which really cannot hurt any foreign country, livestock producers or meat packers. In the long run, humane methods of slaughter are less costly than the cruel methods now used in some countries. We have letters from meat packers to this effect.

If, however, this objection continues to be made, it may be possible to change the wording of the proposed bill to remove the basis for the objection.

Congressman Purcell Considering Bill

Congressman Purcell, representing the 13th District of Texas, is very knowledgeable about matters related to this problem, and has recently surveyed livestock production and marketing in some foreign countries. He listened sympathetically, and commented intelligently on Dr. Thomsen's explanation of the proposed bill. NAHL suggests that humanitarians who reside in Texas, and especially in the 13th Congressional District, write to Congressman Graham Purcell, 120 House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, thanking him for his consideration of the proposed bill, and requesting him to introduce and support it. A sufficient number of letters from his constituents in favor of this proposed bill might have a material influence on his decision. NAHL urges other national and local societies having members in Texas, and especially in the 13th District, to urge them to write or wire Congressman Purcell, who certainly would be interested in the views of his constituents on this problem. When you write, be polite, brief and to the point. And please let NAHL know that you have written, and about his reply.

If Congressman Purcell does not sponsor the bill, for any reason that might seem valid to him, something else will be tried. NAHL will furnish information about this to HIS, Inc., for inclusion in the next Report to Humanitarians, to be published in September. NAHL suggests that if you are going to write, you do so promptly. It will be much better if your letter reaches the Congressman before rather than after he makes up his mind; however, even after that your letters will help, because of his very influential position as chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock.

A Major Humane Project

NAHL knows of no other possible action by humanitarians which has a greater potential for reducing animal suffering in relation to the amount of effort and funds required than does this bill. It is hoped that all humane societies will put aside differences which may separate them on other matters, and get actively behind this project. It will take such cooperation to get the bill passed.

Many Conservation and Animal Bills Introduced in Cong

Nearly fifty (50) bills relating directly or indirectly to animals have been introduced in the present Congress or are being considered for introduction. Some are companion bills introduced in both House and Senate, but in any event the total is far greater than the number for any other recent Congress.

Most of these bills deal with wildlife, conservation and ecology, indicating how our politicians have been impressed with the political oomph exhibited by the environmentalists. If the news media, the universities and young people would give half as much attention to the important humane problems as they do to such things as protecting endangered species, it would help to get more support in Congress for things like humane slaughter and laboratory animal protection.

One of the more important of these bills is one being drafted by Senator Nelson, of Wisconsin, to ban the use of leghold traps. It is doubtful that we now are in a position to pass an effective bill of this kind, partly because work on development of a practical universal humane trap, now being conducted in Canada, has not been completed. However, introduction of Senator Nelson's proposed bill, with committee hearings, would at least serve to call public attention to the cruelties of trapping, and help to pave the way for future legislation.

Representative Ryan, of New York, and Senator Harris, of Oklahoma, are working on possible companion bills for House and Senate, respectively, which would ban certain features of rodeos, particularly the bucking strap, with the intention of reducing the cruelties involved in these exhibitions and at the same time eliminating some of the features of rodeo that make it a popular entertainment. If and when this bill is introduced, all members of NAHL should support it in every way possible.

Several bills are designed to ban or restrict the killing of seals on the Pribilof Islands. One of them, copy of which we have not yet received, (S. 685, by Senator Packwood, of Oregon) is said to prohibit the clubbing of seals. If the bill does only this, it could result in the use of less humane means of killing the seals, or force the seal harvest from the Islands, where it is under government supervision, onto the open seas, where the slaughter would be much greater and involve far more suffering. S. 1315, introduced by Senator Harris, seems to be a much more comprehensive and carefully-thought-out bill. It is designed to protect the welfare of seals, whales and other ocean mammals, and is reported to contain provisions intended to prevent driving the Alaskan seal harvest into the open waters, where the animals would be hunted down by ships (see discussion of seal hunting in Reports to Humanitarians Nos. 4 and 14).

Representative Whitehurst, of Virginia, always a great friend of the animals, has introduced a number of measures. The most important is H.C.R. 243, a resolution which calls on the federal government to develop new research methods so that animals are not required for use in experimentation. Although we strongly believe that something much more than a resolution on this matter is called for, it would help to get this expression of opinion from the Congress. Another resolution proposed by Congressman Whitehurst, H.C.R. 232, would express the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of humane treatment of all animals.

Among other bills introduced by Representative Whitehurst and deserving support is one that would amend the endangered species act to prohibit importation of any species of fish or wildlife obtained by inhumane methods (H.R. 7514).

Bills by Representative Saylor, of Pennsylvania, (H.R. 2631) and Senator Nelson (S. 78) would prohibit shooting animals from aircraft. Hearings have been held on this, and there seems to be a good chance of passage.

S. 249 (Senator Cranston, of California) would protect many endangered species and prohibit some bounty and poisoning programs. Senator Cranston also has a bill (S.J.R. 84) to establish the Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge.

Other Senators who have introduced one or more bills are Bible, Hatfield, Jackson and Len Jordan. Among Representatives introducing such proposed legislation, in addition to those mentioned, are Baring, Dingell, Pelly, Roybal, Waldie and Wolff.

FLORIDA LEGISLATURE REPEALS BLOODLESS BULLFIGHT ACT

One of the first bills passed by the Florida legislature and signed by the Governor, nor repealed the 1970 act which permitted bloodless bullfights.

Since attempts are being made or contemplated to pass legislation in other states permitting bloodless bullfights, and to such spectacles in some states without civic legislative approval, this victory the humane movement has national significance.

Legal Complications

The Senate passed a straight repeal but the House passed a rather complicated bill which was the one adopted by the conference committee set up to reconcile differences, and finally passed by both houses. It will be difficult for anyone acquainted with the complicated legal tangles involved to evaluate the repeal. It improves in some respects upon the legislation which prevailed before 1970, but regard to minor events such as alligator hunting the law may have been weakened to some extent. NAHL conferred at length with its own attorneys, and with the legislative drafting service at Tallahassee, before deciding that the House version should be accepted. Our sponsor in the House, Representative William Gillespie, of New Smyrna Beach, who had introduced a straight repeal bill, assured us that the House Committee bill was as strong, on balance, as his.

Repeal Was Assured

Ever since the 1970 act was passed, NAHL has been working hard and continuously for its repeal. It spent over a thousand dollars on duplicating and mailing letters to candidates for the legislature in last fall's election, and for other expenses obtained 71 pledges for repeal. Forty-eight (48) of these were from candidates who were elected. This and much other preliminary activity, including your letters in response to the June 1970 issue of this Digest, made it virtually certain that a repeal measure would be passed before the bills were introduced.

Cooperation of Other Societies

One of the "clinchers" came when the Florida State Commerce Committee, to which the bill introduced by Senator John Bell, of Fort Lauderdale, had been assigned, held hearings in St. Petersburg. Members of the SPCA of St. Petersburg, on a telephone drive over the weekend, got out a very large and articulate crowd which obviously impressed the committee. Senator Bell; Miss Gleockler, representing the Florida Federation of Humane Societies; Dr. Thomsen, representing NAHL; Frank McMahon, of the Humane Society of the United States; president John Boyle of Hillsborough County Humane Society; Larry Gore, of the SPCA of St. Petersburg, made brief talks before the committee, and the committee acted immediately approving the bill and passing it to the Senate, where it was passed on the first legislative day of the session, carrying the "steam" behind the bill which had been generated by all of these efforts. Bills passed both houses almost unanimously.

NAHL appreciates the cooperation of the foregoing societies, and of others who urged their members to write letters wishing especially to thank NAHL's co-sponsors who made possible its work in the repeal. The successful combined effort of all of these individuals and organizations show what can be done if the humane movement is willing to forget its squabbles and dig in.

(See BULLFIGHTS, page 4, column 1)

To: Humane Information Services, Inc.
4521 - 4th Street South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33705

RETURN COUPON

☐ I wish to be kept on your mailing list for Reports to Humanitarians (I understand that I do not have to become a member or make a contribution to receive them).

☐ I do not wish to be kept on your mailing list.

☐ My name and address on the reverse side are correct.

☐ My name and address on the reverse side are not correct and should read as follows:

ZIP _____

☐ I wish to become an Associate Member and enclose annual dues of \$ _____

☐ I wish to become a Patron Member and enclose annual dues of \$ _____ (\$5.00 or more).

☐ I wish to make a contribution and enclose \$ _____ to be used for _____

KOSHER SLAUGHTER

Since our Report to Humanitarians No. 15, dealing with the slaughter of food animals, was issued, there have been a number of developments with respect to kosher slaughter. Dr. Thomsen, a member of the Advisory Board of the Council for Livestock Pre-Slaughter Legislation, attended a meeting of the Council in New York City, and later conferred with various humane society officers and individual humanitarians.

Education Comes First

Nearly all of these have agreed with the suggestion in our Report No. 15 that it is futile to try to obtain state or federal legislation relating to kosher slaughter until after an intensive campaign of education among the Jewish community. We believe that this campaign must be conducted by someone with unimpeachable credentials as a devout Jew, who is familiar with the Jewish news media and with Jewish organizations, and who has some acquaintance among and acceptability by Jewish leaders. Mr. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., Washington representative of the American Humane Association and president of the Council, in a letter to directors and members of the Advisory Board of the Council dated April 28, seems to agree with this conclusion.

Development of Holding Pen

Everyone seems to agree, also, on the desirability of continuing work to develop a holding pen for small animals. It might require \$50,000 to develop even a prototype, but if adequate funds could be made available it could go a long way toward solving the problem (Humane Information Services is far from convinced, however, that even the large animal holding pen now in use in some plants is fully humane). Meanwhile, an effective program of education within the Jewish community is the first necessity, regardless of other efforts. HIS has some specific plans for this educational project, if and when the humane societies concerned decide to undertake the project.

Eye Gouging Not Common

A few of our Jewish members wrote very nice letters questioning our description of eye gouging as a part of pre-slaughter handling practices found in some kosher plants, and asking for the names and addresses of such plants. We are happy to correct any possible false impression given by this description. We plainly said that pre-slaughter handling methods vary widely in kosher plants. The description of eye gouging, which we took from an article written by the president of a reputable national society who had personally witnessed the distressing practice, and which we verified by writing to an authority on slaughtering methods, was given merely to show how far the cruelties involved in pre-slaughter handling can be carried. We did not mean to imply that eye gouging is a common practice in kosher plants. But at their best, the pre-slaughter handling methods are inhumane.

In any event, we would not publish the names and addresses of individual plants. We are describing a general situation, and it would be unfair to single out individuals. This would do no good, and could do harm. Our members who think they can quickly put a stop to such practices by working through their local humane societies, the newspapers, their synagogues, etc., simply do not understand the situation. They would merely be accused of being uninformed, biased or anti-Semitic. News media are extremely careful to avoid any possible accusation of anti-Semitism, partly because of the editors' genuine aversion to such bias, and partly because of Jewish-controlled advertising. It is impossible to approach this problem successfully without first gaining the understanding and support of a substantial part of not only the total Jewish community, but also of the relatively small Orthodox segment of that community.

Before condemning the Jews for this situation, a humanitarian should recall the inhumane treatment of animals encouraged or condoned by other religions or religious groups. This is a part of human imperfection. It is not any religion, but religious people who are responsible.

CRUEL DRUG CONTINUES TO BE USED AND RECOMMENDED FOR "EUTHANASIA" AND TRANQUILIZING GUNS

The highly painful drug succinylcholine chloride, bearing the trade name of Succos-trin, continues to be used and recommended by some veterinarians and humane societies. This is despite the warning given in an article in our Report to Humanitarians No. 15.

Since that article appeared, our new director of humane education, Burt Brainerd, has unearthed additional evidence of the intense suffering caused by this drug. Our attention was called to an article written by several veterinarians of the USDA reporting on a research project dealing with methods of killing diseased swine and mistakenly favorable to this drug. We are following up on this and other matters connected with the use of succinylcholine chloride, and, if all information is received by the time our September Report to Humanitarians is prepared, will include a full review of all the facts. Also scheduled to appear in that issue is a progress report on the development of improved euthanasia procedures in animal shelters and pounds.

Do Not Use in Tranquilizer Guns

But we cannot wait until the next issue to warn our readers, especially those who are directors or officers of local humane societies, against following the implied advice of a large national humane society to use succinylcholine chloride in immobilization equipment for capturing dogs that are too wild to be caught by routine methods.

This implied advice appeared in an article in the May issue of one of the society's publications with a wide readership among local humane society personnel. The article discusses "the road to success in using drug immobilization equipment". It appropriately warns against the use of such equipment by unqualified personnel, and against drug dosages not suited to the specifications of the animal to be captured.

The author of that article, however, evidently had not read our Report to Humanitarians No. 15, and the editor of the publication apparently also had not read it. We cannot believe that after reading our Report any humane society official would advocate the use of succinylcholine chloride, even by implication.

This article discusses the use in capturing equipment of three drugs: nicotine alkaloid, succinylcholine chloride and Sernylar. While it does not directly advocate any one of these, the only one for which no disadvantages are pointed out is succinylcholine chloride, so the implication that this is preferred is plain. The article also describes favorably a training program for shelter personnel and control officers given by the manufacturer of a particular gun, which we have been told has been advocating the use of succinylcholine chloride.

HIS is extending its research on methods of euthanasia to include the use of immobilization equipment. Meanwhile, we strongly urge all shelters and dog control officers to refrain from using in capture gun equipment any of the three drugs mentioned above.

It must be distinctly understood that these remarks are not intended to be critical of the humane society that published the article, or of the manufacturer of the immobilization equipment. Many usually well-informed personnel of humane societies, and practicing veterinarians, have not understood the great suffering caused by succinylcholine chloride, which appears to be painless because the animal is unable to convey its distress and suffering while immobilized.

COMPARE !

This Report to Humanitarians is filled with facts about really important humane problems and programs. Please note the difference between this and the kind of almost meaningless items found in much of the humane society literature. Every issue of Reports to Humanitarians will continue to feature meaty analyses and calls for action that will lead to reduction in animal suffering. We ask for your continued moral and financial support.

Humane Information Services is especially in need of volunteer services of retired business executives and professional people who are still "young between the ears" and who could assume responsibility for conducting specific action programs. Residence in St. Petersburg is not essential.

GREAT NEED FOR HUMANE SOCIETIES AND SHELTERS IN MANY COMMUNITIES

Humane Information Services receives many letters from animal lovers who live in communities having many humane problems, but no humane society to deal with them. This is to be expected, since only about 20 percent of the 3,099 counties in the United States now have an operational humane society.

At least one state, Mississippi, until recently did not have a single genuine operating humane society.

The great need for a real humane society in that state and for animal shelters in its principal population centers was recognized by the founders of the Mississippi Animal Rescue League, formed several years ago by a group of animal lovers headed by Mr. James G. Cupit, the society's president, with headquarters in Jackson. During the interim, efforts have been made to raise funds for an animal shelter in Jackson, and the intention of the group is to organize branches in other communities of the state. But progress has been slow.

Mobile Shelters a Possible Solution

HIS has tried to be of assistance in this worthy effort. For one thing, we have attempted to elicit interest in the possibilities of using temporarily a mobile shelter, which could be moved to a new location once sufficient funds are obtained to build a permanent facility in Jackson. Dr. Forbes MacLeod, of New Brunswick, Canada, furnished us with his plans for a well-designed mobile shelter which is now being successfully used in his area. However, for use in the United States, where restrictions on highway movement and costs of construction and hauling are greater, we believe that a smaller unit is more suitable. We obtained a bid from a commercial trailer manufacturer. This unit, complete with plumbing, heating and air con-

ditioning, cages, work room, etc., would cost at least \$10,000. Even this amount is too high for most communities struggling to provide minimum shelter facilities.

Used Trailers?

We then looked into the possibilities of rebuilding a used mobile home, and located a very suitable one, complete with plumbing. The price was \$800. We then located a retired cabinetmaker who agreed to do the entire job, which brought our roughly estimated cost to around \$5,000. Unfortunately this man was stricken with an illness which has left him unable to do heavy work. Employment of specialized labor would greatly increase the cost.

The Mississippi Animal Rescue League expressed an interest in using or constructing a mobile shelter, in Jackson if the fund drive does not yield sufficient money for a permanent facility, and in another Mississippi community if the fund drive is successful. HIS would be glad to undertake reconstruction of a used trailer if some more affluent humanitarian would donate the money required. And if any other communities without shelter facilities are interested, we would like to hear from them. Some commercial equipment manufacturers have expressed interest if the prospective demand is sufficiently great.

Other Accomplishments

Although still without a shelter, the Mississippi Animal Rescue League has been engaging in humane education in Jackson, using our News About Animals effectively. Immediately after the big series of tornadoes which hit Mississippi in the spring of 1971 they were out doing animal rescue work. They distributed pet food supplied by the Purina Pet Care Center, of St. Louis, and thoroughly covered every stricken area.

Our Officers' Corner

"BURT" BRAINERD APPOINTED DIRECTOR OF HUMANE EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur B. Brainerd has been elected a director and appointed director of humane education of Humane Information Services.

Mr. Brainerd has been a volunteer worker in the humane movement for some time, and will serve full time in his new position without compensation. He has an excellent background in education and science, with a Bachelor of Science degree from Worcester (Massachusetts) Polytechnic Institute and a Master of Education degree from Boston University.



BRAINERD

In addition to his work for HIS, Mr. Brainerd has been elected a board member of the SPCA of St. Petersburg and a member of its shelter committee.

In behalf of HIS, Burt last fall visited one of the largest mink ranches, located in Maryland, and found that sodium pentobarbital is well suited to provide a really humane death for the millions of mink killed annually. He will shortly visit mink farmers' organizations in order to extend this information to the thousands of mink raisers. This is a highly important, continuing project of HIS. In addition, Burt uncovered significant additional facts relating to the cruel drug succinylcholine chloride, reported elsewhere in this issue.

However, Mr. Brainerd's major interest and talents are in education and writing. He has been given responsibility for developing new programs in these fields which the directors of HIS have had in mind for a long time, but could not get under way because of the pressure of other work.

We are indeed fortunate to have found someone with Burt's ability and training who is such a dedicated humanitarian that he is willing to work just for the satisfaction of helping the animals.

NEW DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR HUMANE LEGISLATION, INC.

Since the first Humane Legislation Digest appeared last year, there have been some changes in the board of directors of the National Association for Humane Legislation.

Mrs. Charlotte L. B. Parks, of York, Maine, and Mr. Arthur B. ("Burt") Brainerd, of St. Petersburg, were elected directors and vice presidents. Hundreds of humanitarians in this country and abroad are familiar with the indefatigable efforts of Mrs. Parks in the promotion of animal welfare, both as an individual and as chairman of the Committee for Constructive Laboratory Animal Legislation. Burt (see separate article in this issue) is relatively new to the legislative field, but has the makings of a good persuader.

Miss Emily F. Gleockler, who is also a paid employee of Humane Information Services, Inc., has resigned as president of NAHL and accepted the position of secretary-treasurer. Dr. Frederick L. Thomsen was elected president. This change was made necessary in order to comply fully with certain legal technicalities connected with lobbying.

So far we're okay!

Sometimes, when the staff of HIS is trying to juggle a dozen pressing problems at one time (as when we are trying to get out this Report), we find it difficult to match the composure of the fellow who fell off the roof of a high building. As he was passing the office window of a friend, the latter shouted that he would rush to get help. The descending victim replied, "Take your time, so far I'm okay!"

VACATIONERS ABANDON PETS

The vacation season is here, creating an important humane problem which calls for action now. Hundreds of thousands of cats and dogs will suffer if we do not act.

Around 2.5 million students in about 1,400 senior colleges and universities will be leaving for home in June. Many of them keep pets in their apartments or rooms during the school year. One of our members living in a university community says that most of these pets are left to fend for themselves. The students hope that they will find new homes, but for most this is obviously impossible.

Humanitarians living in university communities should write letters to the student publications, and to general newspapers in the area, urging the editors to call the attention of their readers to the plight of these pitiful abandoned animals, the improbability of them finding new homes, and the desirability of taking the animals to a humane society shelter before leaving the campus. The more letters like this received by the editors, the more likely they are to give attention to the problem.

While the students are going home, millions of other people are planning or starting their summer vacations. Like the students, they may find it difficult or impossible to leave their pets with some responsible person or in a boarding kennel. So

the animals frequently are left to starve or be run over seeking another home. The same kind of letters described above should be sent to newspapers, describing this situation and what to do about it. Radio and TV stations also may be induced to run such announcements as a public service.

Many vacationers take their pets with them, find that keeping an animal in a travel trailer, tent, cabin or motel involves more inconvenience than expected, and abandon the animal when they move on to the next stop. Many thousands of animals thus suffer the cruel fate of strays. One of our members who vacations in a national park has written us vividly describing the suffering of the hundreds of pets abandoned when the vacationers leave for home. This situation is more difficult to deal with than the other two, since there may be no news media reaching the vacationing pet owners. Local humane societies in the area might be able to persuade park personnel to post signs, or notices on the bulletin boards, urging that pets which cannot be taken home be taken to the local humane society shelter, with road directions.

Here is an important humane problem which cannot be left to others to care for. Think about the situation in your own community, plan appropriate action, and then do what you can, now.

HUMANE LAW VOLUMES

Those who sent their checks for copies of the two volumes codifying and analyzing humane laws now on the statute books of certain states, described in our previous Report to Humanitarians, may be wondering why they have not received these volumes.

The reason is that Dr. Ford, executive director of the Legislative Bureau of the School of Law of the University of Notre Dame, found it necessary to make new arrangements for funding the project, and did so about the time our Report No. 15 was printed, without notifying us at the time. This arrangement was with the Humane Society of the United States, which is better able financially to provide the necessary funds. We approve of this arrangement, under which orders for the volumes will be filled by the HSUS, apparently at the same price we announced in March. When the volumes are ready for mailing, we will turn over to the HSUS the names and addresses of those who ordered, together with our check covering the full amount you sent us.

Both HSUS and HIS feel that before these orders are filled we should be assured that the volumes are substantially as expected. If they are not, your money will be returned. This is in no way a reflection on Dr. Ford's hard-working, dedicated law students who have compiled these volumes. They have gone to an immense amount of work and trouble, with little or nothing to show for it personally except valuable experience and the satisfaction of helping the animals. But this is a highly complicated and technical subject, involving an understanding not only of the law but also of humane legislative problems. Neither HIS nor the HSUS wishes those who placed their orders to be disappointed with the results. Meanwhile, do not send more orders to HIS. Wait for later announcement.

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP DUES AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Like all other humane societies, Humane Information Services has been hit by inflation. The increase in postage rates, for both first and third class, is especially burdensome.

The cost of acknowledging receipt of a member's dues, preparing a mailing plate, sending the renewal notice, and mailing the quarterly Reports to Humanitarians, and other actual out-of-pocket costs of maintaining a member on our rolls now exceed our associate membership dues of one dollar. This leaves nothing for overhead, research and development activities, and for conducting our important action programs to eliminate cruelty to animals. This is despite the fact that our costs of operation are held to an absolute minimum.

For these reasons, our board of directors has voted to change our dues and acknowledgments as follows: (1) Members contributing any amount from one to five dollars will be enrolled as associate members, and receipts will be mailed only if payment of dues is made in cash or by money order (your check is your receipt) or if the associate member resides in a foreign country. Letters received in connection with payment of associate membership dues will not be answered unless they contain specific questions which have not been answered by our Reports. (2) Patron members will include all who contribute five dollars or more, and will be acknowledged. Letters containing only comments not requiring specific replies will not be answered, much as we appreciate receiving them.

However, at least one of our principal officers will read every comment you make in letters, notes or even if written on the margins of coupons. We consider these comments important as indicating the thinking and wishes of our members. In most cases

they are read by both Emily and Doc. We believe that no national humane society gives more personal attention to the mail received. But business firms find that it costs about three dollars to write and mail an ordinary business letter; if we continue to reply to all of our increasing volume of mail, we will have to employ additional stenographic help. However, if you have significant questions, they will be answered by letter.

Many of our members have been sending us newspaper clippings, literature received from other humane societies, magazine articles, and copies of legislative bills. These have proved to be very useful. For example, one of our members recently sent us a reference to a bill that had been introduced in Congress to which no reference has been made in any humane publication we receive or in the daily newspapers, but which has a direct and important bearing on one of our major projects. Please continue to send us such material, even though, for reasons given above, we will no longer send letters of acknowledgment.

Your cooperation in helping us to hold down our costs of correspondence will be appreciated. But do not refrain from asking important questions. Our exchanges of meaningful correspondence constitute one of our most important activities.

BULLFIGHTS— from page 3—

With its treasury so depleted by this campaign that it was unable to pay all of its bills at the end of the year, NAHL is now forced to again appeal for contributions to make possible work on other highly important legislation including that requiring all imported meat products be derived from humanely-slaughtered animals (see article elsewhere in this Report).