

aid available to help promising scholar-athletes attend college.

This Revenue Ruling strikes close to home. As a former University of Washington Husky, I know many of the members of my Rose Bowl football team received financial aid. Without those scholarships, they might not have been able to go to college. A tax deduction is a powerful incentive to support higher education. Though I'd like to believe that people would continue to make donations to our universities without the guarantee of deductibility, human nature is rarely so beneficent. Without the contributions, the type and scope of college athletics we enjoy today would not be possible.

I believe Revenue Ruling 84-132 is bad tax policy, and I am introducing legislation today to repeal it. I am joined in my effort by Congressmen FOLEY, PRITCHARD, SWIFT, CHANDLER, and MORRISON from Washington State, and I would welcome the help of any of my colleagues who would like to participate in this repeal movement. ●

#### ANIMAL WELFARE PEOPLE ARE GAINING—THE IMPACT MOVES BEYOND ANIMALS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the movement for animal welfare is gaining momentum and important changes are taking place within the organizations that are leading the way. I welcome that progress. All too frequently we see callous examples of inhumane treatment of animals. All too frequently we find examples of wasteful and unnecessarily cruel practices in the treatment of laboratory and other animals.

The significance of concern for animal welfare, however, is important for other reasons as well. William Kahrl, in an excellent article published in the Los Angeles Times, noted that "throughout its history the animal welfare movement has always risen and fallen in tandem with a popular concern for child abuse." It has been evident to me, Mr. Speaker, that concern for animal welfare implies a greater concern for all humanity.

Since many of my colleagues may not have seen Mr. Kahrl's article, I insert it in the RECORD.

ANIMAL-RIGHTS PEOPLE ARE GAINING ON US  
(By William Kahrl)

If nothing else, the animal-rights movement has given a lot of people an idea of what it must be like to be Bull Connor. Back in the 1960s, when Connor's police were turning fire hoses and vicious dogs on civil-rights demonstrators in Birmingham, Ala., one wondered how anyone could be so estranged from basic decency. These days

animal-rights activists are gazing with the same puzzlement at the rest of us.

I don't think that we're really as bad as the activists imagine. The indifference that many people of good conscience display toward the cause of animal rights doesn't derive from a lack of sympathy for its objective; it's more a matter of a discomfort with its sense of priorities. Why, after all, at a time when the nuclear shadow is lengthening and the sum of human misery seems to be rising on every hand, are our elected leaders and journals of opinion spending so much time in debating the well-being of rats and mice?

At least in the past there were specific events that brought a concern for animals to the fore.

When the modern movement was born in 18th-Century England, for example, its early campaigns against bear-baiting drew strength from the popular artworks of William Hogarth, who drew a direct link between cruelty toward animals and ultimate moral decline.

Similarly, when the movement first caught fire in this country in the latter half of the 19th Century, its efforts to stop the death of 25,000 horses every year in the streets of New York gained from the contemporary enthusiasm for Darwin's theories, which had for the first time fixed mankind as a part of creation rather than its lord and master.

Even when the movement last flared into prominence in the 1950s it was responding to the sudden outpouring of federal financial support for medical research in post war America.

But there has been no corresponding recent increase in the nature of the evil that animal-rightists perceive that would explain their resurgence today.

And if the problems haven't changed, neither have the issues. Gretchen Wyler of the Fund for Animals, for example, is still working for the same causes that she has been pursuing for the past 20 years.

What has changed most noticeably is the people at the forefront of the movement. In place of the stereotypical little old lady in a flowered hat who spoke movingly of her affection for dogs and cats and who could so easily be dismissed as slightly batty, the new spokesmen for animal rights are often professionals who are trained in the very scientific disciplines whose practices they are criticizing. Rather than playing on sentimental affection, they speak the language of the Yuppies, talking confidently about the counterproductive effects of an overreliance on animal test data, and about new technological advances that they claim are making research on animals obsolete.

Instead of organizing spay clinics and local shelters, today's crusaders have set their sights on statutory change. And many of these crusaders are no longer talking about humane treatment in the laboratories; they want an outright ban on the research that currently accounts for the deaths of an estimated 80 million animals each year.

With nearly 500 animal-welfare groups operating in the country today, theirs is still less a movement than it is a concatenation. But the new activists are showing increasing sophistication at coordinating their efforts and gaining the attention of the media. They have demonstrated as well a considerable facility for capitalizing on their own differences. Every time a band of extremists trashes a university laboratory or destroys someone's research project, the mainstream

animal-rights organizations appear all the more reasonable in their appeals for reform. And the most forward-thinking of their leaders are already speaking of building bridges to the environmental and nuclear movements, whose concerns for life they see as linked together in a single ethical spectrum.

But if these people are so smart, why are they focusing their fire on medical research, which seems to be the hardest case in terms of drawing public sympathy to their cause? Why not march on a cosmetics company instead, or begin liberating farm livestock, which are almost entirely unprotected under the current anticruelty laws?

The answer is that although medicine might appear to be the most unassailable of our surviving establishments, it is also peculiarly vulnerable in its dependence on continued public funding for research. The government, therefore, provides a lever for forcing reforms that might be altogether unattainable in the private sector. And, besides, universities make tempting targets—in part because they are so open to new ideas, but also because academics can usually be counted on to respond foppishly to criticism of their practices.

Both Stanford University and the University of California at Berkeley, for example, have recently lost accreditation from the private voluntary association that is responsible for monitoring the care of laboratory animals. The president of Stanford made his contribution to reasoned debate on this question by denouncing his adversaries as terrorists and vigilantes. The University of California has weighed in with a customary flurry of study committees and internal investigative commissions, as well as a public-relations film showing faculty members dutifully petting their intended victims while they talk about the importance of their research projects. Academic vanity being what it is, fully half the film's 14-minute running time is devoted to listing every member of the departments involved.

Our distinguished representatives in the California Assembly still open every debate on an animal-welfare bill with a chorus of meows and barks. Some traditions die hard. But throughout its history the animal-welfare movement has always risen and fallen in tandem with a popular concern for child abuse. And, judging by the political attention that both issues are receiving today, this, too, is a tradition that retains all of its potency for effecting the kind of long-term changes that the Bull Connors among us might consider unimaginable. ●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN N.  
ERLENBORN

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1984

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take some time to say a few words of praise and thanks to the Republican leader of our Education and Labor Committee. It is well known that no pension legislation could ever have left this body without the imprint of JOHN N. ERLBORN. His contributions to ERISA cannot be measured in ordinary terms—I would be