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John A. Hoyt has served as president of The Humane Society of the United States since 1970. As the chief executive officer of the nation’s largest animal-protection organization, he heads a staff of approximately 135 persons located in Washington, D.C. and throughout various cities of the United States. Chartered for the purpose of preventing suffering and abuse to animals, the Society pursues this objective through education, investigation, litigation and legislation.

Mr. Hoyt is a past president and now serves as vice-president and a member of the executive committee of the World Society for the Protection of Animals, which is based in London, England. He is president of the National Association for Humane and Environmental Education and of the Center for the Respect of Life and Environment. Mr. Hoyt serves as a director of the National Society for Animal Protection; the Interfaith Council for the Protection of Animals and Nature; Earth Day 1990; the Global Tomorrow Coalition; and In Harmony With Nature, an organization of musicians dedicated to environmental concerns. He is actively involved in a number of other animal-protection organizations.

Mr. Hoyt holds both B.A. and D.D. degrees from Rio Grande College, Rio Grande, Ohio. He also holds a M.Div. degree from Colgate Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York. He is listed in Who's Who in America.

Mr. Hoyt and his wife Trudy are the parents of four daughters and have two grandsons.
Opening Statement

The HSUS welcomes this opportunity for dialogue and discussion. Indeed I am hopeful that this forum will provide yet another opportunity for exploring a common ground and increasing our understanding of each other's concerns. Misunderstanding is the biggest obstacle to the path of meaningful dialogue between farmers and the animal protection community. It is a misunderstanding that is frequently fueled and nurtured by certain industry leaders whose interests are best served by polarizing farmers and animal protectionists. It is a misunderstanding that is also perpetuated by certain extremists within the animal rights community. The scenario portrayed is often one of farmers and animal activists drawing battle lines with the stakes defined as the destruction of agriculture. This scenario is often coupled with the attempt to discredit all animal activists by placing labels such as "violent" or "destroyer of property" on everyone and every group working on behalf of animals.

Likewise, certain spokespersons have exploited to their advantage the accusation that all animal advocates are vegetarian and anti-vivisectionist, positions they equate with preferring the well-being of animals over that of humans and with a

---

Presented by John A. Hoyt, President, The Humane Society of the United States at the California Farm Bureau Federation Conference "Animal Agriculture: Conflict or Compromise?," Sacramento, California, December 2, 1990
determination to destroy agriculture. Let there be no misunderstanding as to our position on these issues. The HSUS seeks to avoid personal confrontation and has vigorously renounced violence, intimidation and the destruction of property. We are not a vegetarian organization, and as a matter of policy do not consider the utilization of animals for food to be either immoral or inappropriate - a position that, as you might expect, earns us a great deal of criticism from various animal rights organizations.

We also recognize that livestock and poultry can make significant contributions to ecological farm management. We are, however, fully committed to pursuing reforms within agriculture that are necessary for insuring our goals for the humane treatment of farm animals and an ecologically sound, sustainable farming structure. These goals also encompass economic viability for the farmer and the production of adequate amounts of safe, wholesome food.

To dismiss all animal activists as being anti-agriculture, terrorists or even as uniformed "city folk" is to miss the point that there are very legitimate and appropriate concerns regarding the rearing, transporting and slaughtering of farm animals and the sustainability of current U.S. agricultural practices. By the same token, for animal advocates to paint a picture of the food animal industry as a cruel, heartless and profit-hungry villain is just as fruitless and nonproductive. Admittedly, there is room for improvement for all of us in addressing these issues.
Just as certain segments of industry exhibit an unwillingness to acknowledge shortcomings of particular offensive practices, so are animal activist groups sometimes too general and overstated in their criticisms. It is The HSUS's goal to provide consumers with credible information about modern systems of food production so that they may make informed, conscientious decisions regarding their food purchases. We will continue to refine our message to insure that we accomplish this goal. We will, however, make no apologies for continuing to bring to light legitimate concerns surrounding current agricultural practices, and to advocate the reform of these practices, reforms that in many instances will benefit not only farm animals but also the family farmer, the consumer, the environment, wildlife and society as a whole.

It is time to stop playing into the hands of polarizing forces that would paint farmers and animal protectionists into two separate camps with opposing goals. The reality of the situation is that farmers and The HSUS, as well as other responsible animal protection groups, are currently working together and share many of the same goals.

Common Ground: Animal Suffering

Let's begin the exploration of our common interests with the health and well-being of farm animals. Simply stated, the goals of The HSUS regarding farm animals are to help insure that farm animals are raised, transported and slaughtered humanely and that animal agriculture has an ecologically sound and sustainable basis.
Our goal is not the promotion of one system of animal agriculture over another for reasons of sentiment. Our goal is to evaluate these systems on many grounds—veterinary, scientific, ethological, humane, environmental, ethical and economic grounds. Only a broad-based analysis of animal production systems will uncover all of the costs and benefits of a particular system.

I question the logic of those who condemn all animal activists as being simplistic in approaching these issues while they themselves evaluate agricultural systems only on the basis of efficiency. The HSUS recognizes that economics must be a primary consideration in farming, and we promote systems that are both appropriate for the animal and viable for the farmer.

But we also recognize that many of the current costs of agriculture are not included in the dollars spent at the grocery store. How do you factor into food prices the USDA's estimated cost of $4.8 billion for human foodborne bacterial diseases in 1987? What would we pay for food if groundwater pollution, the erosion of 1/3 of our nation's topsoil, or the chronic bronchitis of 58% of all swine confinement workers were included in the money we spend at the grocery store? Are the annual estimated costs of $400 million dollars in post-weaning calf deaths or the $2 billion lost to mastitis every year considered acceptable expenses? Hardly.

I am confident that no one here wishes to cause, perpetuate or condone animal suffering. I also accept the proposition that we are all interested in reducing and eliminating animal
suffering. We may not all agree on how, under what circumstances, and within what time frame animal suffering must be mitigated; but I am hopeful it is an objective we can pursue in common as well as through our individual initiatives and responses. The fact is that many farmers and ranchers also find certain industry practices offensive and are frustrated by the unwillingness of some industry associations to respond to legitimate concerns of responsible animal protection groups. Not only does this "we and they" attitude retard potential progress, it also undermines the confidence of the American public in the ability of farmers and ranchers to address consumer concerns for food safety, animal welfare and the environment. The HSUS welcomes dialogue with any organization interested in an open exchange of ideas, dialogue which would ideally be directed toward the exploration of a common ground and the resolution of current conflicts when possible.

The HSUS has been and will continue to work closely with farmers and farm organizations on animal welfare issues. We are finding that many farmers and ranchers often recognize the economic and animal health advantages associated with decreasing stress by giving animals more space and allowing them to exercise more of their normal behaviors. Our Farm Animals department - in collaboration with farmers and ranchers, the organic industry, animal scientists, veterinarians, and other animal experts is developing guidelines for the humane care and handling of livestock and poultry. These are guidelines that sectors of the organic industry are intending to include as part of their
certification standards for livestock and poultry. Endorsement of these guidelines by interested farmers and ranchers will provide producers with a powerful marketing tool to connect them with an ever growing number of consumers who are searching for alternatives to products from intensively raised animals.

**Common Ground: Loss of the Family Farm**

Concern for the plight of the American family farmer is an obvious area of common ground between farmers and The HSUS. Our nation has lost 2/3 of its farms since World War II and over 400,000 farm and ranch families just since 1985. The trend toward the control of animal production by corporations - many managed by non-farmers - is continuing the purge of the independent, diversified family-sized farm. Let it be said without equivocation that The HSUS is fully prepared to commit itself to support those actions and policies which seek to sustain the family farmers whose livelihood is being both threatened and jeopardized, so long as those actions and policies are also sensitive and responsive to the needs of animals. And we are indeed taking an active role in supporting farmers who seek to be responsible stewards of both the land and farm animals. The HSUS Humane Sustainable Agriculture program is supporting farmers who are choosing production systems that are both humane and ecologically sound and that seek to minimize the use of antibiotics, hormones and pesticides. We are finding that many farmers and ranchers don't even realize they currently farm according to the principles of humane sustainable farming. And
with little or no change in their practices they have the opportunity to immediately broaden their market.

We are working with farm organizations on common interests such as the benefits that less intensive systems can provide for farm animals and our mutual concerns for the responsible stewardship of the environment and the survival of the family farm. We have also played a significant role in several federal legislative agricultural initiatives. Additionally, we are working to educate consumers on the benefits of alternative farming practices and how to support producers practicing humane sustainable agriculture. The HSUS in conjunction with the International Alliance for Sustainable Agriculture (IASA) is publishing a "Directory of Humane Sustainable Agriculture." One of the purposes of this publication is to direct consumers to those farmers who are practicing humane sustainable agriculture.

This is an area where both farm organizations and animal protectionists can work for positive change and provide options for farmers and ranchers who wish to survive on independent family-sized farms. We continue to educate consumers and strengthen the demand for alternative products. We advocate changes within the existing agricultural infrastructure, changes that will allow for and support such products. The production of innovative animal products open up new markets and opportunities for the entire industry. The availability of such products would respond to growing consumer demand. Let's welcome and encourage new ideas and new products. Let's welcome and encourage innovative farmers who are taking a risk as they work to improve
agriculture. Let's welcome and encourage new directions for agriculture.

Common Ground: The Environment

The environmental impact of agriculture is another area of concern that provides farmers and animal protectionists with a natural alliance. There are a multitude of animal protection issues that are linked with environmental concerns and in turn with the concerns of farmers. One brief example is water pollution. Agriculture is the largest single nonpoint source of water pollution, with animal wastes and pesticides being significant contributors to this problem. Integration of animals and their waste into the farming system is not usually possible with large confinement systems, and waste disposal becomes a major problem. If for no other reason, farmers should share the concern that current agricultural practices are polluting underground water sources because 97% of rural drinking water comes from these sources. Additionally, greater than 40% of irrigation water and 55% of livestock water comes from underground water sources.

Another brief example of shared concerns involves the goal of minimizing pesticide use. That farmers are also interested in decreasing their use of pesticides is reflected in many polls. Their reasons? To reduce groundwater contamination and improve drinking water quality, to reduce production costs, and to reduce handling exposure - handling exposure that places certain farm workers at a higher risk for developing acute illness and cancer.
Closing Statement

Will the current trend toward misunderstanding and polarization between animal advocates and farmers continue? The good news is that new trends are emerging--farmers are forming alliances with responsible humane organizations and recognizing that their goals are more often compatible than not. Farmers are also realizing what Gene Logston, himself a farmer, spoke of in the Farm Journal, and I quote:

"...farmers are being persuaded to paranoia over a movement that is going to do them more good than harm...Which is more of a threat to your independent business as a family livestock farmer: animal rights or animal megafactories? Think about it."

Many farmers and ranchers recognize that the public's growing concern for safe, humane and environmentally sound food production practices presents them with opportunities. New choices are being provided to farmers and ranchers who are being squeezed out by the trend to "bigger and better."

Humane organizations are becoming more receptive to the plight of the farmer and more sophisticated in their recognition of the benefits that less intensive systems can provide for farm animals and for the environment. And they are working to help educate consumers and build reliable markets for humane and sustainably produced food items.

Finally, responsible animal protection groups and farm groups are recognizing that the key to agriculture in the future is in flexibility and a frank evaluation of both the shortcomings and positive aspects of current U.S. agricultural practices.
There is no future in supporting animal production systems based only on personal beliefs that an animal prefers one system over another. Likewise, there is no future in the defense by industry of certain practices that are indefensible and harm agriculture's image in the public eye. The hope for the future lies in a willingness to question the ways in which we have all become accustomed to thinking about animal agriculture.

Steve Bjerklie, editor of Meat and Poultry, in the August 1989 edition of that publication, writes:

"If we always maintain our respect for the animals we raise for food, if we acknowledge at all times this is an animal, not a factory, that produces meat, if we treat our livestock with compassion and gentleness, if we honor with humaneness our animals' loss of life for our gain, then this industry will stay worthy."

We join you in hoping it will indeed be so.
NAME OF ORGANIZATION: The Humane Society of the United States

1) In what year was your organization established? 1954

2) What is your current membership? 1,000,000+

3) What are the objectives of your organization?
   Prevention of abuse and suffering to animals; preservation of the environment.

4) Please list the current officers of your organization:
   See attached sheet.

5) What is the background and experience of these officers? (Please include any biographical sketches if available)
   See attached sheet.

6) What do you feel has been your most successful activity or program in recent years which has helped to further your organization's objectives?
   Public education; awareness of specific issues affecting animals; ending clubbing of seals; anti-fur campaign; tuna/dolphin issue

7) Who does the major work for your organization? Please check all that apply.
   Professional Staff 95%
   Officers and Board Members 3%
   Professional Consultants 2%
   Volunteer Members
8) What is the principal source of your organization's funding? If possible, could you furnish the percentage of your total budget in each of these categories?

- Memberships Dues? 41%
- Contributions? 23%
- Grants? __________
- Gifts & Bequests? 21%
- Trusts? 2%
- Publications? 2%
- Royalties? __________
- Conferences and Workshops? 1%
- Other sources? 10%

9) If your receive membership dues, what is the annual amount? 

$10

10) Do members receive a newsletter or any other type of publications?
Yes X No ___

If so, please list.

Quarterly magazine: HSUS News; quarterly Close-Up Reports; Animal Activist Alert on request.

11) Does your organization sell any merchandise? Yes X No ___

If so, what type?

- Books or other printed publications? X
- Posters? X
- T-shirts? X
- Films/Videos? X
- Bookmarks? __________
- Other? Christmas cards __________

12) What is your approximate annual operating budget? $17 million

13) a) Do you support any legislative efforts in Washington D.C.?
Yes X No ___

b) In any states? Yes X No ___

14) Do you sponsor a specific political action committee? Yes ___ No X

If so, what is the name of this PAC? __________
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Interview with Mr. John Hoyt, Humane Society of the United States, November 29, 1990

The Humane Society of the U.S. believes strongly in animal welfare but does not support the absolute positions of animal rights groups. They believe vegetarianism is a personal choice and do not advocate vegetarianism. They believe that use of animals for food, research, and companion purposes is acceptable. They do have concerns about research with animals when alternative methods can be used, but they do not absolutely oppose animal research as some groups do.

The HSUS believes in legitimate uses of animals. It is opposed to violence and intimidation that has been used by animal rights groups.

They believe that a backlash is developing on animal rights groups. HSUS wants to be a responsible organization, seeks protection for animals and also has environmental concerns.

One of their vice-presidents is Jan Hartke, daughter of former U.S. Senator Vance Hatke (D-Ind.)

They get their members by direct mail, their present membership and constituents are 1,200,000.

The 400 local humane societies are independent. Some local groups are more oriented to animal rights than HSUS. HSUS has 8 regional offices. Board members are nominated through a referendum ballot, for 3 year terms. Some are selected for their national influence, benevolence, or business affiliations.

The staff is program oriented. the board deals with fiscal and audit functions.

Hoyt is a former Presbyterian minister from Fort Wayne, Indiana. He heads a staff of 130 and overseas a $17 million budget. The executive vice-president and treasurer is a former Methodist minister.

They make a concerted effort to work on humane issues. They see animal rights groups a trying to paint with a broad brush.

HSUS is opposed to fur products and fur production. They separate this issue from use of animals for food.

They form a coalition with the Massachusetts SPCA and the American SPCA (Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals)

John Colbert (sp) of ASPCA is a friend of his in New York. He recommended a visit. They do more work with companion animals and may be a bit more radical than HSUS.

The leaders of animal welfare groups more frequently come out of an education background and some are former ministers.

The animal rights groups get their start in civil rights, anti-war, and women's rights movements.
Major thinkers in the animal rights movement and philosophy are Tom Regan, provessor at North Caroline State University, Chapel Hill (he is mixed up here, NC State is at Raleigh; UNCG at Chapel Hill)
Singer, a book called Animal Oiberation, introduced the movement.
Hoyt believes that Singer has more credibility than Regan.
Bernie Roland, Colorado State, is superior to Regan.
Many local societies are led by retired military people.

Royal SPCA in England is head by a former British Naval admiral; the Scottish SPC"A is headed by a retired admiral; the World Society si headed by a former British Naval Captain.

Hoyt offered to help with internatinal contactsx if we wanted his help.

Michael Fox is one of 4 veterinarians on their staff. Hoyt does not alwasy agree with Fox. They will not promote he new book "Innhumane Society".1 Fox takes some positions not in line with HSUS.
Some Animal rights leaders have egos to fulfill. They try to get their name in front of the public more than the organization's aims. Hoy doesn't want HSUS to be known as Hoyt's organization.
**REFERENCE SLIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>NOTE AND RETURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPROVAL</td>
<td>PER PHONE CALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS REQUESTED</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR COMMENT</td>
<td>REPLY FOR SIGNATURE OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR INFORMATION</td>
<td>RETURNED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INITIALS</td>
<td>SEE ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE AND FILE</td>
<td>YOUR SIGNATURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REMARKS**

FROM: Fred Woods

Date: 1/25
### Combined Statement of Financial Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$11,982,779</td>
<td>$8,051,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables, deposits, and prepaid expenses</td>
<td>1,307,914</td>
<td>875,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>24,063,326</td>
<td>23,578,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed assets</td>
<td>10,422,237</td>
<td>9,734,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$47,616,256</td>
<td>$42,240,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$2,724,622</td>
<td>$2,359,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>36,044,479</td>
<td>31,519,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily restricted</td>
<td>3,587,376</td>
<td>3,627,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently restricted</td>
<td>5,259,779</td>
<td>4,734,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$47,616,256</td>
<td>$42,240,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Combined Statement of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue, Other Additions, and Transfers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions and grants</td>
<td>$22,748,068</td>
<td>$1,422,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests</td>
<td>9,376,899</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>2,783,668</td>
<td>505,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of literature and other income</td>
<td>740,089</td>
<td>(13,984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue and Other Additions</strong></td>
<td>$35,648,724</td>
<td>$1,928,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers (net assets released from restrictions)</td>
<td>$1,968,543</td>
<td>($1,968,543)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue, Other Additions, and Transfers</strong></td>
<td>$37,617,267</td>
<td>($40,493)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Expenses and Other Deductions</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal-protection programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education, membership</td>
<td>$13,771,425</td>
<td>(40,493)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruelty investigations and regional offices</td>
<td>2,710,951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife, animal-habitat, and sheltering programs</td>
<td>2,953,481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth- and higher-education programs</td>
<td>1,833,843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal assistance, litigation, legislation</td>
<td>1,365,435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and government relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal-research issues and bioethics</td>
<td>713,845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and farm animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and grants to other humane organizations</td>
<td>199,855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to annuitants</td>
<td>180,232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and general</td>
<td>2,475,415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership development</td>
<td>3,187,043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising</td>
<td>3,700,301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses and Other Deductions</strong></td>
<td>$33,091,826</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change in Net Assets                             | $4,525,441  | ($40,493)  |

The HSUS is tax exempt under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Contributions are tax deductible to the extent allowed by law. The society's audited financial statements are available upon request.
August 5, 1996

Mr. Harold Guither
Urbana, IL

Dear Mr. Guither:

Thank you for your recent inquiry into The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS). I am pleased to enclose a copy of our latest Annual Report and Financial Statement, along with some other publications to better familiarize you with The HSUS.

As you may know, The HSUS is a 501 (C)(3) tax exempt organization, gifts to which are tax deductible as charitable contributions. With over three million constituents, The HSUS has grown steadily into the nation’s most respected and most effective animal protection organization. As needs or crises arise here or around the world, The HSUS has always responded with the capacity and expertise necessary to help solve these problems.

If I can ever provide you with further information about The Society’s animal protection programs, please feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Laurie C. Hochstein
Office of Development

LCH/hs

Enc.
June 27, 1994

Harold D. Guither

Urbana, IL

Dear Mr. Guither:

Thank you for your recent note to The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS). I am pleased to enclose a copy of our latest Annual Report and Financial Statement, along with some other publications to better familiarize you with The HSUS.

As you may know, The HSUS is a 501 (C)(3) tax exempt organization, gifts to which are tax deductible as charitable contributions. With over one 1.5 million constituents, The HSUS has grown steadily into the nation's most respected and most effective animal protection organization. As needs or crises arise here or around the world, The HSUS has always responded with the capacity and expertise necessary to help solve these problems.

If I can ever provide you with further information about The Society's animal protection programs, please feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Arthur T. Keefe III
Director of Development

ATK:1ch

Enc.
### Statement of Financial Position on December 31, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Endowment Funds</th>
<th>Annuity Funds</th>
<th>Trust Funds</th>
<th>Total 1992</th>
<th>Total 1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$8,161,429</td>
<td>$319,463</td>
<td>$751,895</td>
<td>$609,800</td>
<td>$213,165</td>
<td>$10,055,752</td>
<td>$5,237,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables, Deposits, and Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td>766,918</td>
<td>(36,164)</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>318,234</td>
<td>113,324</td>
<td>1,163,170</td>
<td>458,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>10,828,454</td>
<td>69,663</td>
<td>2,472,698</td>
<td>2,591,222</td>
<td>1,038,215</td>
<td>17,000,242</td>
<td>15,686,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
<td>9,150,215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$28,907,016</td>
<td>$352,952</td>
<td>$3,225,451</td>
<td>$3,519,256</td>
<td>$1,364,704</td>
<td>$37,369,379</td>
<td>$29,972,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td>$1,103,333</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balances</td>
<td>27,803,683</td>
<td>340,952</td>
<td>$3,225,451</td>
<td>$3,519,256</td>
<td>$1,364,704</td>
<td>$36,254,046</td>
<td>28,681,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Fund Balances</strong></td>
<td>$28,907,016</td>
<td>$352,952</td>
<td>$3,225,451</td>
<td>$3,519,256</td>
<td>$1,364,704</td>
<td>$37,369,379</td>
<td>$29,972,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statement of Revenue and Expenditures for the Year Ended December 31, 1992

#### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Endowment Funds</th>
<th>Annuity Funds</th>
<th>Trust Funds</th>
<th>Total 1992</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Contributions</td>
<td>$8,472,889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,472,889</td>
<td>30.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and Grants</td>
<td>4,720,508</td>
<td>$137,776</td>
<td>$13,765</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,882,049</td>
<td>17.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests</td>
<td>11,949,364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,949,364</td>
<td>43.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>1,407,512</td>
<td>21,890</td>
<td>15,846</td>
<td>(95,769)</td>
<td>62,850</td>
<td>1,412,329</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Literature and Other Income</td>
<td>644,203</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>645,568</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expired Annuities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$27,194,476</td>
<td>$161,031</td>
<td>$329,611</td>
<td>(85,769)</td>
<td>$62,850</td>
<td>$27,362,199</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Endowment Funds</th>
<th>Annuity Funds</th>
<th>Trust Funds</th>
<th>Total 1992</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal-Protection Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education, Membership Inform. and Publications</td>
<td>$5,922,743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,922,743</td>
<td>29.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruelty Investigations and Regional Offices</td>
<td>2,447,246</td>
<td>$115,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,562,396</td>
<td>12.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife, Animal Habitat, and Sheltering</td>
<td>2,136,921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,136,921</td>
<td>10.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Higher Education</td>
<td>940,021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>940,021</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Assistance, Legislation, Legislation and Government Relations</td>
<td>971,578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>971,578</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioethics and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Animals</td>
<td>677,929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>677,929</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and Grants to Other Humane Organizations</td>
<td>417,504</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td></td>
<td>170,619</td>
<td>498,307</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to Annuitants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and General Membership Development</td>
<td>1,867,054</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>17,881</td>
<td>24,954</td>
<td>12,975</td>
<td>1,925,489</td>
<td>9.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising</td>
<td>2,418,146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,418,146</td>
<td>12.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$19,364,626</td>
<td>$122,775</td>
<td>$18,631</td>
<td>$195,573</td>
<td>$87,938</td>
<td>$19,789,543</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excess of Revenue Over Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Endowment Funds</th>
<th>Annuity Funds</th>
<th>Trust Funds</th>
<th>Total 1992</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,829,850</td>
<td>$38,256</td>
<td>$10,980</td>
<td>(281,342)</td>
<td>(25,088)</td>
<td>$7,572,656</td>
<td>$7,572,656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The society's audited financial statements are available upon request.
THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES
FINANCIAL OPERATIONS REPORT FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1991
Contributions to The HSUS are tax deductible.

Statement of Financial Position on December 31, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Endowment Funds</th>
<th>Annuity Funds</th>
<th>Trust Funds</th>
<th>Total 1991</th>
<th>Total 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$3,198,883</td>
<td>$270,889</td>
<td>$755,930</td>
<td>$277,291</td>
<td>$734,133</td>
<td>$5,237,126</td>
<td>$7,864,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables, Deposits, and Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td>756,602</td>
<td>(63,021)</td>
<td>(8,237)</td>
<td>(123,423)</td>
<td>(103,207)</td>
<td>458,714</td>
<td>278,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>8,843,714</td>
<td>69,053</td>
<td>2,466,778</td>
<td>3,658,369</td>
<td>648,866</td>
<td>15,686,780</td>
<td>14,963,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
<td>8,590,066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,590,066</td>
<td>2,726,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>$21,389,265</td>
<td>$276,921</td>
<td>$3,214,471</td>
<td>$3,812,237</td>
<td>$1,279,792</td>
<td>$29,972,686</td>
<td>$25,832,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Liabilities             |                    |                  |                 |              |            |            |            |
| Fund Balances           | $1,279,657         |                  |                 |              |            |            |            |
|                         | 20,109,608         | $276,921         | $3,214,471      | 3,800,598    | $1,279,792 | 25,130,896 |            |
| Total Liabilities and Fund Balances | $21,389,265 | $276,921 | $3,214,471 | $3,812,237 | $1,279,792 | $29,972,686 | $25,832,300 |

Statement of Revenue and Expenditures for the Year Ended December 31, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Endowment Funds</th>
<th>Annuity Funds</th>
<th>Trust Funds</th>
<th>Total 1991</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>Total 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Contributions</td>
<td>$7,528,799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,528,799</td>
<td>35.72%</td>
<td>$7,618,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and Grants</td>
<td>4,967,244</td>
<td>$136,658</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,129,402</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>4,121,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests</td>
<td>5,992,777</td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,392,777</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>5,372,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>1,029,116</td>
<td>87,739</td>
<td>(7,042)</td>
<td>241,236</td>
<td>$143,409</td>
<td>1,494,458</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>1,440,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Literature and Other Income</td>
<td>527,778</td>
<td>3,281</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>533,838</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>685,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expired Annuities</td>
<td>139,262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139,262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$20,184,976</td>
<td>$227,678</td>
<td>$404,991</td>
<td>$117,142</td>
<td>$144,487</td>
<td>$21,079,274</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$19,237,971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures
Animal-Protection Programs:
  Public Education, Membership Information, and Publications: $5,847,703 $100,334
  Cruelty Investigations and Regional Offices: 2,230,608 40,387
  Wildlife, Animal Habitat, and Sheltering: 1,609,097
  Youth and Higher Education: 649,437
  Legal Assistance, Litigation, Legislation and Government Relations: 816,603
  Bioethics and Farm Animals: 380,277
  Gifts and Grants to Other Humane Organizations: 195,815 7,047 $500
  Payments to Annuities: $208,492
  Supporting Services:
    Management and General: 1,329,663 3,366 12,601 20,632 16,394 1,382,656 $68 1,525,379
    Membership Development: 2,733,754
    Fund-raising: 1,153,654
  Total Expenditures: $16,946,611 $151,134 $13,101 $229,124 $188,810 $17,528,780 100.00% $16,485,209

Excess of Revenue
Over Expenditures: $3,238,365 $76,544 $391,890 ($111,982) ($44,323) $3,550,494 $2,752,762

The society's audited financial statements are available upon request.
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NOTICE TO MEMBERS

The Board of Directors of The Humane Society of the United States is charged under the Bylaws with direction and management of the affairs of the Society. The Board is composed of 24 persons, all of whom must be members, and is divided into three classes of eight persons each. The terms of these classes expire at three-year intervals. Thus, one-third of the membership of the Board of Directors is elected each year for a term of three years. The Board establishes the policies of the corporation, approves budgets, and reviews Society actions and programs.

Board members are asked to attend at least two meetings each year. Those who serve on the Executive Committee or other committees are asked to attend additional meetings. All Directors serve in a nonsalaried volunteer capacity.

The Nominating Committee, composed of four members of the Society and two other members from the Board of Directors, has nominated the following eight members to serve on the Board of Directors for a three-year term (1991-1994), commencing with the annual meeting of members on October 12, 1991:

INCUMBENTS

Carroll Forgham-Thrift, Knoxville, Tennessee. President and owner, Carlson Travel Network/Corporate Travel; former board member, Knox County Humane Society.

Alice R. Garey, Arroyo Grande, California. Pension Trust Committee chair; Executive Committee member; board chairwoman, Central Coast Animal Protection Society; member of numerous organizations concerned with animal protection.

Jane Goodall, Ph.D., Tucson, Arizona. Primatologist, lecturer, writer; director, Gombe Stream Research Center, Tanzania; board member, Jane Goodall Institute for Wildlife Research, Education, and Conservation.

Marilyn G. Seyler, Mansfield, Ohio. Executive Committee member; board member, corresponding secretary, and author of the newsletter for The North Central Ohio Nature Preservation League; board member and advisor for S.T.O.P! (Stop the Overpopulation of Pets); active in civic associations and in state and national animal-protection organizations.


K. William Wiseman, Arrowsic, Maine. Chairman, HSUS Board of Directors and Executive Committee; director, World Society for the Protection of Animals; former general manager, Producing Division, Mobil Oil Corporation; former president, Center for the Arts at the Chocolate Church, Bath, Maine.

(continued on reverse)
NEW CANDIDATES

Donald W. Cashen, Racine, Wisconsin. Accountant (Professional Services Associates); instructor, Gateway Technical College; former executive of community/civic organizations and clergyman-educator; active in local captive-wildlife-protection activities.

Jennifer Leaning, M.D., Lincoln, Massachusetts. Internist and emergency physician; chief, emergency services, and director of medical program evaluation, Harvard Community Health Plan; board member, Physicians for Social Responsibility; member of HSUS Scientific Advisory Council; member of various animal-protection organizations.

Members are urged to elect this slate of nominees by completing the enclosed ballot and returning it in the envelope that is provided. Members are invited to write in the names of persons other than those nominated if they wish to do so. To be counted, your ballot should be received by the Elections Committee by September 27, 1991.

The Directors elected will take office at the time of the annual meeting of HSUS members, which will convene at 2:30 p.m. on Saturday, October 12, 1991, at the Embassy Row Hotel, Washington, D.C.

AMY FREEMAN LEE
Secretary
August 14, 1992

NOTICE TO MEMBERS

The Board of Directors of The Humane Society of the United States is charged under the bylaws with direction and management of the affairs of the Society. The board is composed of 24 persons, all of whom must be members, and is divided into three classes of eight persons each. The terms of these classes expire at three-year intervals. Eight members, comprising one-third of the Board of Directors, are elected each year for a term of three years.

The board establishes the policies of the corporation, approves budgets, and reviews Society actions and programs. Board members are expected to attend two meetings each year. Those who serve on the Executive Committee or other committees are expected to attend additional meetings. All directors serve in a nonsalaried, volunteer capacity and are eligible for reelection.

The Nominating Committee is elected each year at the time of the annual meeting of members. It is composed of four members at large and two other members from the Board of Directors. The committee meets to review the potential candidates who have been recommended and reports its nominations to the secretary. Any 250 members in good standing may also nominate one or more candidates for membership on the board by written petition.

The Nominating Committee has nominated the following eight members to serve on the Board of Directors for a three-year term (1992–1995), commencing with the annual meeting of members on October 31, 1992:

**Judi Friedman,** Canton, Connecticut
Environmental educator and activist; author of children’s books on animals and environment; vice president, Peace Ecology Inc.; chairwoman, People’s Action for Clean Energy; board member, Promoting Enduring Peace, national peace organization; board member, ELECT (state environmental PAC); member, numerous animal-related organizations.

**Harold H. Gardiner,** Salt Lake City, Utah
Facilities Committee chairman; Executive Committee member; retired; former owner, Gardiner—A Marketing Company; accredited member, Public Relations Society of America and other professional organizations; former president and board member, Humane Society of Utah.

**Leslie R. Inglis,** Nokomis, Florida
Audit/Budget Committee chairman (until 9/92); Executive Committee member; chairman of the board, Humane Society International; retired chairman and CEO, Vortice Corporation; member, numerous animal-rights/animal-protection organizations.

**Virginia (Pat) Lynch,** San Francisco, California
Nominating Committee chairwoman, 1992; Executive Committee member; docent council, California Academy of Sciences; member, Women for International Understanding; Marine Mammal Center volunteer.

(continued on reverse)
O. J. Ramsey, Esq., Sacramento, California
Vice chairman, HSUS Board of Directors; Board Development Committee chairman;
Executive Committee member; partner, Ramsey, Morrison, Wallis & Abramson; mem-
ber, American Board of Trial Advocates; member, Anthony M. Kennedy American Inn
of Court.

Robert B. Sorock, Tucson, Arizona
Compensation Committee chairman; Executive Committee member; former president
and board member, Michigan Humane Society; president, Sunrise Graphics.

John E. Taft, Ojai, California
Chairman of the board, EarthKind USA; environmentalist; founder and president, Con-
servation Endowment Foundation and African Conservation Fund to protect animals
and critical wildlife habitat; former appliance business manager and environmental film
producer.

Robert F. Welborn, Esq., Denver, Colorado
Executive Committee member; chairman of the board, Center for Respect of Life and
Environment; partner, Welborn, Dufford, Brown & Tooley.

The bylaws provide for the election of directors by mail ballot in order to give all members the
opportunity to select the governing board, whether candidates are nominated only by the committee
or also by petition. Members may elect the slate of nominees by completing the enclosed ballot and
returning it in the envelope provided. Members may also write in the names of persons other than
those nominated if they wish to do so. To be counted, your ballot should be received by the Elections
Committee by October 20, 1992.

The directors elected will take office at the time of the annual meeting of HSUS members, which
will convene at 11:00 a.m. on Saturday, October 31, 1992, at the Clarion Harvest House, Boulder,
Colorado.

AMY FREEMAN LEE
Secretary
July 31, 1993

NOTICE TO MEMBERS

The Board of Directors of The Humane Society of the United States is charged under the bylaws with direction and management of the affairs of the Society. The board is composed of 24 persons, all of whom must be members, and is divided into three classes of eight persons each. The terms of these classes expire at three-year intervals. Eight members, comprising one-third of the Board of Directors, are elected each year for a term of three years.

The board establishes the policies of the corporation, approves budgets, and reviews Society actions and programs. Board members are expected to attend two meetings each year. Those who serve on the Executive Committee or other committees are expected to attend additional meetings. All directors serve in a nonsalaried, volunteer capacity and are eligible for reelection.

The Nominating Committee is elected each year at the time of the annual meeting of members. It is composed of four members at large and two other members from the Board of Directors. The committee reviews the potential candidates who have been recommended to fill the eight vacancies created each year and reports its nominations to the secretary. Any 250 members in good standing may also nominate one or more candidates for membership on the board by written petition.

The Nominating Committee has nominated the following eight members to fill the eight vacancies on the Board of Directors for the three-year term (1993-1996) commencing with the annual meeting of members on October 9, 1993.

INCUMBENTS

H.I. (Sonny) Bloch, New York, New York and Clearwater, Florida
Radio broadcast journalist on real-estate, financial, and marketing management; member, board of governors, National Center for Financial Education; member, National Association of Real Estate Brokers; former co-producer and host, "Living With Animals," nationally televised PBS series.

Anita W. Coupe, Esq., New York, New York
Labor-employment attorney; partner in firm of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius; board member, Center for Respect of Life and Environment; activist in various international, national, and local organizations concerned with protection of animals and preservation of wildlife habitats.

Amy Freeman Lee, Litt. D., San Antonio, Texas
Artist, writer, and lecturer; secretary, HSUS Board of Directors; Legal, Bylaws and Ethics Committee chairwoman; Elections Committee chairwoman; Executive Committee member; board chairwoman, The Wilhelm Schole, Houston; member, Texas Supreme Court’s Lawyer Discipline Committee; board member, state and local animal-welfare organizations.

Eugene W. Lorenz, Falls Church, Virginia
Publisher, St. Anthony Publishing; former administrator and consultant on health-care issues; member, various professional organizations; active in support of national and worldwide animal-protection programs.

(continued on reverse)
Jack W. Lydman, Washington, D.C.  
Lecturer; consultant; foreign-service officer, retired as ambassador to Malaysia; HSUS Planning and Policy Committee chairman; Alice Morgan Wright—Edith Goode Trust chairman; Board (Officer) Nominating Committee chairman; Executive Committee member.

Thomas L. Meinhardt, Cincinnati, Ohio  
Owner and manager, T. Line Development, real-estate investment property; charter member and current membership chairman, Animal Rights Community of Greater Cincinnati.

David O. Wiebers, M.D., Rochester, Minnesota  
Consultant in neurology and epidemiology, Mayo Clinic; HSUS Scientific Advisory Council chairman; member, various professional organizations and numerous organizations concerned with animal protection.

NEW CANDIDATE

William F. Mancuso, Brookfield, Connecticut  
Vice president, Trust Division, The Putnam Trust Company of Greenwich; member, Connecticut Bankers Association and Estate Planning Council of Lower Fairfield County.

The bylaws provide that directors be elected by mail ballot in order to give all members the opportunity to select the governing board, whether candidates are nominated only by the committee or also by petition. Members may vote by selecting from one to eight of the nominees and returning the completed ballot in the envelope provided. Members may write in the names of persons other than those nominated if they wish to do so. To be counted, your ballot should be received by the Elections Committee by September 24, 1993.

The eight directors elected will take office at the time of the annual meeting of HSUS members, which will convene at 1:30 p.m. on Saturday, October 9, 1993, at the ANA Hotel, Washington, D.C.

AMY FREEMAN LEE  
Secretary
BALLOT
Election of Directors
The Humane Society of the United States
For the term 1992–95

Please vote by checking the names of the persons you wish to elect.

☐ Judi Friedman
☐ Leslie R. Inglis
☐ O. J. Ramsey, Esq.
☐ John E. Taft

☐ Harold H. Gardiner
☐ Virginia (Pat) Lynch
☐ Robert B. Sorock
☐ Robert F. Welborn, Esq.

Write-in votes:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

I wish to propose the following people for consideration in future years as candidates for election to the HSUS Board of Directors:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Signature

Date

Note: Please return your ballot so that it will be received no later than October 20, 1992.
December 10, 1991

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE HSUS WHO ARE QUALIFIED TO VOTE:

At a meeting held in Washington, D.C., on October 13, 1991, the board of directors of our society voted to recommend to you certain amendments to our bylaws.

Under the democratic procedures of The HSUS, the bylaws can be amended only by the members, voting in a referendum.

Accordingly, the board hereby submits to referendum the proposed amendments to the bylaws presented in the enclosed notice of referendum.

To assist your consideration of the proposed amendments, we are presenting a general explanation of the proposed amendments at the beginning of the Notice of Referendum. In addition, for each recommended change to an existing bylaw provision, the Notice of Referendum sets forth the wording of the present bylaw, the change recommended, the new wording of each affected bylaw if the amendment is approved by the membership, and, where necessary, a briefer explanation for the particular amendment.

A ballot and envelope are enclosed for your use. You have the option of voting FOR or AGAINST each of these amendments.

Ballots must be returned within thirty days from the date of this letter and must be signed in order to be counted.

Please vote and return your ballot promptly.

Respectfully submitted,
Amy Freeman Lee
Secretary

Enclosures
NOTICE OF REFERENDUM

The board of directors of The Humane Society of the United States, acting pursuant to the provisions of the bylaws of the society, hereby submits for referendum vote by persons who have been members of the society prior to June 10, 1991, the recommended amendments to the bylaws set forth below:

General Explanation of the Proposed Amendments

In the past several years, the charitable mission of The Humane Society of the United States has come to be implemented not just through the original HSUS, now in its thirty-seventh year of existence, but also through a cluster of separate organizations controlled by and affiliated with The HSUS, most notably the National Association for Humane and Environmental Education (NAHEE) and the Center for the Respect of Life and Environment (CRLE). Both NAHEE and CRLE are in a period of growth and expansion which necessitates increased executive oversight and administration of their programs. In addition, the board of directors, at its April 1991 meeting, endorsed the launching of an organization to be known as Humane Society International (HSI), which is intended to be the international operating arm of The HSUS. At the same meeting, the board also approved the creation of a new environmental organization called EarthKind, an organization whose role will be to address a wide variety of environmental issues with special concern for the protection and well-being of those animals being negatively affected by environmental changes. Nevertheless, The HSUS remains the centerpiece, primary funding source, and operational heart of this family of organizations.

The creation and expansion of this family of related organizations, in the view of the board of directors, calls for a redefining and restructuring of the functions, responsibilities, and titles of the executive leadership of The HSUS in order to more effectively administer and supervise both The HSUS and the cluster of related organizations.

Accordingly, the board of directors proposes that the bylaws be amended to create a new office, identified by the title Chief Executive, and that the duties of the existing office of President be redefined. The Chief Executive would have direct responsibility for the oversight and the supervision of NAHEE, CRLE, HSI, and EarthKind, and, as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), would have final, but less direct, supervision of The HSUS, which would be managed by the President. The Chief Executive would be elected by and be responsible to the HSUS board of directors, which, partly through common membership with the boards of the controlled-affiliated organizations and through The HSUS's funding of such organizations, has ultimate managerial control over the related organizations. The Chief Executive, being freed of the more routine, day-to-day administration of The HSUS, would also become primarily responsible for projecting The HSUS's charitable mission onto the international stage.

The President of The HSUS, as reconstituted by the proposed bylaws amendments, would become the Chief Operating Officer (COO) of The HSUS and responsible for the management of The HSUS. The President would be responsible to and work under the general supervision of the Chief Executive and would be elected by and report to the board of directors.

In the judgment of the board of directors, this realignment of the two top management positions is necessary and appropriate, should result in the enlargement of our charitable mission, particularly into international spheres, and should enhance the outreach and effectiveness of our programs.

The board of directors respectfully recommends to the membership that the bylaws amendments described below be approved.

Special Note: To alleviate any member concern about the continuity or stability of The HSUS's leadership under this proposed reorganization, we feel it appropriate to add that, if the membership approves these changes to the bylaws, the board of directors anticipates keeping our longstanding and highly successful management team in place. The board will be meeting on February 2, 1992, and, assuming again that the changes to the bylaws are approved by referendum, expects to elect, as Chief Executive, John A. Hoyt, The HSUS's President for the past twenty-one years, and, as President, Paul G. Irwin, who has been Treasurer since 1975 and Executive Vice President since 1986.
ARTICLE VIII, Section 1

PRESENT WORDING:
Section 1. At each annual organization meeting of the Board of Directors, or in default of election at such meeting, then at an adjournment thereof, or at any meeting of the Board of Directors duly called for the purpose of election of officers, the Board of Directors shall elect a Chairman of the Board, a Vice Chairman of the Board, a President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer. The Board may also elect such other officers as the business of the Society may require. No person shall be eligible to hold office who is not a member of this Society at the time of his appointment. All the officers shall hold office at the pleasure of the Board of Directors but in no case beyond the time when their respective successors shall be elected and shall qualify. Any officer may be removed from office by the Board of Directors at any time.

RECOMMENDED CHANGE:
In the first sentence, add the words “a Chief Executive” immediately after “a Vice Chairman of the Board.”

AMENDED WORDING:*
Section 1. At each annual organization meeting of the Board of Directors, or in default of election at such meeting, then at an adjournment thereof, or at any meeting of the Board of Directors duly called for the purpose of election of officers, the Board of Directors shall elect a Chairman of the Board, a Vice Chairman of the Board, a Chief Executive, a President, a Secretary and a Treasurer. The Board may also elect such other officers as the business of the Society may require. No person shall be eligible to hold office who is not a member of this Society at the time of his appointment. All the officers shall hold office at the pleasure of the Board of Directors but in no case beyond the time when their respective successors shall be elected and shall qualify. Any officer may be removed from office by the Board of Directors at any time.

Explanation: The person serving in the new office of Chief Executive, as with the other higher management positions, would be elected annually by the board of directors.

ARTICLE VIII, Section 5

PRESENT WORDING:
None. What follows is an entirely new section displacing the present Section 5, which describes the duties of the president. The duties of the president, as reconstituted, will be set forth in a new Section 6.

AMENDED WORDING:
Section 5. The Chief Executive shall be the chief executive officer of the Society and shall be responsible only to the Board of Directors. He shall have general supervision, direction, and control of the activities and business of the Society and its controlled-affiliated organizations in accordance with principles and policies prescribed by the Board of Directors and shall have final authority over all other staff officers and employees of the Society and its controlled-affiliated organizations. His salary shall be determined by the Board. He shall, a reasonable time before the beginning of each fiscal year of the Society, submit to the Board a written budget and program proposal for the coming year. The Board shall approve or amend and adopt a budget for the ensuing year and the Chief Executive shall operate within said adopted budget. The Chief Executive shall present annually to the membership of the Society a comprehensive report of the work done in the preceding year and the goals and objectives of the Society and its controlled-affiliated organizations for the ensuing year. The Chief Executive may participate in any meeting of the Board of Directors or any committee of the Board, but without vote.

Explanation: See General Explanation of the Proposed Amendments, above.

ARTICLE VIII, Section 6

PRESENT WORDING:
Section 5. The President shall be the principal executive officer of the Society and shall be responsible only to the Board of Directors. He shall conduct the activities and business of the Society in accordance with principles and policies prescribed by the Board of Directors. His salary shall be determined by the Board. He shall employ and have full authority over other staff members and shall determine the duties and, within the limits of a budget approved by the Board, the compensation of

**Proposed new language is underlined.
all such staff members. He shall, a reasonable time before the beginning of each fiscal year of the Society, submit to the Board a written budget and program proposal for the coming year. The Board shall approve or amend and adopt a budget for the ensuing year and the President shall operate within said adopted budget. The President shall deliver to the annual meeting of the members of the Society a comprehensive report of the work done in the preceding year and an outline of plans for the ensuing year. The President may participate in any meeting of the Board of Directors or any committee of the Board, but without vote.

RECOMMENDED CHANGE:
This section has been substantially rewritten and is presented below.

AMENDED WORDING:
Section 6. The President shall be the chief operating officer of the Society and shall, in concert with the Chief Executive, report to the Board. He shall, subject to the direction and control of the Chief Executive, conduct the activities and business of the Society in accordance with principles and policies prescribed by the Board of Directors. His salary shall be determined by the Board. The Board shall approve or amend and adopt a budget for the ensuing year and the President shall operate within said adopted budget. The President may participate in any meeting of the Board of Directors or any committee of the Board, but without vote.

Explanation: See General Explanation of the Proposed Amendments, above.

ARTICLE X.

PRESENT WORDING:
Any two persons, being President, Secretary, Treasurer, or Assistant Secretary or Assistant Treasurer, shall have the joint authority to execute, under seal, such form of transfer and assignment as may be customary or necessary to constitute a regular transfer of any stocks or other registered securities standing in the name of the Society. They may from time to time execute and deliver on behalf of the Society proxies on any and all stock owned by the Society.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES:
In the first sentence, insert the words “Chief Executive” immediately before the word “President.”

AMENDED WORDING:
Any two persons being Chief Executive, President, Secretary, Treasurer, or Assistant Secretary or Assistant Treasurer, shall have the joint authority to execute, under seal, such form of transfer and assignment as may be customary or necessary to constitute a regular transfer of any stocks or other registered securities standing in the name of the Society. They may from time to time execute and deliver on behalf of the Society proxies on any and all stock owned by the Society.

Explanation: This is a technical amendment which follows from and is necessitated by the creation of the new office of Chief Executive.

FURTHER CHANGES NOT REQUIRING A VOTE:
The texts of the present Sections 6 and 7, within Article VIII, describing the duties of the Treasurer and Secretary respectively, are not being amended, but would be renumbered as Sections 7 and 8 respectively.

Amy Freeman Lee
Secretary

Roger A. Kindler
General Counsel

December 10, 1991
The Humane Society of the United States Animal Protection Referendum

Instructions: Please indicate your response by placing an "X" in the appropriate box after each question. Your vote will remain confidential. Thank you for your cooperation and support.

1. Animal Cruelty Laws
Do you agree or disagree that individuals convicted of animal abuse, neglect, torture, maiming and killing should be sentenced as felons and given severe punishment, instead of a "slap on the wrist" misdemeanor sentence?
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Not Sure

2. The Future of "Puppy Mills"
Do you agree or disagree that cruel, abusive and inhumane puppy mills should be shut down?
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Not Sure

3. Where to Go to Adopt a Pet
Do you agree or disagree that individuals and families should consider going to a local shelter to adopt an animal, rather than buying one at a pet store?
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Not Sure

4. The Solution to Pet Overpopulation
Do you agree or disagree that spaying and neutering can prevent unwanted litters and save millions upon millions of dogs and cats from being destroyed each year?
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Not Sure

5. Animal Experiments in the Classroom
Do you agree or disagree that all science classes should immediately abandon projects that involve the dissection of animals as a teaching technique?
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Not Sure

6. Extending Humane Treatment to Horses
Do you agree or disagree that horses should be classified as companion animals, the same as dogs and cats, instead of being classified as livestock and being subjected to inhumane transportation, treatment and slaughter for human consumption abroad?
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Not Sure

7. The Link Between Cruelty to Animals and to People
It has been documented that individuals who are violent and abusive to animals may also commit unspeakable acts of abuse against people. Do you agree or disagree that The HSUS must step-up its fight against animal cruelty?
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Not Sure

8. Disaster Relief Plans for Pets
Do you agree or disagree that when community leaders prepare emergency and disaster relief programs, the protection of pets should also be included?
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Not Sure

9. Extending Humane Treatment to Animals Who Live in the Wild
Do you believe that animals living in the wild should be protected from inhumane treatment, such as steel-jaw leg-hold traps that cause so much pain, or poisoning, or hunting from aircraft?
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Not Sure

Please return this entire form: Do not detach any portion. Thanks!
Aaron-
New York Post
- Dec 31, 1993
- Jan 23, 1994
- Dec 1993, New Yorker magazine - Animal Rights advertisement HSUS