



# The Animal Welfare Act: Background and Selected Legislation

**Tadlock Cowan**

Analyst in Natural Resources and Rural Development

September 27, 2012

**Congressional Research Service**

7-5700

[www.crs.gov](http://www.crs.gov)

RS22493

**CRS Report for Congress**

*Prepared for Members and Committees of Congress*

## Summary

In 1966, Congress passed the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act (P.L. 89-54) to prevent pets from being stolen for sale to research laboratories, and to regulate the humane care and handling of dogs, cats, and other laboratory animals. The law was amended in 1970 (P.L. 91-579), changing the name to the Animal Welfare Act (AWA). The AWA is administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Congress periodically has amended the act to strengthen enforcement, expand coverage to more animals and activities, or curtail practices viewed as cruel, among other things. A 1976 amendment added Section 26 to the AWA, making illegal several activities that contributed to animal fighting. Farm animals are not covered by the AWA.

In the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress, the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007 (H.R. 137; P.L. 110-22) was enacted. The bill amended Section 26 of the AWA to strengthen provisions against animal fighting. The AWA was amended again in 2008 when provisions were included in the 2008 farm bill (P.L. 110-246). These provisions ban the importation of puppies under six months of age for resale, tighten prohibitions on dog and other animal fighting activity, and increase penalties for violation of the act.

Other AWA bills introduced in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress included the Pet Safety and Protection Act (H.R. 1280/S. 714) to restrict where research facilities could obtain their dogs and cats; Haley's Act (H.R. 1947) to make it unlawful for animal exhibitors and dealers (but not accredited zoos) to allow direct contact between the public and big cats such as lions and tigers; the Animal Protection and Accountability Improvement Act (H.R. 2193), to prohibit the use of animals in marketing medical devices and products; and the Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act (H.R. 6949/S. 3519), to require an AWA license from USDA of dog breeders who raise more than 50 dogs in a 12-month period and sell directly to the public.

In the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress, two of the bills were reintroduced: the Pet Safety and Protection Act (H.R. 3907/S. 1834); and the Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act (H.R. 5434/S. 3424). Both bills were referred to the House Committee on Agriculture, where they saw no further action.

The 112<sup>th</sup> Congress has reintroduced two bills and introduced several new bills. The Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act was reintroduced as H.R. 835 and referred to the House Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry. The Pet Safety and Protection Act (H.R. 2256/S. 707) was also reintroduced and referred to the same subcommittee. The Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act (S. 1947) was introduced and referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. The bill would impose criminal penalties for attendance at animal fighting exhibitions. This prohibition on attendance was also added to the Senate farm bill (§12213, S. 3240). The Traveling Exotic Animal Protection Act (H.R. 3359) would amend the AWA to prohibit the exhibition of an exotic or wild animal in any animal act if, during the previous 15 days, such animal was traveling in a mobile housing facility. H.Res. 736 expresses disapproval of using gas chambers to euthanize shelter animals. The Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act of 2011 (H.R. 1513/S. 810), was also reintroduced in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress. The bill would prohibit conducting invasive research on great apes (e.g., chimpanzee, bonobo, gorilla, orangutan, gibbon) and provide a retirement sanctuary for the nearly 1,000 great apes still used for research in the United States. The bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Health of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. In the Senate, the bill was ordered to be reported out of the Committee on Environment and Public Works with an amendment favorably.

## **Contents**

Key Provisions of the Animal Welfare Act.....	2
Animals Covered.....	2
Businesses and Activities Covered.....	2
Standards.....	3
Oversight and Enforcement.....	3
Legislative History.....	4
Original Law.....	4
Animal Welfare Act of 1970.....	4
Animal Welfare Act Amendments of 1976.....	4
Improved Standards for Laboratory Animals Act.....	4
Protection of Pets.....	5
2002 Amendments.....	5
Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007.....	5
2008 Farm Bill.....	6
Animal Fighting.....	6
Puppy Imports; Penalties for AWA Violations.....	6
Dogs and Cats in Research.....	6
Pet Safety and Protection Act of 2009.....	7
Other Selected Bills.....	8
Animal Protection Accountability Improvement Act.....	8
Haley’s Act.....	8
Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act.....	8
Sense of Congress to Ban Shelter Gas Chambers.....	9
Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act of 2011.....	9

## **Contacts**

Author Contact Information.....	10
Acknowledgments.....	10

The Animal Welfare Act (AWA; 7 U.S.C. 2131 *et seq.*) is intended to ensure the humane treatment of animals that are intended for research, bred for commercial sale, exhibited to the public, or commercially transported. Under the AWA, businesses and others with animals covered by the law must be licensed or registered, and they must adhere to minimum standards of care. Farm animals are among those not covered by the act, which nonetheless provides a broad set of statutory protections for animals.<sup>1</sup>

The law was first passed in 1966 following several years of lobbying by animal welfare organizations and growing public outcry over allegations that large numbers of pets were being “dognapped” for sale to medical research laboratories. Congress amended the original law in 1970, 1976, 1985, 1990, and 2002. These amendments generally were intended to expand the scope of the AWA or to clarify various provisions. The U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA’s) Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) administers the AWA. The House and Senate Agriculture Committees have exercised primary legislative jurisdiction over the act and its amendments.

Animal welfare advocacy organizations have continued to back proposals to further extend the reach of the AWA. Several such proposals were introduced in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress. The Pet Safety and Protection Act of 2009 (H.R. 3907/S. 1834) was reintroduced in the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress, as was the Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act (H.R. 5434/S. 3424). The bills saw no further action in the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress.

The 112<sup>th</sup> Congress has reintroduced two bills and introduced several new bills. The Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act was reintroduced as H.R. 835 and referred to the House Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry. The Pet Safety and Protection Act (H.R. 2256/S. 707) was also reintroduced and referred to the House Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry. The Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act (S. 1947) was introduced and referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. The bill would impose criminal penalties for attendance at animal fighting exhibitions. This prohibition on attendance was also added to the Senate farm bill (§12213, S. 3240). The Traveling Exotic Animal Protection Act (H.R. 3359) would amend the AWA to prohibit the exhibition of an exotic or wild animal in any animal act if, during the previous 15 days, such animal was traveling in a mobile housing facility. Another bill, the Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act of 2011 (H.R. 1513/S. 810), was also reintroduced in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress. The bill would prohibit conducting invasive research on great apes (e.g., chimpanzee, bonobo, gorilla, orangutan, gibbon) and provide a retirement sanctuary for the nearly 1,000 great apes still used for research in the United States. The bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Health of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. In the Senate, the bill was ordered to be reported out of the Committee on Environment and Public Works with an amendment favorably.

---

<sup>1</sup> Legislation introduced, but not passed, in the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress, the Prevention of Farm Animal Cruelty (H.R. 4733) would have restricted federal purchases of food products derived from animals to those raised free from cruelty and abuse. Numerous other federal laws seek to protect other classes of animals, often those from the wild. Examples include the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Lacey Act as amended, and the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act. These and the others are described, with legal citations, in CRS Report 94-731, *Brief Summaries of Federal Animal Protection Statutes*, by Vivian S. Chu.

## Key Provisions of the Animal Welfare Act<sup>2</sup>

### Animals Covered

The act applies to any live or dead dog, cat, nonhuman primate, guinea pig, hamster, rabbit, or other warm-blooded animal determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be for research or exhibition, or used as a pet. The AWA explicitly excludes birds, rats, and mice bred for research; horses not used for research; and other farm animals used in the production of food and fiber.<sup>3</sup> Animals sold in retail facilities are not covered, unless they are wild or exotic animals. Cold-blooded animals like fish and reptiles also are excluded from coverage.

### Businesses and Activities Covered

Generally, animal dealers and exhibitors must obtain a license, for which an annual fee is charged. APHIS does not issue a license until it inspects the facility and finds it to be in full compliance with its regulations. If a facility loses its license, it cannot continue its regulated activity. Those who conduct research, and general carriers that transport regulated animals, do not need a license but must still register with APHIS and undergo periodic inspections. Specific details follow.

**Dealers**, including pet and laboratory animal breeders and brokers, auction operators, and anyone who sells exotic or wild animals, or dead animals or their parts, must have an APHIS license for that activity. So-called Class A licensees are breeders who deal only in animals they breed and raise; all others are called Class B licensees. Exempt from the law and regulations are retail pet stores, those who sell pets directly to pet owners, hobby breeders, animal shelters, and boarding kennels.

**Exhibitors** must be licensed by APHIS as such. These so-called Class C licensees include zoos, marine mammal shows, circuses, carnivals, and promotional and educational exhibits. The law and regulations exempt agricultural shows and fairs, horse shows, rodeos, pet shows, game preserves, hunting events, and private collectors who do not exhibit, among others.

**Animal transporters** must be registered, including general carriers (e.g., airlines, railroads, and truckers). Businesses that contract to transport animals for compensation are considered dealers and must have licenses.

**Research facilities** must be registered. They include state and local government-run research institutions, drug firms, universities, diagnostic laboratories, and facilities that study marine mammals. Federal facilities, elementary and secondary schools, and agricultural research institutions are among those exempt from registration.

**Animal fighting** generally is prohibited by the AWA. The ban includes dogfights and bear and raccoon baiting; sponsors and exhibitors are subject to penalties. The AWA also has banned bird fights, except in the states where they are not prohibited by state law (namely Louisiana and New

---

<sup>2</sup> Unless noted, sources on the AWA are various materials provided by APHIS.

<sup>3</sup> For example, rabbits raised for food are exempt from AWA coverage; those for pets are not.

Mexico), and the sponsor or exhibitor was unaware that the transaction had occurred in interstate commerce.

## **Standards**

All licensed and registered entities must comply with USDA-APHIS regulations, including recordkeeping and published standards of care. These standards deal with humane handling, shelter, space requirements, feeding, watering, sanitation, ventilation, veterinary care, and transport. (AWA regulations are at 9 C.F.R. §1.1 *et seq.*)

## **Oversight and Enforcement**

APHIS's Animal Care (AC) program oversees the AWA, under which approximately 12,000 facilities were licensed or registered in FY2011. For 2012, AC had an annual budget of nearly \$28 million.<sup>4</sup>

AC officials make unannounced inspections of registered and licensed facilities to ensure compliance with all rules. Under the AWA, research facilities are to be inspected at least annually. Inspection frequency for other AWA-regulated facilities is based on risk; for example, moderate-risk facilities are to be visited about once yearly. APHIS inspectors also conduct searches to identify unlicensed or unregistered facilities. Failure to correct deficiencies can result in confiscation of animals, fines, cease-and-desist orders, or license suspensions.

In 2010, USDA's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) released an audit of AC's investigations of large-scale dog dealers (i.e., breeders and brokers) that failed to provide humane treatment for the animals under their care.<sup>5</sup> In a previous audit of laboratory animals, the OIG found that AC did not aggressively pursue enforcement actions against violators of AWA. The May 2010 audit determined that (1) AC's enforcement process was ineffective against dealers with repeated violations; (2) APHIS misused its guidelines to lower penalties for AWA violators; and (3) some large breeders circumvented AWA by selling animals over the Internet.<sup>6</sup> APHIS concurred with the OIG's findings and has implemented 13 of the 14 recommendations as of FY2012.

---

<sup>4</sup> A portion of this amount, \$696,000, was used to administer the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. §§1821-1831), which makes it a crime to exhibit or transport any "sore" horse, i.e., one whose feet have been injured to alter its gait. In an August 2010 petition, the Humane Society of the United States, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the American Horse Protection Association, and Friends of Sound Horses, Inc., have requested that APHIS tighten its regulations for horses by permanently barring from competition any horse scarred from soring and requiring horse organizations to impose penalties for violations. APHIS is considering comments on the proposed changes until June 13, 2011. See *Federal Register*, vol. 76, no. 71: 20569, April 13, 2011.

<sup>5</sup> Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Animal Care Program Inspections of Problematic Dealers, May, 2010. Report accessible at <http://www.usda.gov/oig/webdocs/33002-4-SF.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> Large breeders that sell AWA-covered animals over the Internet are exempt from AC's inspection and licensing requirements due to a loophole in AWA. The IG report recommended that APHIS prevent large breeders from circumventing AWA requirements by seeking legislative change to exclude these breeders from the definition of "retail pet store," and require that all applicable breeders that sell through the Internet be regulated under AWA. The Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act (H.R. 835), reintroduced in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress, would close the existing AWA loophole.

## **Legislative History**

### **Original Law**

Although long known as the Animal Welfare Act, the original law was passed simply as P.L. 89-544, and referred to as the “Laboratory Animal Welfare Act” of August 24, 1966. The law requires dealers in dogs and cats for research purposes to obtain a USDA license and to abide by USDA-set humane treatment requirements. It also requires a research facility to register with USDA only if it uses dogs or cats and either (1) purchases them in interstate commerce or (2) receives federal research money. The law authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to set humane handling standards for guinea pigs, nonhuman primates, rabbits, and hamsters as well as dogs and cats—but only dealers and research facilities with dogs and cats are subject to these standards. Farmers and pet owners are among those exempted from the law. Other provisions spell out recordkeeping requirements, enforcement authorities and penalties for noncompliance.

### **Animal Welfare Act of 1970**

P.L. 91-579 renamed the “Laboratory Animal Welfare Act” the Animal Welfare Act and expanded animal coverage to include all warm-blooded animals determined by the Secretary to be used for experimentation or exhibition, except horses not used in research and farm animals used in food and fiber research. The 1970 law also incorporated exhibitors; defined research facilities; and exempted from coverage retail pet stores, agricultural fairs, rodeos, dog and cat shows.

### **Animal Welfare Act Amendments of 1976**

The 1976 amendments (P.L. 94-279) added Section 26 to the AWA. Section 26 is directed at animal fighting and made illegal (1) sponsoring or exhibiting an animal in an animal fighting venture; (2) interstate shipment of animals to be used in animal fighting ventures; and (3) use of U.S. mails or communication systems to advertise or promote animal fighting ventures. Section 26 contained its own definitions, authority for investigations, and penalty provisions. The 1976 amendments also clarified and expanded previous regulations covering animal transport and commerce. Hunting animals are generally exempt. The amendments passed over the objections of USDA and the U.S. Attorney General, who believed that animal fighting was a state and local law enforcement issue.

### **Improved Standards for Laboratory Animals Act**

These amendments were passed as Title XVII, Subtitle F, of the Food Security Act of 1985 (P.L. 99-198, the omnibus 1985 farm bill). The law directs the Secretary to set new minimum standards of care for handling, housing, feeding, water, sanitation, ventilation, and so forth. One new provision that was highly contentious at the time singles out two species by requiring standards for the exercise of dogs and the psychological well-being of primates. The law provides that research facilities must have procedures that minimize pain and stress to the animals, and describes practices considered to be painful. Each research facility must establish an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee to review research proposals that involve animal experimentation and to provide oversight of laboratories. The amendments also increase civil and

criminal penalties for AWA violations, and establish an animal welfare information center at USDA's National Agricultural Library.

## **Protection of Pets**

Section 2503 of the Food Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-624, the 1990 farm bill) extends pet protections. It requires public and private animal shelters and research facilities that acquire dogs and cats to hold them for at least five days to allow time for either adoption or recovery by the original owner before they can be sold to a dealer. Dealers are prohibited from selling dogs and cats they did not breed unless they provide certified records on, among other things, the animals' origin. Other new recordkeeping requirements also are specified.

## **2002 Amendments**

Title X, Subtitle D, of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-171, the omnibus 2002 farm bill) makes it a misdemeanor to ship a bird in interstate commerce for fighting purposes, or to sponsor or exhibit any bird in a fight with knowledge that any of the birds were so shipped (even fights within a state where the practice is permitted). The law also increases the maximum financial penalty for a violation (a misdemeanor) of the anti-fighting provisions of the AWA, to \$15,000 from \$5,000. The 2002 law also explicitly excludes from AWA coverage birds, rats, and mice bred for research purposes. The Secretary of Agriculture had previously published regulations excluding these animals from coverage, which the Animal Legal Defense Fund challenged in federal court. When USDA agreed to settle the case by essentially reversing its regulations, Congress (in P.L. 106-387, the FY2001 agriculture appropriation) blocked the action by prohibiting funds for such a rule change. The 2002 law made the exclusion a permanent part of the AWA.<sup>7</sup>

## **Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007**

P.L. 110-22, signed into law May 3, 2007, makes a violation of the animal fighting provisions of the AWA a felony punishable by up to three years in prison, under Title 18 of the *U.S. Code* (Crimes and Criminal Procedure). The law, based on companion bills introduced by Representative Gallegly (H.R. 137) and Senator Cantwell (S. 261), also makes it a felony to trade, in interstate and foreign commerce, knives, gaffs, or other sharp objects designed for use in animal fighting, or to use the Postal Service or other "interstate instrumentality to trade in such devices, or to promote an animal fighting venture."

Proponents of various animal fighting bills had observed that in 2001, the House and Senate approved strong animal fighting sanctions in their respective farm bills, but that conferees on the final 2002 farm bill (P.L. 107-171) removed the felony language. Proponents argued that stronger deterrents were needed because animal fighting is a brutal, inhumane practice that is closely associated with criminal activity, endangers children where aggressive dogs are being reared, and may contribute to the spread of avian influenza in the case of live birds. Opponents countered that such measures would violate provisions in the U.S. Constitution that protect states' rights,

---

<sup>7</sup> CRS Report 94-731, *Brief Summaries of Federal Animal Protection Statutes*, by Vivian S. Chu.



including the Commerce Clause, and that recognize private citizens' right to travel for economic reasons. Completely banning and/or stiffening penalties for all animal fighting activities would drive them further underground, undermining efforts to protect animals and the public from any disease problems created by such activities, other opponents have argued.

While animal fighting is prohibited, attendance at animal fighting exhibitions is not. The Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act (S. 1947), introduced in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress, would impose criminal penalties for attendance at animal fighting exhibitions, or for causing a minor to attend an animal fight. This prohibition on attendance was also added to the Senate farm bill (§12213, S. 3240).

## **2008 Farm Bill**

### **Animal Fighting**

The 2008 farm bill (P.L. 110-246) contains a number of amendments to the AWA. One section (§14207) strengthens further the definitions of, and penalties for, activities related to animal fighting. For example, maximum imprisonment rises to five years from the current three years. The animal fighting provision is based on language in S. 1880 and H.R. 3219 (110<sup>th</sup> Congress)—bills introduced shortly after the July 17, 2007, indictment of NFL quarterback Michael Vick on charges related to dog fighting—to more explicitly ban various dog fighting activities, and to define the term.<sup>8</sup>

### **Puppy Imports; Penalties for AWA Violations**

The 2008 farm bill also requires regulations to prohibit importation for resale of dogs unless they are at least six months of age, in good health, and have all necessary vaccinations, with exemptions for research, veterinary treatment, or imports into Hawaii from certain countries. Another section (§14214) increases the maximum penalty for a general violation of the act from the current \$2,500 to \$10,000 for each violation. APHIS published in the *Federal Register* on September 1, 2011, their intention to implement these regulations. The regulations would require that live dogs imported in the United States for resale, research, or veterinary treatment be accompanied by an import permit issued by APHIS. The final rule has not been published as of August 2012.

### **Dogs and Cats in Research**

Both the House- and Senate-passed versions of the 2008 omnibus farm bill had contained the language of two other pending bills (the Pet Safety and Protection Act of 2007; H.R. 1280/S. 714) to restrict where research facilities could obtain their dogs and cats. This language was deleted by conferees; the final version instead directed USDA to review “any independent reviews by a nationally recognized panel of experts” on Class B use by researchers. Conferees said in accompanying report language that they were aware of concerns regarding use of random source

---

<sup>8</sup> Another bill, H.R. 3327, included the provisions of H.R. 3219 and S. 1880, as well as language to enable animal humane agencies to initiate civil actions where violations are alleged.

animals from Class B dealers. However, they observed that USDA's FY2008 appropriation (part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008, P.L. 110-161) had requested such an independent review.

## **Pet Safety and Protection Act of 2009**

Critics have long asserted that the limited number of Class B dealers who still collect dogs and cats from random sources, including "free to a good home" classified ads, auctions, and flea markets, are more concerned about profit than animal welfare. Others have contended that passage would leave no viable sources of random source dogs and cats, which are needed by medical and veterinary researchers because of their genetic and age diversity; and that the majority of Class B dealers are in compliance with the AWA.

The NRC issued its report in May 2009. It concluded that random source dogs and cats may be desirable and necessary for certain types of biomedical research but that "it is not necessary to acquire them through Class B dealers, as there are adequate numbers of such animals from shelters and other sources."<sup>9</sup> The NRC noted that of the more than 1,000 Class B dealers in the United States, at last count only 11 of them acquired and sold live dogs and cats for research and teaching. The report's conclusions and recommendations apply only to these 11 dealers that may supply such animals for research funded by the National Institutes of Health, the authors stated.

The report discusses in more detail the advantages and disadvantages of random source dogs and cats, which constitute less than 1% of all laboratory animals; evaluates the Class B dealer system, under which (it found) animal standards of care appear to vary greatly; and offers alternative options for obtaining random source animals. These alternatives include partnering with pet owners, veterinarians, breeders, and others; obtaining animals from Class A dealers and through donations from small breeders and hobby clubs; and acquiring animals directly from pounds and shelters, among others.<sup>10</sup>

The Pet Safety and Protection Act, originally introduced in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress, was reintroduced in the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress as H.R. 3907/S. 1834, and reintroduced in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress as Act (H.R. 2256/S. 707). The bills would amend the AWA to limit the sources of random source dogs and cats to a licensed dealer (under Section 3 of the AWA) who has bred and raised the animal; a publicly owned or operated pound or shelter that meets certain qualifications; someone donating the dog or cat that bred and raised the animal or owned it for not less than one year; and research facilities licensed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The bill also would subject violators to a fine of \$1,000 per violation, over and above any other applicable penalties.

---

<sup>9</sup> NAS, *Scientific and Humane Issues in the Use of Random Source Dogs and Cats* (Report in Brief), May 2009. The entire report is at [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=12641](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12641).

<sup>10</sup> In light of violations noted by APHIS inspections, GAO also noted in a September 2010 report that APHIS's oversight of dealers who provide "random source" dogs and cats for research was in needed tighter managerial controls. See *USDA's Oversight of Dealers of Random Source Dogs and Cats Would Benefit from Additional Management Information and Analysis*. GAO-10-945, September 2010.

## Other Selected Bills

Two bills were offered in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress, but did not re-emerge as proposals in the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress: the Animal Protection and Accountability Improvement Act and Haley's Act.

### **Animal Protection Accountability Improvement Act**

H.R. 2193 would have amended the AWA to prohibit the use of animals in marketing medical devices and products, and increase the penalties for animal research facilities that violate this part of the act. This language was the House farm bill (H.R. 2419) but was deleted by conferees. Interest in the proposal was stimulated at least in part by a sales demonstration in an Ohio medical facility, where a dog reportedly was given a brain aneurysm, repeatedly subjected to the medical device, and later put down. Proponents believe the incident highlighted an inhumane practice done for profit, not science or medicine. Opponents argue that the facility had not approved the demonstration and acted swiftly to address it, and that most research facilities even go beyond federal welfare requirements to ensure that research animals do not experience pain and suffering.

### **Haley's Act**

This bill (H.R. 1947) would have amended the AWA to make it unlawful for animal exhibitors and dealers (but not accredited zoos) to allow direct contact between the public and big cats such as lions and tigers. The bill, which also would have increased penalties for AWA violations, was named for a teenager killed by a grown Siberian tiger in 2005 while having her picture taken with it at an APHIS-licensed facility. Opponents argue that the measure is unnecessary because federal regulations already ban such contacts with older cats (the facility presumably was out of compliance) and because zoos will gain a monopoly in exhibiting younger cats.

### **Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act**

In May 2010, USDA's Office of Inspector General released a scathing report that excoriated APHIS for its lax enforcement of the AWA with respect to large dog-breeding operations ("puppy mills").<sup>11</sup> The report documented that over half of the kennels cited for violations between 2006 and 2008 continued to break the law. Among other shortcomings, APHIS inspectors failed to confiscate dogs at kennels that were violating the AWA, reduced punishments arbitrarily, improperly documented inspections and thereby caused nearly half of all administrative hearings involving problem breeders to be compromised because of lack of evidence. The report noted the loophole in the AWA that exempts from APHIS's inspection and licensing requirements breeders who sell dogs over the Internet or through newspaper advertisements.<sup>12</sup>

The Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act (the PUPS Act, H.R. 6949/S. 3519) was introduced in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress, reintroduced in the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress as H.R. 5434/S. 3424. It has also been reintroduced in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress as H.R. 835 by Representative Gerlach, and referred

---

<sup>11</sup> USDA, Office of Inspector General, *APHIS Animal Care Program, Inspections of Problematic Dealers*. Audit Report 33002-4-SF, May 10, 2010. Report can be accessed at <http://www.usda.gov/oig/webdocs/33002-4-SF.pdf>.

<sup>12</sup> APHIS has approximately 100 inspectors responsible for over 4,600 licensed dog-breeders.

to the House Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry. The bill would amend the AWA to bring large dog-breeding operations that sell directly to the public under AWA inspection and licensing.

The proposed legislation would require those who breed dogs to obtain an AWA license from USDA if they raise more than 50 dogs in a 12-month period and sold directly to the public. The bill also would set some minimum daily exercise requirements for dogs held by the dealers. Supporters of the bills contend that the Internet and other relatively recent marketing techniques have enabled importers and large commercial breeders, whom they call “puppy mills,” to sell their animals directly to the public while evading the AWA licensing and humane handling requirements, even though they are selling large numbers of animals. (Wholesale breeders are already covered by the AWA.) Opponents counter that the measures would strain USDA resources and newly subject thousands of relatively small in-home and hobby breeders, as well as rescue organizations, to burdensome licensing and regulatory requirements that were designed for large commercial businesses.

The Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act is similar in intent to measures offered in the 109<sup>th</sup> Congress, the Pet Animal Welfare Statute (“PAWS”; H.R. 2669; S. 1139). “PAWS” would have required commercial dog and cat breeders to obtain AWA licenses if they sold more than six litters or more than 25 dogs or cats directly to the public each year, among other things.

## **Sense of Congress to Ban Shelter Gas Chambers**

H.Res. 736 was introduced in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress by Representative James Moran in July 2012. The resolution expresses opposition to and disapproval of the use of gases to euthanize shelter animals (e.g. carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, nitrogen, nitrous oxide, argon). The resolution also expresses support for state laws that require euthanasia of animals by injection using sodium pentobarbital. In comparison to using gas chambers, euthanasia of shelter animals by injection is considered more reliable and more humane by the American Humane Association, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the National Animal Control Association, the Association of Shelter Veterinarians, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and the Humane Society of the United States. In August, H.Res. 736 was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture’s Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry.

## **Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act of 2011**

The United States is the only developed country that continues large-scale confinement of chimpanzees in federal laboratories. The European Union, Japan, and New Zealand have banned or strictly limited their use. Approximately nine federal laboratories own an estimated total of 500 great apes, mostly chimpanzees, used as subjects in biomedical research. Many of the chimpanzees, however, are no longer actually used in medical research, but simply warehoused at government laboratories.<sup>13</sup> As laboratory techniques have advanced (e.g., computer modeling,

---

<sup>13</sup> The federal government began breeding chimpanzees in the 1960s for the space program. In the mid-1980s, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) stepped up its chimpanzee breeding program under the assumption that chimpanzees—humans’ closest primate cousin—would be ideal laboratory models for AIDS. It turned out that apes were not as useful a model as originally believed. NIH later imposed a moratorium on its chimpanzee breeding program and began looking for solutions to deal with its “surplus.” Although NIH considered euthanizing the chimpanzees, the agency abandoned the idea in favor of sending them to sanctuaries.

DNA analysis, *in vitro* study) and animal research ethics have evolved, questions have arisen about the continued use of great apes as research subjects, and about the ethics and cost of housing chimpanzees.

In 2000, the Chimpanzee Health Improvement, Maintenance, and Protection Act (P.L. 106-551, the CHIMP Act) was enacted. The act created a federally funded national sanctuary system for chimpanzees retired from research and prohibited killing them as a matter of convenience to laboratories. Approximately 152 chimpanzees have been retired to the federally funded national chimpanzee sanctuary system. Approximately 500 more from U.S. research, including military, air and space research, were placed in private sanctuaries in North America. Under the CHIMP Act, however, the laboratories had complete discretion as to when a chimpanzee was considered for retirement, and under certain circumstances a retired chimpanzee could be returned to research.<sup>14</sup>

The Great Ape Protection Act was introduced in the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress (H.R. 1326/S. 3694). After referral, no further action was taken on the bill. A new great ape protection bill—the Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act of 2011, (H.R. 1513/S. 810)—was introduced in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress. As was the case with the Great Ape Protection Act, the new bill would prohibit invasive research on great apes (e.g., chimpanzee, bonobo, gorilla, orangutan, gibbon), prohibit the use of federal funds for great ape research in and outside the United States, and permanently retire all great apes owned by the federal government. The new bill would also establish a great ape sanctuary system fund in the U.S. Treasury to provide funding for the animals' retirement. The previous Great Ape Protection bill had similar provisions, but did not create the federal funding system to support the retirement of great apes owned by the federal government. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. In the Senate, the bill was ordered to be reported out of the Committee on Environment and Public Works with an amendment favorably.

## **Author Contact Information**

Tadlock Cowan  
Analyst in Natural Resources and Rural  
Development  
tcowan@crs.loc.gov, 7-7600

## **Acknowledgments**

This report was originally written by Geoffrey S. Becker, Specialist in Agricultural Policy.

---

<sup>14</sup> In 2007, the Chimpanzee Home Act amendment was enacted. The amendment prohibited returning chimpanzees to research once they were retired into federal sanctuary.