

custody of the monkeys taken in the Silver Spring raid.

Under a 1981 order from a Maryland court, the monkeys are being maintained at the National Institutes of Health's animal facility at Poolesville, MD.

The animal rights advocates filed a suit in 1982 to gain custody of the animals on the grounds that they (advocates) have a bonding with the monkeys by virtue of weekly visits and by providing fresh fruits, toys, and a television to improve the primates' environment and well-being.

A federal magistrate in reviewing the suit recommended that it be dismissed because animal rights advocates do not have standing in federal court. The recommendation was upheld by a federal district court judge.

The appeal of the magistrate's recommendation has brought together more than a dozen scientific societies and educational associations for the purpose of filing an amicus (friend of the court) brief with the federal court of appeals. Although the animal rights advocates cite 10 reasons as to why their right to sue has been violated by the magistrate, the amicus brief is concerned only with the issue of standing.

The issue is most significant because the granting of standing to animal rights advocates would open the courts to more suits, inasmuch as there would be a legal recognition that animal advocates have a guardian relationship with laboratory animals.

The consequence for academic institutions and other animal laboratories would be in terms of the numbers of suits that could be filed against individual institutions and the adverse public relations institutions would encounter by the filing of such suits.

The federal appeals court is expected to hear the appeal in June. A steering committee to assist in the preparation and filing of the amicus brief has been selected. The committee is composed of the American Physiological Society, the American Psychological Association, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the National Association for Biomedical Research, the National Association of State Universities & Land Grant Colleges, and the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

Activists in UK Set Bombs at Four Homes

A group in England called the Animal Rights Militia has taken credit for placing

bombs outside of the homes of four people who are involved with the use of laboratory animals.

A time bomb was found under the car of a West Sussex salesman who represents a firm that imports and breeds monkeys for sale to laboratories. A similar bomb was found under the car of a London researcher who uses baboons.

A third bomb was found on the front porch of a director of a research laboratory in Harrogate, and the fourth bomb was placed on the doorstep of a university professor in Staffordshire.

No one was injured because police dismantled the bombs before they could be detonated.

Columbia University's Research Funds Suspended

Columbia University has become the first institution to be charged with failing to meet the requirements of the new National Institutes of Health guidelines for laboratory animal care. The result of this failure has led to the suspension of all federal funds for laboratory animal research above the level of rodents.

The suspension of funds has halted research on a variety of projects including research concerned with heart disease, cancer, AIDS, arthritis, infertility, organ transplant surgery, and birth defects.

The suspension of funds followed an on-site inspection by federal inspectors in January. The new guidelines were put into effect last December 31.

The university was cited for deficiencies in four general areas: the number of veterinarians available; the sterility of areas where animals recover from surgery; the housing of dogs under quarantine; and the techniques used to minimize health risks to laboratory personnel.

The suspension will be lifted after the university certifies the deficiencies have been corrected and are approved by federal inspectors.

Tax Reform Bill to Limit Retirement Deductions

The House-approved version of the congressional tax reform bill includes a section that could have severe consequences for many individuals who participate in tax-deferred retirement plans sponsored by nonprofit organizations.

Title XI of H.R. 3838 would limit tax-deferred salary reductions to a maximum of \$7,000 annually for retirement plans authorized by IRS codes 401(k) and 403(b). TIAA-CREF retirement program is included in this section.

For individuals who also have an IRA program in addition to a 401(k) or 403(b) retirement plan, the \$2,000 maximum contribution to the IRA would reduce the maximum contribution allowed to the other plan by that same amount, providing the \$5,000 maximum was contributed prior to any contribution to an IRA plan. However, should a maximum contribution be made to an IRA plan first, then nothing could be contributed to any other tax-deferred retirement plan, thus reducing the annual contribution for all plans to a total of \$2,000.

Individuals who are in the \$50,000-plus income range are expected to feel the full impact of this section, should it be enacted. Additionally, the tax reform bill, if enacted, is to be retroactive to January 1, 1986, regardless of when it is passed by the Congress.

Persons concerned as to the effects this section may have on their retirement programs should write to their senators.

APHIS Could Be Victim of Gramm-Rudman

The role of the US Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service as the enforcers of the Animal Welfare Act may be nearing an end.

In recent years the Reagan administration has attempted to give this role to states and nonprofit organizations such as humane societies, but the Congress has always blocked such moves.

This year, as in past years, the administration has requested zero funding for federal inspections of animal laboratories.

With the enactment last year of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law, a legislative formula devised to reduce the federal deficit, the Congress may not be able to restore funds for this program. The current appropriation for this activity is \$4.8 million.

As in past years, APS has joined with other organizations in encouraging the Congress to maintain this federal inspection program instead of giving Animal Welfare Act enforcement powers to states and nonprofit organizations.

W. M. Samuels, CAE