

# Oregon Daily Emerald

Friday, October 21, 1988

Eugene, Oregon

Volume 90, Number 38

## Inside

- The Duck football lowdown, Page 1S
- 'Gorillas' on campus, Page 3
- U2's *Rattle and Hum*, Page 10
- Something 'Fresh', Page 7

## Agency investigating animal research program

By Michael Drummond  
Emerald Associate Editor

The University's animal research program remains the subject of a federal investigative inquiry nearly three months after a National Institutes of Health site inspection gave the program a clean bill of health.

Officials with the Office for Protection from Research Risks (OPRR) acknowledged Wednesday they are conducting an inquiry of the University's animal care and use procedures for possible federal Animal Welfare Act and Public Health Service (PHS) violations.

The OPRR is a policy-enforcing arm of the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

Dr. Alan Sandler of the OPRR said Thursday his office received a formal complaint from People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA)

about six weeks ago detailing alleged federal policy violations. However, Sandler refused to elaborate.

"From our office's standpoint, we have what we consider to be an active inquiry in response to PETA's formal allegations," Sandler said.

"The matter that we do have under consideration is between us and PETA ... that's not really subject to discussion at this time," Sandler added.

However, Ingrid Newkirk, national director for PETA, listed allegations within the formal complaint Thursday.

PETA claims the University lacks a proper animal research review process, despite the presence of an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), fails to provide proper veterinary care, and staffs improperly trained animal researchers.

PETA also maintains that the University's IACUC approves illegal animal experiments, that many University animal research projects lack scientific and medicinal applicability, and overall the University is not in compliance with its assurance.

An assurance is akin to a contract by which a research institution must abide. The PHS awards federal funding for animal research based on an institution's compliance to its assurance.

"We will have to decide whether there is substance to those allegations, and if so we will investigate them," Sandler said. He could not indicate when the OPRR would announce its conclusions because he said his staff is waiting for additional material from PETA.

Sandler said it would be "hard to gauge what kind of investigation OPRR might make," but added that it would be different from the NIH site inspection conducted June 29 (See related story, this page).

"I would always view such an inquiry seriously," said John Moseley, University vice president for research.

"I certainly cannot say any mistakes were never made, but I would be surprised if they (OPRR) conducted a formal investigation," he

## Moseley's letter predates NIH facilities inspection

By Michael Drummond  
Emerald Associate Editor

A University administrator's letter to Sen. Mark Hatfield, which predates a National Institutes of Health site inspection of the school's animal research facilities has animal rights activists calling foul and administrators on the defense.

John Moseley, University vice president for research, penned a letter to Hatfield June 2, 1988 — 27 days before a National Institutes of Health (NIH) inspection team conducted an administrative site visit of the University's animal care and use program.

In the letter, Moseley said he had discussed the controversy surrounding the University's animal research program with representatives from the NIH and the Office for Protection from Research Risks (OPRR).

Moseley stated, "(The representatives) have concluded that there are no substantive reasons to conduct further investigations of animal care and use here, but have stated that they might be forced to conduct a formal investigation for political reasons.

"Obviously, we would like to avoid such an investigation due to the negative public relations aspect, but we have no concerns that significant nega-

tive findings would occur."

The NIH report issued Sept. 23 cited several administrative problems with the University's animal research program, but overall it concluded the school earned a clean bill of health.

Animal rights activists claim Moseley's letter foreshadowed the NIH's conclusions and indicated the site inspection was a public relations whitewash.

"They (University administration) need to stop worrying about public relations and start washing their hands," said Ingrid Newkirk, national director for People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA).

Moreover, Newkirk said the site inspection did not deal with PETA's true concerns relating to proper veterinarian care, research supervision and staff competency at the University.

"Where did they (NIH) look for wrongdoing, that's my question. I think their findings are inappropriate and their priorities are misplaced. It's clear from reading the report it's a public relations attempt to reduce the damage that the light of public opinion is doing to the University of Oregon's covenant-like research community," Newkirk said.

Moseley admitted the University is concerned about the

Turn to Investigation, Page 5

Turn to Letter, Page 4



John Moseley

## Volunteer's mistake voids voter eligibility

By Don Peters  
Emerald Associate Editor

Some of the 74 people who registered to vote at the University on Tuesday will not be allowed to cast ballots Nov. 8.

Phyllis Crockett, campus coordinator and president of Students for Dukakis, failed to return voter registrations to the Lane County elections office before the 5 p.m. Tuesday registration deadline.

"I didn't know I had to get them in then," Crockett said.

Lane County Elections Manager David Spriggs said he learned of the mixup from a clerk. The clerk had received a phone call Wednesday morning from Crockett, saying she had 74 late registration cards.

Crockett said she forgot the deadline, and realized her mistake too late. "I feel bad about it," she said. "Now I'm just trying to make up for it."

Crockett has written a letter to the Oregon Daily Emerald, apologizing to those who regis-

tered.

The exact number of people unable to vote is not known. If a person was already registered to vote, but was re-registering because of a change of address, arrangements will be made allowing them to vote, Spriggs said.

"But they will have to bring in proof of their move," he said.

Kate Mente, field organizer for Campaign '88 Dukakis-Bentsen, said, "We're apologetic about this. Phyllis (Crockett) feels very bad, but she's doing everything she can to fix it."

According to Spriggs, this situation is neither new nor unique. "It's happened before," he said. "Just last March we had 84 (registration forms) turned in late."

Spriggs went on to say that county election workers will sort through the 74 late forms and see just which ones will be allowed to vote. "But it's going to take a while," he said.



## The Young and the Rested

The leaves are falling and winter is right around the corner, but for sophomore Robin Milner and senior David Plews, spring seems to be a state of mind.

Photo by James Marks