SUFFERING: Pathetic scenes like this are common in puppy mills, where animals are crowded in filthy cages, many allowed to die because it's cheaper to kill than feed them. (Photograph courtesy NATIONAL ENQUIRER.) The. V. appled a anima!l balked and whined in...
PUPPY MILLS — FROM PAGE 1

born to pain, suffering, disease and
cold-hearted death.

NOT ALL PUPPY MILLS BAD?

A copy of the rough draft of this article
was sent to Roy H. Carbery, executive
secretary of the American Kennel Club,
with an invitation to correct, criticize or
accept. The AKC maintains such records
from the registrations of dogs and litters
by and resulting from sales made by the
puppy mills and we do not expect that or-
ganization to be enthusiastic about any-
articles of this kind. But we want to be
fair, and to avoid exaggeration or judging
any article on the basis of a few underrepresen-
ted cases. Excerpts from Mr. Carbery's let-
ter follow.

"Your article, 'The Puppy Mills Must
Go,' is returned without, sans correc-
tion. I read it with a great deal of in-
terest, and my reaction is that described
as ambivalent. On the one hand, I hearti-
ly agree that those who own and operate
underhund and unhealthy kennels, and
those whose actions undermine the un-
worthy public, must be dealt with to the
full extent of the law (Editor's note: Does
he mean existing law or needed future
law?); but I cannot agree with the prom-
ise that every breeder and broker of dogs
for the pet trade, whether they be a local
bREEDER OR A MILL, will handle dogs
in an humane manner. To the contrary—at least from that which we have
seen during our investigations of op-
terations throughout the country—such
tend to be not.

I am inclined to accept the state-
ment made by Floyd Clark, President
of the National Pet News and Breeds
Association (National Pet News, Novem-
ber, 1973), who, being a breeder and broker
for the pet market, estimated 10% as
being 'shoddy' operations.

"The overall impression I get from the
article is that a major portion of the
pet population problem falls to those
who engage in pure-bred dogs. I cannot agree
with that either. The figures cited, such
as that out of 100,000 dogs sold, 10
have been shipping to nearby pet shops.
The numbers add up and are ascertainable.
But the AKC does produce an analysis of its
records which would show the actual numbers in-
volved.

"More and more dog clubs around the
country have launched educational pro-
grams, preaching the gospel of responsi-
ble breeding and ownership. Local clubs
have (or more correctly, their members have)
become active in the humane movement in
their respective areas. We, too, as an
organization, have taken a more active and
persuasive role in forcing out those
whose reasons for being in pure-bred dogs
are inconsistent or in opposition to the ideals
of the pure-bred breed, as we understand it.

"We do not wish to engage in any con-
frontation with the AKC, and would be glad
to cooperate with that organization in a
determined effort to eliminate the contra-
tions described in this article, if they
apply to 80 or to only 20 percent of the
commercial pet trade.

Any successful attempt to deal with
this situation will not be based on super-
fluous knowledge, hasty, shoot-from-the
hip simplistic action such as licensing of
pet shops. Above all, support for an ef-
fective program by humanitarians, legiti-
mate breeders, and public officials will
depend upon more complete understanding of
the various interests involved than the
foregone description, or other brief artic-
les like it, can offer. It will be
necessary to read and digest the remainder
of this analysis before it is possible to
even understand the basis for the remedial
action required. So, you advocates of
condensation, please labor on!

WHERE THE MILLS OPERATE

Puppy mills are found in many parts of
the country: in the mid-western and
western farming states of Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas,
Missouri and Illinois. That is because of their
own sources of supply nearby.

Some of the larger and more aggressive
pet shops, tired of trying to handle the
small, poor-quality puppies received from
the mills, have sought to establish their
own sources of supply nearby. Many city and
wholesalers and pet shops. Many city and
wholesalers and pet shops. Many city and
suburban "backyard breeders" who sell di-
rect to the public through signs in the
front yard or through classified adver-
tisements in the newspapers meet the defi-
tion of the term "puppy mill" as described by
the editor and publisher of National Dog
News:

A "puppy mill operation is not iden-
tifiable as a pure-bred kennel, but rather
by its purpose, namely, to breed puppies
to sell for a profit, and no other
reason.

According to that definition, a sub-
stantial part of the classified advertis-
ers of "purebred" puppies might be called
puppy mills. Frequently they are house-
wives seeking a source of supplementary
income. One such woman referred to her
breeding bitch as "my little gold mine."

But we want to be
idea of the legitimate hobby, as
mentioned by the National Pet News, the
editor and publisher of No.
November, 1973; Re-
port to Humanitarians No. 26; December, 1973;
p. 2.

PROPOSED NEW TYPE OF PUPPY MILL?

For some time our members have been
serving us brief news stories about an
organization that they take to be the efforts of Milton
Doctor to establish a new type of puppy
mill, to be financed partly by no less
than the United States government. If this
were true, it would constitute one of
the greatest boondoggles of all time.

With all the problems presented by the pet
population explosion and the existing pup-
y mills, we hardly need a new source of
puppies for the commercial pet trade.

We understand that Doctor now disavows
any intention to emphasize or encompass the
breeding of any new enterprises, which would be
designed, we understand, to breed other kinds of pets
needed by pet shops (let's hope it is not
cats, which so far have largely escaped
the attentions of the puppy mills) and to
make collars, leashes and other supplies
for pet shops, though we question the
derstanding of Doctor's real inten-
tions, we quote from what purports to be a
press release issued by Doctor's Pedigree
Industries, Inc., which was sent to us by
Robert E. Frank, chairman of the Legisla-
tive Committee of the Illinois State Fed-
eration of Humane Societies:

"WALRLEHEAD, MASS.—Milton Doctor,
the founder and former president of the coast-
eastern dog-products concern, Doctor's Pet
Cans, has announced plans to form the coun-
try's first handicapped entrepreneur lending program
to the U. S. Office of Minority Busi-
tess Enterprise."

"The Handicapped Entrepreneur Lending
Program, Inc. (HELP) will also lend to peo-
ple who are physically disabled, or
enforced in Illinois generally lax. To an apparently increas-
"..."
While the chief opponent throughout was the Animal Rescue League of Boston, an American Humane Association (AHA) affiliate, state representative Robert B. Hummer, veterinary consultant to the AHA, appeared at the hearing in support of the decompression chamber. He has been offered as evidence by the same kind of people who employ quảngifiers. Hummer, who is said to have made the statement that if an animal has to die it makes no difference how it dies, did effective work to impede consideration of the bill. (These details are given for the historical record only, and are not intended to support action by anyone.)

STATE LAWS
Humane Information Services has been urged repeatedly to prepare a model euthanasia law which would forbid the use of decomposition chambers and other inhumane methods for destroying dogs and cats in shelters and pounds, and perhaps specify humane solutions for destroying kittens. We may be repeatedly refused to do so, because we do not yet know enough about some alternative methods to warrant citing them as either humane or otherwise.

Some of those who cannot wait on more investigation to act against decomposition chambers have proposed that injections of sodium pentobarbital shall be used. This method, properly used, is humane; one can (and should) properly and quickly use it. But improperly used (see Report to Humanitarians No. 27, March, 1974) it can cause suffering. To overcome this objection by specifying the use of sodium pentobarbital by intravenous injection is not necessarily going to fit in for all shelters, or for puppies, kittens, and the drug, cannot be used. We have found that it is difficult to get some shelters to begin using larger dogs to ingest the drug in food.

Moreover, to specify this, and only this method, is to make it a very difficult situation because of federal restrictions on the purchase and use of sodium pentobarbital. It is impossible to wish to leave the shelters with no feasible humane method.

These objections to requiring the use of sodium pentobarbital do not apply in places like Dallas, where only two establishments are involved, both employing veterinarians and the drug, and with managers capable of seeing that the injections are made properly. But for a large number of some shelters and pounds employees indifferent to animal suffering can misuse any method. To propose to overcome this objection by specifying the use of sodium pentobarbital by intravenous injection only is unreasonable. Intravenous injections for cats and for dogs, puppies and kittens, are difficult or impossible, and it is difficult to get some shelters to begin using larger dogs to ingest the drug in food.

Moreover, to specify this, and only this method, is to make it a very difficult situation because of federal restrictions on the purchase and use of sodium pentobarbital. It is impossible to wish to leave the shelters with no feasible humane method.

These objections to requiring the use of sodium pentobarbital do not apply in places like Dallas, where only two establishments are involved, both employing veterinarians and the drug, and with managers capable of seeing that the injections are made properly. But for a large number of some shelters and pounds employees indifferent to animal suffering can misuse any method.

For these reasons we prefer, until we can come up with a more comprehensive bill, one that can address themselves to the real issues involved, to make more general statements. We have found that it is difficult to get some shelters to begin using larger dogs to ingest the drug in food.

ARGUMENTS TO BE OVERCOME

What happened at the hearings on the Connecticut legislation is an issue to what proponents of such legislation must overcome.

Testimony against the bill was given by

According to the summary of Hummer’s testimony given in the AHA publication ShopTalk for April, 1975, he presented "fatal­ ly unbecoming" and "falacious and unsupported allegations of cruelty" resulting from use of the chamber which has been made by opponents, who, in his opinion, have "maliciously used their influence and power to advance the personal and political ambitions of some of their associates, who, in turn, have cooperated in spreading lies and rumors to the public."

A favorite device of detractors is to set up straw men and knock them down with arguments that no informed person can deny. But when it comes to debating decom­ pression, humanitarian opposition can see their opponents the setting up the straw men. They do so by making all kinds of unsupported and false allegations actually resulting from use of the chamber. Mostly, these are of two kinds: (1) those based on the delusion that death in the chamber gives life to fish suffering comparable with that undergone by casin­ workers or deep-sea divers who control "the bends", (2) those based on observation of actions of various objectives by the animals which actually occur after consciousness is lost, and humane. We have consistently re­ butted these false statements, but whether or not the animal suffers during decompression. These subjective and inaccurate observ­ ations of decompression animals by emotional­ humanitarians, when they appear in letters to the editor or in other media, are usually accompanied by ar­ousing public indignation; but when of­ fered to a legislative committee in front of veterinarians, who are expected to evaluate the source of the statement, they become a boomerang to those trying to persuade the committee to approve the bill. The erroneous statements only serve to impugn the scientific credibility of all the good evidence offered in sup­ port of the bill. For these reasons, it will prove effective in most cases to stick with the scientifically sound evidence presented in Report to Humanitarians: No. 20, 21 and 31. Nobody has yet even attempted to refute any specific sentence or paragraph. And there will always be present at such hearings, and to write letters to the editor, representatives of the American Humane Association (AHA) and other local societies, to present evidence in favor of rapid decompression. The reason for this essentially obvious fact, that the AHA has scores of member societies which have investments in decompression chambers which which find it a quick and convenient method of so-called euthanasia. It is the AHA, aided greatly by the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), which carries the spear for decompression chambers, valiantly battling to protect what it considers to be the interests of its member societies.

There are two individuals connected with AHA, one as a veterinary consultant and the other as a public relations speaker and writer for AHA’s ShopTalk, who have carried much of the burden of defense of the decompression chamber. And both are people who have a personal interest in the continuing development of ShopTalk. Report to Humanitarians has attempted on several occasions to persuade these individuals to address themselves to the real issues involved, instead of using the old debate of the AHA’s device of either ignoring the issues or setting up straw men which have no legs to do with them.

But perhaps this interpretation is unfair. We would like you, the reader, to judge for yourself, and the decisions taken from letters we have sent to Dr. Hummer and to Captain Martin Passini, editor and former editor respectively of the Naval Medical Corps, Corpus Christi, Texas. To neither of these letters, dated January 7, 1975, and January 27, 1976, respectively, have we received a reply. In no other paragraphs or sentences have been omitted to save space.

"Dear Dr. Hummer:"

"Every active individual humanitarian and humane society seems to have some per­ fected method of so-called euthanasia."

"To neither of these letters, dated January 7, 1975, and January 27, 1976, respectively, have we received a reply. In no other paragraphs or sentences have been omitted to save space."

"Dear Dr. Hummer:"

"Every active individual humanitarian and humane society seems to have some per­ fected method of so-called euthanasia."

"To neither of these letters, dated January 7, 1975, and January 27, 1976, respectively, have we received a reply. In no other paragraphs or sentences have been omitted to save space."

"Dear Dr. Hummer:"
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Invariably seems to arouse anger, resentment, and non-objective rebuttal. Since then, I have considered whether others involved directly in most cases, would one think that all of those concerned with euthanasia are entirely object.
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agency, administrative and other persons attended. Many praised the action that HELP and its associated company, Pedigree Industries, Inc., will undertake. As a result, a number of union groups viewed it as an especially important method of creating new profit-producing, entrepre-

neurial and employment opportunities. Some 4,000 jobs could be created in the initial phase. (Editor's note: We understand that members of Congress and the Administration are currently receiving protest mail and disavow giving their approval to the project.)

The U.S. Department of Commerce, for each million dollars of privately, paid-in-capital, HELP will guarantee an additional $1 million by the Small Business Administration,” Dohctor added.

HELP funding, through HELP, our "bank," should enable Pedigree Industries, Inc., to initially undertake "joint ventures" with 400 "profit-minded" federally recognized "advantaged or disadvantaged people," concluded Dohctor.

"Historically deprived of entrepreneurial opportunities, these people will enter into various profit-making ventures with Pedigree Industries such as pet breeding, buying, selling, grooming, feeding, medical, veterinary services, retail stores, and pet cemeteries. These businesses, in turn, will provide employment for the community.

As soon as he learned about this proposal, Dr. Frederick L. Thomas, as presi-
dent of our sister society, the National Association for Humane Legislation (NAHL), wrote to President Ford as follows:

"The society have called our attention to stories recently appearing in newspapers about a proposal by Milton Dohctor, former president of the country’s first handicapped entrepreneur lending program through the U.S. Office of Minority Business Enterprise, United States Department of Commerce. The three

commitments, pledging to provide $1 million to the businesses for other mills in their area, buying the output of the latter, letting them know about probable future market needs, perhaps supplying stud services, helping them in obtaining "papers" from the AKC, contacting potential buyers assuring them of the "quality breeding" and shipping the puppies. Conditions for the animals in the establishments of these wholesale dealers are said to be little better than in the individual puppy mills they service.

TRANSPORTATION BY AIR

The "bunchers" ship most of the puppies by commercial airlines, to which the business is a relatively small yet still a material source of dollar income. The largest shipping point is Salinas, Kansas, which is a busy "puppy port." But shipments leave airports throughout puppy-mill territory.

The usual shipping container is a fli-

snelsey (to reduce cost and weight) to the puppies, which are often returned to their new homes after such a journey. No puppy younger than eight weeks of age should be shipped, and 12 weeks would be a more appropriate minimum. There are two reasons why the very young puppies are shipped and offered for sale in the marketplace: (1) the impulse buyers who patronize these shops almost invariably are "sold" on the cute little balls of fur, which they hold up to their faces, and (2) the wholesalers, who are the managers of such a journey. No puppy younger than eight weeks of age should be shipped, and 12 weeks would be a more appropriate minimum.

The same is true when the puppies reach their eventual destinations. The transportation of puppies reaches the pet shops is the part of the answer is: Insurance. So long as the puppies make a net profit from the busi-

ness, they are not unduly concerned. The airlines make a net profit from the business. The potential losses, except through property damage, are insured. If market conditions have deteriorated or if market conditions have deteriorated or if the proposals are not adopted, the airlines are not likely to lose any money on the business.
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volved in the commercial pet trade. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

In response to the public clamor to do something about the tremendous problem, bills were introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives which would have the Department of Agriculture responsible for bringing about certain reforms in the air transportation of puppies. Among other things, they would have required that all puppies be at least eight weeks of age, unless otherwise specified by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The house version, and contrary to managed acceptable opposition through the Agriculture Committee and the House Rules Committee, the chairman of the Committee, John A. Hoyt, president of the HSUS, was expanded to forbid interstate shipment of animals for fighting, or the promotion of such activities.

This feature was not a part of the Senate bill. The two bills passed by the respective houses were combined by the conference committee, and the result, identified as S. 414, approved by both branches of Congress and signed by President Ford. It had been feared that he would veto the bill, especially because of the prohibition on cock fighting, but the letter to President Ford. It had been feared that he would veto the bill, especially because of the prohibition on cock fighting, but the letter to President Ford, which would mean the bill, was sent to President Ford, which would mean the bill, was sent to the latter.

No change of any note was made by the conference committee. As the conference report, the Senate voted 75 to 17 to declare horse and dog fighting a Federal crime to be undertaken by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

There are no accurate data on the total number of puppies produced each year. However, it is estimated that the number of puppies produced will move into the millions annually.

Puppies produced in the United States and marketed in this country are only a fraction of the number estimated to be produced each year. The rest of them are sold to various animal dealers, pet shops, and large pet stores.

The puppy buyer can also buy puppies from the Internet, from mail order catalogs, and from pet shows. The vast majority of puppies sold at pet shows are sold illegally.

The puppy buyer should be advised to ask what breed the puppy is, what age it is, and what is included in the price. The pet shop should be asked to give a guarantee that the puppy is healthy and will live for at least one year. The puppy buyer should also be advised to ask for a certificate of health from a veterinarian who has seen the puppy.

The puppy buyer should also be advised to ask if the puppy has been vaccinated and dewormed. The puppy buyer should also be advised to ask if the puppy has been neutered or spayed.

The puppy buyer should also be advised to ask if the puppy has been neutered or spayed. The puppy buyer should also be advised to ask if the puppy has been vaccinated and dewormed.
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commercial competition also limits the amounts that can be obtained as fees or donations. If you wish to help, the best shelter charges $40 for a spayed female puppy or shop, which does not require spaying.

In the situation that the "purebred" pet shop puppy holds out to the buyer the prospective profits through the later sale of puppies. Sometimes the buyer, which is now being transferred to the shelter is not able to come and take the puppy.

The situation that the "purebred" pet shop puppy holds out to the buyer the prospective profits through the later sale of puppies. Sometimes the buyer may return the puppy and try to sell it to the shelter, which does not require spaying.

Humane organizations have joined in a suit to force compliance. Finally, in May, 1976, Judge Charles Richer ordered the Department of Agriculture to revoke all permits of this trade if they really wanted to do anything about it.

EFFECT ON PET SHOPS

Humane organizations would shed no tears over the fact that continuation of existing conditions in puppy mills eventually will shake public confidence in the pet shops and result in their losing many buyers. Meanwhile, however, they have in the puppy mills and bunched a ready and comparatively cheap source of puppies adapted to the needs of the shelter and their financial buyers. They are not likely to agree to give up this source of supply just to save the lives of the puppies. However, if they are reminded of these prospects forcefully and often enough, they will probably be ready to join the humane organizations in a cooperative effort to keep the mills from doing any more harm.

Meanwhile, however, they have in the puppy mills and bunched a ready and comparatively cheap source of puppies adapted to the needs of the shelter and their financial buyers. They are not likely to agree to give up this source of supply just to save the lives of the puppies. However, if they are reminded of these prospects forcefully and often enough, they will probably be ready to join the humane organizations in a cooperative effort to keep the mills from doing any more harm.

EFFECTS ON LEGITIMATE BREEDERS

Humane organizations have already sent a letter to the editor of the Florida Times-Union, urging them to join in a boycott of dog shows and other activities of this trade if they really wanted to do anything about it.

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO STOP THE CRUELTIES OF THE PUPPY TRADE?

The time has come to do something to eliminate the cruelties and fraudulent aspects of the commercial trade in puppies. Passage of the Pelly bill is a good step in the right direction. If the 8 weeks' minimum age for puppies shipped is retained without change, or any land or Hill Romance Mammal Protection Act, which is now on the floor of the Senate, will appeal Judge Richey's wise and courageous decision.

In its special report on this subject the HSUS offers a number of recommendations, including passage of state laws. pertinent to a number of aspects of this trade, any or all of which, in the opinion of the HSUS, would be of value in the effort to end the cruelties of the puppy trade. In any event, the HSUS is inclined to side with the proponents of this legislation. If we fail to include all except a few breeders in any such act, we may fail to deal with the problem. For publishing something like a "report to the Editor" on this subject, the HSUS was actually sued for libel or slander by a group of breeders and extensively by a dog owner whose article on the subject appeared. The HSUS has always believed in and advocated persuasion, de-escalation, and the orderly process of voluntary change. We invite the open-minded cooperation of legitimate breeders and their organizations, the local and state kennel clubs and the American Kennel Club.
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

PRIORITIES AND MAILING LISTS

We have enjoyed receiving Report to Humanitarians for several years. At one time we were on your mailing list, but for some reason your name was removed unintentionally. That has been rectified and you will begin receiving the OMB again.

I noted with interest the fine series of articles entitled "Ripoff" which appeared in your recent issues. The very real problem exposed there is emerging in our field of wildlife management. Some of us are spending countless hours and literally hundreds of thousands of dollars to prevent the State of Alaska from killing about 100 wolves which, oddly enough, would benefit the wolf and other wildlife in the long run. Yet they completely ignore the rapidly deteriorating conditions of 37 million acres of national wildlife refuge land and 477,000 member federal national refuges which provide habitat for billions of individual species.

The March, 1976 (Number 35), issue of Report to Humanitarians illustrated quite a different misdirection of priorities in the humane movement.—--Lauraine L. Wilkerson, Secretary, Wildlife Management Institute, Washington, DC.

REPLY:

We thank you for returning to our mailing list. The "for some reason" we had been "unintentionally" removed from your mailing list very likely was our change of address in 1975. We have tried to notify all matters of humane literature to us, but have not been successful in giving the decline in number of publications received since our move. Publications are not forwarded from our old address. We will greatly appreciate the favor if all officials of humane organizations reading this check with their mailing lists to see that our address has been correctly changed.

SOMEBODY DOESN'T LIKE US!

"Your March Report sounds as though you, and you alone, are present in the public mind..." Perhaps we had all fold up and allow your wisdom to lead us. I think not.

Franckly, sir, your seemingly gall as a know-it-all is quite astounding for any person. A humanitarian? I think not.—-V. George, Canada.

REPLY:

We fully realize that sometimes our reports must sound somewhat pontifical. Did you stop to think that this might be because some are the elders, not just the juniors? You have not been on our mailing list, and hence don't know that we often admit puzzlement and ask for suggestions. And we believe that most of us may make a great effort to keep in touch with what other humanitarians are thinking. We read all letters and all humane publications received—which is a fantastic dual task beyond fault. We issue the viewpoints expressed in our reports that come to us. That is why we are true about trapping, the subject about which we seem to disagree.

What you say about trapping is not contradicted by our report. We have not specifically been doing. There may be other Canadians who feel we have slightly their efforts on trapping. Just the contrary is true.

BUT SOMEBODY DOES!

"Yet another excellent HIS Report!"

William Reed, St. Petersburg, Florida, is astounded how you manage to keep your standards of keen insight, practical ideas, compassion, and articulate presentation so consistently high. "We were especially interested in your article on licensing—a new dimension to our work in this area. The Green-Wood County Humane Society is now the Animal Control Authority for the same district and has total responsibility for the licensing hassle."—Mrs. Louis Arvin, Alton, Kentucky.

REPLY:

We are glad not all of our readers agree with V. George, writer of the letter replied to above! If you are unable to pass an ordinance calling for licensing of pet owners rather than animals, please let us know. The benefits are so obvious, yet the idea is so new that humanitarians seem afraid to public will not accept it. Perhaps the public would be more inclined if it were presented in the proper light. We will never know until we try.

HE DOESN'T AGREE WITH US!

"Please remove my name from your mailing list. I have never taken part in the animal welfare movement. I fail to see the right of inexperienced people to interfere with either of these age old professions. People who enjoy the use of fur's and all of our legally controlled natural resources should not be subject to such ridiculous harrassment."—(sic)—M. VanDonk, Orland Park, Illinois.

REPLY:

Thank you for bringing us back once again to reality. We in the humane movement tend to be so suspicious and loaded with apprehensions, from mutual exchanges of correspondence, that nearly everyone else would agree with us, if only they were "educated." Human education is far more than merely "teaching the people what is going on."

Also thank you for asking to be taken off our mailing list. If there are others who feel the same way, please write. We have no postage to use.

YOUR LETTERS AS GOOD AS OURS

We receive many letters from members suggesting that we write to letters to editors or articles about this and that subject. Typically is this one?

REPLY:

You complement us unduly by implication. Newspapers are more likely to pay attention to handwritten letters from local people than to neatly-typed ones from a distant organization. We do it for all such suggestions, and to write individual letters to all of the thousands of newspapers in the United States, much less foreign countries, commenting on our humane movements. It is your responsibility to the newspaper editors, and we would consider your words our credits.

LATER NOT "SNIPPY"—OUR REPLY WAS!

"I do not think Ms. Fullenlove's letter was snippy, but your reply was. It too, "a snit.""—Mrs. Franklin S. Buckwalter, Colonial Heights, Virginia.

REPLY:

Sorry, dear lady, but Emily would take back a thing if her exchange of correspondence with John Fullenlove foiled and she left out by Doc. During eight years that Ms. Fullenlove has been receiving our reports she had never sent us even a dollar, then returned angrily for a delay for which she was not in any way responsible. Doc more or less understood the importance of our attendance to our shortage of staff and the resulting inevitable delays in answering mail. So, if our reply seemed unduly sharp, blame it on too high-pitched poor old Doc.

"About the leaflets ('Let Us Live'), we now are completely out of stock, with no means of ordering more. If you need some, write to the Animal Welfare Institute, Post Office Box 350, Georgetown Station, Washington, DC 20007, which seems to still have plenty on hand."

AND FROM VIRGINIA

"You need never apologize for delays or even not acknowledging correspondence. I understand the feeling. Our efforts are mostly directed towards (eliminating) the suffering of animals. My feelings and others I heard from after reading your publications have changed completely regarding what was for me considered to be humane."—Miss Bernice Wallus, Richmond, Virginia.

REPLY:

Knowing what a dedicated humanitarians you are, we are most pleased to receive your approval.


REPLY:

Doc's only interest is in helping to improve human programs. Emily has just as much to say about the content of our reports as Doc. She agrees entirely with our present policy. It does no good at all to publish little squibs about bad conditions for animals unless there is such a program to be effective action. They may please some readers, and bring in contributions, but they don't help animals. And, contrary to our friend's notion) it does not mean that our readers would prefer brevity, more than 95 percent of the many readers who have commented on this in the past urge us to retain our present style. So, you fans of brevity, all we ask is that you send us the address of the one who has written to us who had the comment, so we can send them a copy of our report.

M. Fullenlove's letter was snippy, but your reply was. It too, "a snit."—Mrs. Franklin S. Buckwalter, Colonial Heights, Virginia.

REPLY:

"I do not think Ms. Fullenlove's letter was snippy, but your reply was. It too, "a snit.""—Mrs. Franklin S. Buckwalter, Colonial Heights, Virginia.

REPLY:

Mrs. Buckwalter isn't the only one commenting on the letter from Donald Tarr which appeared in Report No. 35. We received one other, from a long-time member, which reads:

"Since (Report to Humanitarians) is Doc's baby, I respect his righ to do it as he pleases. But I am more interested in expressing his ideas in his own lengthy style rather than knowing what method of expression meets the reader's desire. Even if he had not been so perfectly felt was too wordy, I suspect he would feel justified in continuing his present style."—(Name withheld on request.)

REPLY:

Doc's only interest is in helping to improve humane programs. Emily has just as much to say about the content of our reports as Doc. She agrees entirely with our present policy. It does no good at all to publish little squibs about bad conditions for animals unless there is such a program to be effective action. They may please some readers, and bring in contributions, but they don't help animals. And, contrary to our friend's notion) it does not mean that our readers would prefer brevity, more than 95 percent of the many readers who have commented on this in the past urge us to retain our present style. So, you fans of brevity, all we ask is that you send us the address of the one who has written to us who had the comment, so we can send them a copy of our report.

MEMORIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

have been received from...

Mrs. Ervin Rele, West Bend, Wisconsin, "in memory of Marie Thompson, sadly missed, president and organizer of The Wisconsin Humane Society"

Mrs. Benjamin P. Grondzold, Watertown, Wisconsin, "in memory of my sister Bertha Mary Smoot, who lived and worked in St. Petersburg so many years."

Mr. and Mrs. John A. Healy, Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania, "in memory of Thomas Christopher Healy, the best thing that ever happened to us. He passed away October 75, 1973, only six years old. Thornbush, blood clot in brain. We miss him so much and we hope all our hearts that same day another Tiger will enter our lives."

Mr. and Mrs. Frederick O. Matheside, Gladstone, New York, "in memory of our dog Snooke (1948-1959)."

Mr. and Mrs. Phillip J. McCorm, Memphis, Tennessee, "in memory of two of the finest dogs we have ever known, Patay and Filmore. Patay was a beautiful English setter, and Filmore a beautiful chow. If they were living, they could tell you about their adventures and how they understood us and our hearts."

Mr. William Reed, St. Petersburg, Florida, "in loving memory of my poodle Choo-Choo."

Mr. and Mrs. Paul A. Bumet, Tameshie, New Jersey, "in