(No. 25) -- Adoption Policies Affect Surplus

Humane Information Services, Inc.
ARTICLES ON SPAY CLINICS AND THE PET POPULATION EXPLOSION EVOKE STRONG RESPONSES

The second article in our series on spay clinics and the pet population explosion, which appeared in Report to Humanitarians No. 26 (March, 1974), stirred vigorous responses from individual humanitarians, humane societies and other groups. Many requested additional copies or reprints.

That article dealt very candidly with the most controversial aspects of the problem. Much of our mail was most interessingly and favorably worded. We have not seen this approach as an isolating one, nor could anyone working with the media or scholars thereof disagree with your conclusions.

We had expected a good many requests to cancel subscriptions, either totally or from our mailing list, but there were only a few.

The article was cancelled by membership in HIS. I am in total disagreement with your attitude on spay clinics. You evidently have no respect for the fact that spaying is the only answer to over-population."--Constance Humane Information Services, Rockland County (New York) SPCA: "As one who often assumes steward management duties for you on your articles (on the surplus), I can say there are no times when anyone working with such data couldn't do quite as well, could disagree with your conclusions.

In a report to HIS, No. 24, we fought for the nonissue of the HSUS agreeing that this approach in isolation will not solve the surpluses problem. This has been especially noticeable in connection with the tremendous growth recently seen in spay clinics. The necessity of spaying and neutering the surplus population is widely understood by veterinarians. The HSUS is not willing to acknowledge this fact.

Another member says: "I wish to identify wholeheartedly with Dr. Frederick L. Thomsen, head of the Davis Animal Hospital in Elkhart, Indiana: facts he has been able to unearth.

The HSUS agrees that reducing the surplus population is in the interest of everyone seeking to find answers to the pet population explosion..."--Anna Canavan, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Adoption Policies Affect Surplus

The HSUS joins many others in expressing our appreciation for the consistently enlightened approach that characterizes Report to Humanitarians. It is a vehicle that serves the entire humane movement well, and in saying that I fully recognize that it is a professional statement, it is also an action statement relative to elimination of surplus animals set forth in HIS, No. 24.

The first of these was the local humane society..."--Arthur B. Brainerd, our director of humane information services, Rockland County (New York) SPCA: "As with any program, there are many humanitarians who believe they cannot..."--Harold Davis, head of the Davis Animal Hospital...[cited from the text].

Dr. Robert C. Bay wrote: "My compliments on your article (in Report to HIS, No. 24). Your candid assessment of the pet population explosion is factual and your recommendations are practical and precise.

At its annual convention in Philadelphia July 15-19 the American Veterinary Medical Association..."--Edward Newman, president, California Humane Association. Mr. Newman's article and the facts he has been able to unearth.

OTHER COMMENTS RECEIVED

Among the letters received following Report to HIS, No. 24 were several dealing with the distribution of surplus animals to family..."--Harold Davis, as well as interesting comments and suggestions for a future issue. One of these letters, from Ms. Linda Grey, of San Jose, California, has had much influence on our thinking about spaying versus castration. We are sure you will be interested when it appears in a later issue.

THE FIRST STEP

In Report to HIS, No. 24 we outlined the five major points in a complete and effective surplus control program. The first of these was "Stop breeding, stop adoption of unspayed females without removing the selling mentality..."--Anna Canavan, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
EFFECTS OF DIFFERENT SPAY POLICIES ON RECEIPTS AND ADOPTIONS OF ANIMALS AT SHELTERS AND POUNDS

by Arthur S. Batchelor
Director of Humane Education

This is a statistical analysis of the effects of different spay policies on receipts of animals, adoptions and actual spayings at shelters and pounds, intended for officers and directors of shelters, and public officials concerned with animal control programs.

Thus, we have the anomaly of humane societies through one side of the mouth preaching the gospel of spaying and neutering, and on the other side of the mouth telling some would-be adopters that they can have the unspayed female of his choice, so long as he pays the adoption fee.

Likewise, we find in many communities that the local governmental unit having responsibility for animal control is complaining about the costs of such a policy, while at the same time, urging the need for spaying and neutering, and perhaps even operating a low-cost public spay clinic, at the same time that it is putting out unspayed females for adoption.

What is to many societies a very important effect of reducing the number of incoming animals and adoptions is a decrease in the income from fees when animals are received and adopted. In many societies, these fees constitute a principal source of income for operation of the shelter. And these societies do not agree with those who maintain that the real business of the animal shelter is to put itself out of business. This is especially true of high-salaried executive directors.

Another result of spaying is the reduction in the number of unspayed females and males that will result in greatly increasing this abandonment, and hence reducing receipts of males at the shelter.

Secondly, the shelter directors and officers are afraid that such a policy would result in reducing the number of adoptions necessary that the society widely publicize its spay program of its own (it is now asking the public to return lost unspayed female cats or dogs, except where a spay has been recently performed).

The humane movement has been increasing the surplus of dogs and cats for decades, and urging the need for spaying and neutering, and perhaps even operating a low-cost public spay clinic, at the same time that it is putting out unspayed females for adoption.

The answers are very simple. First, the directors and officials of these shelters claim that if they refuse to adopt out unspayed females, then members of the public who are ignorant of the whole problem and don't want to see their unwanted female pets adopt a few years, and almost certainly are not interested in ever adopting a dog or cat. The animals will be taken to the country and dropped by the roadside, left in a public shelter or elsewhere, and of course, they will be returned to the public. The shelter officers are convinced that any tightening of the adoption conditions to exclude unspayed females on hand. If the adopters in any of the humane society animal shelters, in St. Petersburg and in Clearwater, operated by two different societies. For example, we find that one of these societies and the County Pound (Continued same column below)

Table I

Pineal County, Florida

In Pinellas County, Florida, in which Humane Information Services' headquarters are located, there are two humane society animal shelters, in St. Petersburg and in Clearwater, operated by two different societies. For example, we find that one of these societies has the policy of not adopting out unspayed female cats or dogs, except where a spay has been recently performed. In 1972 the County took over dog control operations, becoming the only facility which picks up strays, many of which are unsuitable for adoption. Only 24 percent of its male and female dogs received at the SPCA of Clearwater and the County Pound were adopted out, whereas at the SPCA shelter, where there was no spay program or any spay requirement, attendants dealing with prospective adopters do everything they can to discourage the adoption of the "unspayed" female and male dogs. In other words, the adopters will put them out, but they seem to have had an opportunity to learn that unspayed females are far from conclusive.

This difference may reflect the fact that the SPCA of St. Petersburg shelter during the two-months' period were adopted out, as compared with a little over two percent for the nearby County pound, which has no spay requirement or arrange-
HUMANE LEGISLATION DIGEST
of the National Association for Humane Legislation, Inc.
675 Pinellas Point Drive South, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705

September, 1973

Humane Bills in Congress Lag for Lack of Vigorous Support by Humanitarians

Prospects are poor for the passage of important humane legislation by the 93rd Congress. This is because humanitarians in general, and even many of their leaders, seem to be almost completely unconcerned regarding the processes involved in getting legislation through the House of Representatives and the Senate. The obstacles are many. Unless there are faced realistically, and appropriate action taken to deal with them, failure is inevitable.

The reasons why it is so difficult to obtain humane legislation were explained in our August Digest for September, 1972, which was included as an insert in Report to Humanitarians No. 19 in March of the year. In view of the mistakes which have been made in the past, and which over the years have prevented the passage of many important bills for the improvement of animal welfare, have been made all over again during the present Congress. Humanitarians and humane organizations just don’t seem to want to change.

It need not be this way. If the leading humane organizations will get together before each session of Congress, thoroughly examine the different legislative proposals and work toward getting their chances of passage, make a selection of one or two or possibly three of these proposals, cooperate in promoting their chances, one or two of these bills, find sponsors for each in the House and the Senate, and then follow through on these bills throughout the entire session of Congress, humanitarians could hope to obtain the passage of at least one important piece of humane legislation by the end of the session of Congress. Over the years this would represent a tremendous accomplishment in behalf of animal welfare.

Early in the present Congress, NAHL suggested to the heads of leading national societies in both the humane and wildlife fields that they get together and try to agree on a legislative program which then could be backed by the weight of the cooperating societies.

Such a meeting was held in Washington in April, and, somewhat to everybody’s surprise, there was complete harmony and agreement among the representatives of the following organizations: Defenders of Wildlife; Friends of the Earth; The Fund for Animals, Inc.; The Humane Society of the United States; National Association for Humane Legislation, Inc.; and Society for Animal Protective Legislation.

Letters received before and after this meeting from the American Humane Association, the Massachusetts SPCA and the International Society for the Protection of Animals, which were unable to be represented at the meeting, gave the impression to NAHL that these societies approved of such a cooperative effort and at least were not opposed to the recommendations of the group which met. We expect them to support, at least in principle, the bills selected at the meeting as having highest priority. Several letters to other national humane society inviting it to the meeting and later expressing hope that naive to the action plan and support these bills went unanswered.

At this meeting it was unanimously agreed that the program be successful in passing any important humane legislation it would be necessary to concentrate efforts on a few bills.

After much discussion of the pros and cons of different measures, it was agreed that the important bills having some chance of passage and deserving the vigorous support of the cooperating societies, are the Bayly-Anderson trapping bill and the Gunter bill extending the provisions of the federal Humane Slaughter Act to persons holding in transit livestock for slaughter, and humane meat products for export to the United States. Of these, the Gunter bill appeared much less controversial and to have the best chances for passage.

Since that meeting, several of the societies represented have taken some steps to promote passage of both of these bills, such as writing letters to and interviewing members of Congress. The two wildlife organizations have been especially active and effective in obtaining about 30 co-sponsors of the trapping bill in the House. Humane organizations have helped. A vice president of NAHL, for one, helped in obtaining these co-sponsors. But activity on the Gunter bill has lagged. Much more vigorous support for this bill is needed if it is to pass both houses of Congress.

For example, NAHL received scores of the news bulletins and other publications put out by humane societies in this country. We have run across very few references to the Gunter bill, explaining what it would do and suggesting that members write to their Senators and Congressmen in behalf of the bill. As a result of lack of publicity in the humane publications, the number of letters received by members of Congress relating to this bill has been pitifully small.

And most of these have resulted from special educational promotions of NAHL. Congressmen should have been receiving thousands of letters.

Here is a bill which is almost non-controversial, which would eliminate the suffering of millions of animals annually yet would harm nobody; but it rests in peace in the files of members of Congress because animal lovers and humanitarians are either too uninformed or too indifferent to write a few letters to their own Senators and Congressmen, and to members of the House Agriculture Committee.

No doubt this lack of information and urgency reflects the fact on the part of humane societies generally, from the local to the national level, of losing their tax exemption privileges by becoming involved in legislative activities. This is a very legitimate and understandable concern. But, as we have explained several times in Humane Legislation Digest, the prohibition is against devoting a “substantial” proportion of the society’s budget to legislative activities, which means that local societies having large expenditures for the operation of animal shelters and anti-cruelty work would be spending only a minute proportion of their total outlay by including in their news bulletins information on the Gunter bill and what should be done about it. The prohibition, also, does not affect the ability of active members, directors and unpaid officers of the societies, as individuals, to write letters, to write articles for the local press in behalf of the bill, or to send contributions to the National Association for Humane Legislation, which is very badly in need of funds to carry on even the most essential part of the campaign for this and other important humane legislation.

Let’s stop kidding ourselves. Being a humanitarian does not mean simply tell other people off when they commit some inhumane act, denouncing the biomedical laboratories, and rescuing an occasional project, recreation, or dog. It means doing some effective work for the animals, such as writing letters where they are really needed, and once in a while contributing until it hurts in order to achieve some specific goal such as passage of the Gunter bill.

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT!

As we go to press we have received an urgent telephone call from a hard-working legislative assistant to Representative Gunter in Washington, asking that the heads of each humane society approving of the Gunter bill, H.R. 8055, write a letter to Congressman Gunter on the society’s behalf, simply stating such approval and support.

These letters can be used effectively in talking with other individual members of Congress who may be interested in co-sponsoring the bill. They will all like to know how the humane movement feels about it.

So, if you society presidents or executives have not yet written such a letter, please do so as a matter of urgency. Let’s stop kidding ourselves. Being a humanitarian does not mean simply tell other people off when they commit some inhumane act, denouncing the biomedical laboratories, and rescuing an occasional project, recreation, or dog. It means doing some effective work for the animals, such as writing letters where they are really needed, and once in a while contributing until it hurts in order to achieve some specific goal such as passage of the Gunter bill.

Modern ships still use primitive, inhumane methods of handling livestock. Here several LIVE cattle are hoisted over the side of a ship by means of a rope placed around their horns. Many times a leg breaks or the animal becomes loose and falls on the deck or railing of the ship breaking its legs and ribs. Generally an animal suffers a broken neck or severe overstrain from this method.

(The above photograph is from "An Inquiry into the Transportation and Slaughter of Livestock—Part 1", a leaflet of the International Society for the Protection of Animals. Other excerpts from this excellent leaflet will be found on pages 2 and 3 of this supplement.)
Punching Eyes Out With a Nail


During the month of January, 1968, ISPA field officer John Walsh met with members of the five leading humane societies in Brazil and visited many slaughterhouses in various parts of the country... The methods of killing animals were cruel and barbaric, and methods of transporting livestock to the slaughterhouses were primitive. One of the worst acts of cruelty noted in Walsh's report is connected with the use of an instrument called the "Choura". The Choura is a metal pole with a wooden handle. At one end is a nail sharpened to a fine point. The Choura is used as a prod to move cattle and other livestock and the nail is constantly jabbed into the animal to make it move faster. It was noted that in rural areas, the Choura is jabbed into the eyes of the animal causing the loss of both eyes so that the animal will not wander off before slaughter.

The current method of killing the cattle in Brazil is by striking them on the head with a hammer, or by the use of the "choura", a round iron bar, several feet long, with a chisel-like point. The killing is done by means of a single blow to the cervical vertebra of the neck, which causes immediate paralysis if used properly. It is extremely difficult to determine whether a blow was used in this manner and the animal often must be struck repeatedly. In regard to the use of the hammer, Walsh noted that in some slaughterhouses, cattle were hit as many as thirteen times on the head and although they fell down, they remained conscious. The conscious animal was then shackled by one rear leg, hung upside down, and its throat slit. In most slaughterhouses there was no effort to render the animals unconscious before slaughter.

Transportation

The transportation of livestock throughout the world has been of great concern to ISPA. The transportation of millions of animals, as portrayed on these pages, is by legislation. The methods used in slaughtering and pre-handling these food animals in many foreign countries are so objectionable, for any reason, to domestic consumers that a large percentage of all imports from these countries is not permitted. There are no protective regulations for livestock being transported in many ports as the cover photo shows. Swin in many countries are loaded and unloaded with a minimum of concern for the welfare of the animals. The methods used in slaughtering and pre-handling these food animals in many foreign countries are so objectionable, for any reason, to domestic consumers. The latter certainly have as much right to demand that the meat they eat be from humanely-slaughtered animals as from sanitarily-slaughtered animals. Imported meat usually cannot be differentiated from domestically produced meat, so United States consumers are not permitted to use any of the foreign meat products produced for export to the United States. The importation of meat from foreign countries has been increasing steadily. This imported meat comes from about twenty dozen countries scattered throughout the world, with Australia being the largest supplier.

Transportation

This is not a minor bill affecting only a small number of animals. The meat equivalent of over five million head annually is imported by the United States alone. This figure does not include the meat produced for domestic consumption, as well as all meat imports for human consumption. The importation of meat has been increasing steadily. This imported meat comes from about twenty dozen countries scattered throughout the world, with Australia being the largest supplier.

The methods used in slaughtering and pre-handling these food animals in many foreign countries are so objectionable, for any reason, to domestic consumers that a large percentage of all imports from these countries is not permitted. There are no protective regulations for livestock being transported in many ports as the cover photo shows. Swin in many countries are loaded and unloaded with a minimum of concern for the welfare of the animals. The methods used in slaughtering and pre-handling these food animals in many foreign countries are so objectionable, for any reason, to domestic consumers. The latter certainly have as much right to demand that the meat they eat be from humanely-slaughtered animals as from sanitarily-slaughtered animals. Imported meat usually cannot be differentiated from domestically produced meat, so United States consumers have no choice. They are protected against imported meat that has been unsanitarily slaughtered, and all plants producing meat for export to the United States must meet the humane requirements of the United States. This undoubtedly would encourage plants producing for domestic use to introduce humane methods, which are more efficient as well as humane.

A few people have suggested that to require use of humane slaughtering methods in these plants would constitute interference in the domestic affairs of other countries. That obviously is completely untrue. The United States would be merely setting up requirements which must be met for meat products imported into this country. No foreign country would be forced to do anything. Surely we have the right to exclude from this country products that are objectionable, for any reason, to domestic consumers. The latter certainly have as much right to demand that the meat they eat be from humanely-slaughtered animals as from sanitarily-slaughtered animals. Imported meat usually cannot be differentiated from domestically produced meat, so United States consumers have no choice. They are protected against imported meat that has been unsanitarily slaughtered, and all plants producing meat for export to the United States must meet the humane requirements of the United States. The USDA inspects such plants regularly and certifies those from which imports are permitted. It would require little additional inspection to include a humane slaughter requirement along with the sanitary requirements. The other objection to doing something now about this very urgent humane problem is that passage of the bill at this time might aggravate the current beef shortage and contribute to higher prices in this country. There is no basis in fact for this objection. It may be said with complete confidence that beef prices and supplies in this country would not be affected by the passage of a humane slaughter bill.
Slaughter Practices in Brazil

We had the opportunity to watch the Brazilian methods of slaughter on several occasions and at different kinds of slaughterhouses. The methods in any of them, as far as the handling of the animals is concerned, are unspeakably rough. Roughness and brutality is always present. The causes for this are not only low wages, which make a collection of better trained and more civilized workers difficult, but a total lack of inspection and/or care for the animals.

Up to the present, not a solitary slaughterhouse in this country exists which even made an attempt to start humane slaughter of cattle! In most of the abattoirs, small and large alike, the hammer is being used. In addition, although prohibited nowadays, the "Choupa" is still very much used in many municipal and state slaughterhouses.

Considering the transport, the handling, the methods of slaughter, there is no doubt that meat animals in Brazil are subjected to terrible cruelties.

Due to the importance of the hygienic point of view, so much emphasized by the World Health Organization, we believe that improvements in these matters are most urgent. The only way to get attention to this point of view but as a sanitary condition as well. We are certain that the consumer in the United States. and in other nations where the quality of meats which are imported is so important, will never be satisfied with meat obtained by the methods of slaughter in Brazil, and that therefore the importation of the meat from Brazil must be stopped as soon as possible.

Humane Slaughter Bill, H. R. 8055

Beef imports and supplies will not be affected by the bill, and beef is by far the most important imported meat, why then will passage of the bill result in the adoption of humane methods in many plants? Answer: (a) Officials in some countries, sympathetic to humane methods in many plants? Answer: (a) Officials in some countries, sympathetic to humane methods, will be induced to adopt them.

If beef imports and supplies will not be affected by the bill, and beef is by far the most important imported meat, why then will passage of the bill result in the adoption of humane methods in many plants? Answer: (a) Officials in some countries, sympathetic to humane methods, will be induced to adopt them.

If beef imports and supplies will not be affected by the bill, and beef is by far the most important imported meat, why then will passage of the bill result in the adoption of humane methods in many plants? Answer: (a) Officials in some countries, sympathetic to humane methods, will be induced to adopt them.
TRAPPING BILLS GENERATE DISCORD

Although at least six national wildlife and humane societies, including the National Association for Humane Legislation, have opposed the Bayh-Anderson bill (H.R. 8065, H.R. 9207 and H.R. 9379), some other societies are opposing this bill and are in favor of bills following a different approach to the problem.

The National Association for Humane Legislation offers three alternatives to the Bayh-Anderson approach:

1. That represented by the bill introduced by Representative Long, of Maryland, H.R. 4715, which would prohibit the shipment in interstate or foreign commerce of any fur or live animals caught in or by leghold traps in the United States or any country which has not banned the manufacture, sale or use of leghold or steel-jaw traps.

Despite the apparent simplicity and potential effectiveness of such legislation, all kinds of difficulties arise from any attempt to ban traps. Supposed to ban the states and foreign countries concerned either passed legislation or issued directives by the game commissions or other authorities, stating that the use of leghold traps is prohibited. Obvious is the need to write a bill or not to be held against any proposed legislation, but where they constitute a veritable sieve selected by the Bay-Anderson bill. Under this proposal the federal government would require a trap to provide a space between them when the trap is sprung, and it would be guarded against is the tendency on the part of wildlife and foreign countries to continue using these traps.

It is imperative that the tendency to continue using these traps be guarded against. The tendency to continue using these traps is evidenced by a bill recently introduced by Representative Long, of Maryland, H.R. 4715, which would prohibit the shipment in interstate or foreign commerce of any fur or live animals caught in or by leghold traps in the United States or any country which has not banned the manufacture, sale or use of leghold or steel-jaw traps.

Despite the apparent simplicity and potential effectiveness of such legislation, all kinds of difficulties arise from any attempt to ban traps. Supposed to ban the states and foreign countries concerned either passed legislation or issued directives by the game commissions or other authorities, stating that the use of leghold traps is prohibited. Obvious is the need to write a bill or not to be held against any proposed legislation, but where they constitute a veritable sieve selected by the Bay-Anderson bill.

The TENDER TRAP

The Tender Trap is an ordinary steel trap which is sprung as follows: The jaws of the trap are sprung, the leg of the animal is firmly held, but there is little or no pain. A child can spring the trap without wounding the arm of the trapper. And it could be made humane, or at least sufficiently so for humanitarians to accept it as an alternative to no effective trapping ban at all.

The TENDER TRAP

The Tender Trap is an ordinary steel trap which is sprung as follows: The jaws of the trap are sprung, the leg of the animal is firmly held, but there is little or no pain. A child can spring the trap without wounding the arm of the trapper. And it could be made humane, or at least sufficiently so for humanitarians to accept it as an alternative to no effective trapping ban at all.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT THE CRUELTY OF TRAPPING

It goes no good for humanitarians to wring their hands and denounce the cruelties of trapping. The time has come for action. Write letters to the two U. S. Senators from your state, addressing them at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. 20510, urging them to support the Anderson bill, H.R. 8065.

Write to your own Congressman, at the House Office Building, Washington, D. C. 20515, asking him to support in every way possible the Anderson bill to ban cruel traps, H.R. 8065.

Write to each of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, addressing each at the House Office Building, Washington, D. C. 20515, urging them to consider and pass H.R. 8065.

These Representatives are: John D. Dingell, of Michigan; Paul G. Rogers, of Florida; Robert L. Leggett, of California; Mario Biaggi, of New York; Glenn H. Anderson, of California; E. (Kika) de la Garza, of Texas; Peter N. Kyros, of Maine; Ralph Metcalfe, of Illinois; John B. Breaux, of Louisiana; Fred B. Kennedy, of Pennsylvania; Bob Eckhardt, of Texas; Gerry E. Studds, of Massachusetts; David B. Bowen, of Mississippi; William S. Cohen, of Maine; Joel Pritchard, of Washington.

Send any replies you receive to: National Association for Humane Legislation, Inc., 675 Finlay's Point Drive South, West Petersburg, Florida 33705.

BILLS INTRODUCED IN SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SINCE JUNE HUMANE LEGISLATION DIGEST

Humane treatment of animals transported in commerce: S. 2293 (Roe), S. 2309 (Hoe), H.R. 9141 (Macdonald).

To strengthen enforcement of Horse Protection Act of 1970: S. 2252 (Hartke), S. 2388, S. 2391 (Keating), S. 2394 (Tunney and Stevenson); H.R. 3873 (Whitehurst).

Prohibition of wild horses: H.R. 7895 (Zwacz).

National Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Day: H.R. 2093 (DeConcini), H.R. 2094 (DeConcini), House Con. Res. 243 (Sarabani).

National Dog Week: Senate Joint Res. 139 (Mark Hatfield).

Legislation for spay clinics: S. 1032 (Craston, co-sponsor) H.R. 7895 (Wolff), H.R. 8065 (Hartke).


To improve zoos and aquariums through a National Zoological and Aquariums' Facilities: S. 2042 (Hatfield), companion bill to H.R. 1266 (Whitehurst).

P A I D A D V E R T I S E M E N T

"Combination approach" comes after the trap is sprung. The provision in the "Tender Trap," a new approach to solving the problem of trapping, is probably as much to the advantage of animals alike, should be satisfied, except for one important condition. This condition is in that perhaps 90 percent of the suffering of an animal caught in any kind of a leghold trap, including the "Tender Trap," comes after the trap is sprung. It is the attempt to get away from the trap, rather than the actual closing of the trap's jaws, which creates the real cruelty involved in trapping. The animal may sprain ligaments or break a leg in its struggles to free itself. Or, it may bite its leg off or break one of its shoulders close to the jaws of the trap; this is called a "wring-off." A very substantial proportion of deaths of animals caught in leghold traps do wind up as wring-offs, which are unable to hunt or defend themselves effectively and frequently succumb to infection or being killed by a predator. Animals which remain in the traps, regardless of how "humanely" caught, may die from exposure or freeze to death. The provision in the "Tender Trap" bill is a significant improvement over other proposals which would be difficult for the animal to enforce. And, of course, the mental trauma of the trapped animal is probably as much to be regretted as the physical suffering.

These considerations, however, do not necessarily invalidate the "Tender Trap" and the Bay-Anderson bill approach to solving the trapping problem. Attempts have been made to insert tranquilizer tabs in the padding, to be ingested by the animal in its attempts to chew the padding and get away from the trap. However, even though this was probably a motive, and could be for the purpose of causing the animal to lie quietly until the trap was sprung or for a means of eliminating the animal on the spot.

Our sister society, Humane Information Service, has done extensive research on different drugs from the standpoint of their possible use in euthanizing trapped animals, and believes that many tranquilizers, as well as narcotics, would not be effective in preventing animals caught in the traps. One thing which must be guarded against is the tendency on the part of the general public to mistake people who are accustomed to capturing wild animals with so-called tranquilizing guns to a "sucy-cholcholine tranquilizing agent." As was explained fully in a recent issue of the "combination approach," the Bay-Anderson bill approach to solving the trapping problem, is probably as much to the advantage of animals alike, should be satisfied, except for one important condition. This condition is in that perhaps 90 percent of the suffering of an animal caught in any kind of a leghold trap, including the "Tender Trap," comes after the trap is sprung. It is the attempt to get away from the trap, rather than the actual closing of the trap's jaws, which creates the real cruelty involved in trapping. The animal may sprain ligaments or break a leg in its struggles to free itself. Or, it may bite its leg off or break one of its shoulders close to the jaws of the trap; this is called a "wring-off." A very substantial proportion of deaths of animals caught in leghold traps do wind up as wring-offs, which are unable to hunt or defend themselves effectively and frequently succumb to infection or being killed by a predator. Animals which remain in the traps, regardless of how "humanely" caught, may die from exposure or freeze to death. The provision in the "Tender Trap" bill is a significant improvement over other proposals which would be difficult for the animal to enforce. And, of course, the mental trauma of the trapped animal is probably as much to be regretted as the physical suffering.

These considerations, however, do not necessarily invalidate the "Tender Trap" and the Bay-Anderson bill approach to solving the trapping problem. Attempts have been made to insert tranquilizer tabs in the padding, to be ingested by the animal in its attempts to chew the padding and get away from the trap. However, even though this was probably a motive, and could be for the purpose of causing the animal to lie quietly until the trap was sprung or for a means of eliminating the animal on the spot.

Our sister society, Humane Information Service, has done extensive research on different drugs from the standpoint of their possible use in euthanizing trapped animals, and believes that many tranquilizers, as well as narcotics, would not be effective in preventing animals caught in the traps. One thing which must be guarded against is the tendency on the part of the general public to mistake people who are accustomed to capturing wild animals with so-called tranquilizing guns to a "sucy-cholcholine tranquilizing agent." As was explained fully in a recent issue of the "combination approach," the Bay-Anderson bill approach to solving the trapping problem, is probably as much to the advantage of animals alike, should be satisfied, except for one important condition. This condition is in that perhaps 90 percent of the suffering of an animal caught in any kind of a leghold trap, including the "Tender Trap," comes after the trap is sprung. It is the attempt to get away from the trap, rather than the actual closing of the trap's jaws, which creates the real cruelty involved in trapping. The animal may sprain ligaments or break a leg in its struggles to free itself. Or, it may bite its leg off or break one of its shoulders close to the jaws of the trap; this is called a "wring-off." A very substantial proportion of deaths of animals caught in leghold traps do wind up as wring-offs, which are unable to hunt or defend themselves effectively and frequently succumb to infection or being killed by a predator. Animals which remain in the traps, regardless of how "humanely" caught, may die from exposure or freeze to death. The provision in the "Tender Trap" bill is a significant improvement over other proposals which would be difficult for the animal to enforce. And, of course, the mental trauma of the trapped animal is probably as much to be regretted as the physical suffering.
Petersburg employs its own veterinarian to examine the animals in question, only 18 percent of the male dogs and 5 percent of the female cats, as compared with 37.5 percent of the female dogs, had 37.5 percent of its received are adopted out after the adjustment period. The data for cats are much lower than for dogs, and that this is particularly true of females. The adoption fees for female cats, as compared with the previous arrangements, so far as the adopter is concerned, are $12 for female dogs and $20 for female cats. This fee was collected at the time of adoption and was non-refundable if the cat was returned as unspayed. Seventy-five percent of the females who operate for this low fee under a contract with the SPCA. Thus, the only difference between the Clearwater and St. Petersburg SPCA arrangements, so far as the adopter is concerned, is a $6 higher charge for Clearwater charging system, at most in the latter case, is $25 for one or more of the reasons given in the table above. The data were not available for the SPCA of Clearwater, but they are for the SPCA of St. Petersburg. The County pound, on the other hand, does not require any spay fee. Of the 23 cats adopted during the period of adjustment, receipt of female adoptions represented by males and females, and that this is particularly true of females. The adoption data for the SPCA of St. Petersburg required, for all females adopted out by the shelter, in addition to the adoption fee and spay charge, a deposit of $50 for female dogs and $20 for female cats. This deposit and the spay charge constitute what would be accepted by any cooperating veterinarian as cash, and the dog or cat was spayed as soon as possible after adoption by the SPCA.

Early in 1971 the shelter inaugurated its own spay clinic, but only for female animals adopted from the shelter. It is a public clinic, and full charge for spaying was reduced to $15 for dogs and $10 for cats. This fee was collected at the time of adoption, in addition to the regular fee for shots and de-clawing. If the pet owner decided not to have the animal spayed, the deposit was refunded if and when evidence is given to the SPCA that the animal actually has been spayed. If the pet owner, therefore, was willing to spay the animal to a designated cooperating veterinarian for spaying. This veterinarian would be paid by the SPCA. Low-cost spay clinics do help to reduce the discrimination against females in the process of destroying the current surplus. Obviously, the price of spaying does affect the number of people willing to pay for this service. Low-cost spay clinics do help to increase neutering and hence to decrease the surplus of animals. The tremendous surplus of cats has forced many humane society shelters to adopt the practice of requiring spaying at the time of adoption. Yet, many shelters and pounds do not even take in cats. Community animal control programs, in most cases, are only at the shelters.
LETTERS TO THE EDITORS...

So many thought-provoking, constructive letters have been received since our last report that it might be possible to reproduce how many of them in our readers' letters. A few are quoted in the lead article in this issue, and others which relate to putting into practice the words you will find appear in future articles dealing with this subject.

We continue to receive letters commenting on our series of articles, "DO DELAYS IN REPLIES TO YOUR LETTERS.

You may add this to your collection of sharpest letters... Three months ago I wrote to you requesting some help and have yet to receive a reply. Kindly remove my name from your mailing list, as I consider your neglect inexcusable.

"You are performing a tremendously valuable service for all of us.
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