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At the recent National Conference on the Ecology of the Surplus Dog and Cat Problem, a misnomer, the term "surplus" is misleading, and that we should refer to "unwanted" rather than "surplus".

There will always be unwanted dogs and cats which must be disposed of — the American urban population is remarkably mobile. People move into apartments which do not accept pets, or from one area to another, or in some cases, from one owner to another. The high costs of adequately caring for pets in an urban environment, and the trouble involved in the care of pets, by young people and without the care and comfort of a relative or friend in a position to take them. Many or most of these suddenly unwanted animals are not very adoptable. Most people do not accept pets, or from one area to another.

NEED FOR PET FACILITIES WILL CONTINUE

Commercial breeders out of business. The shelters will be needed to care for the large and growing population. The ending of true surplus production will merely reduce the growing pressure on shelters, pounds and other existing animal control programs which would do a far better job of shelter operation, of highly important local humane society work which now are not even neglected, and of animal control operations which would be the core of the surplus control program itself. It is very important to note this, because some animal control operations have been unable to express reservations about drastic surplus control programs which might put them out of business and cut the need for their well-paid positions.

Legitimate breeders and pet shops would not be put out of business, either. Puppies and kittens would be needed to supply new pet owners, to supply breeders to whom the potential success of their work has become of genuine importance or are a source of social satisfactions, and to supply ordinary pet owners who wish their pets by death or other forces of displacement.

WHAT "SURPLUS CONTROL" MEANS

When we speak of pet animal surplus control, we refer to the elimination of the breeding of more puppies and kittens than are needed by the surplus population of pet owners. Legitimate breeders, or what is commonly known as "the fancy". We are talking about, not the elimination of all eunuchia of pet animals, which will always be necessary to care for the inevitable excess in the natural pet float, but the annual killing of millions of pet animals which were born to die, without a chance of being adopted into a good home. Nobody not contributing thoughtlessly or for greed to this totally unnecessary surplus production will be injured by an effective animal control program. All pet owners will be benefited because, in the absence of the surplus, pet animals will come to have a new, more accepted place in the community. And every person and agency in the business of providing services for pets and pet owners will be benefited, by taking their activities out of the "cheap" category and making them a respected part of the community.

"HUMANE EDUCATION" NOT THE ANSWER

Humanitarians have been talking for many years about the imperative need for eliminating the production of the surplus puppies and kittens.

First they became hipped on education of pet owners. The great need was believed to be getting the word to these pet owners about the existence of the surplus animals abandoned by pet owners no longer able to keep them, and to provide for impoundment of bite cases and the inevitable strays and their "wild" offspring which will otherwise be a serious menace and of what kind of animal control programs we may have.

On the issue of stopping the surplus production of puppies and kittens we really do not mean preventing any breeding, or putting shelters, pounds and these benighted animal owners were aware of these facts, it was assumed, they would act to correct the situation.

But for centuries preachers have inveighed against "sin" and to the crime of petty thievery, shoplifting, burglaries and purse snatchings seems to be continuously on the rise. The pet owners again to explain to the sinner the error of his ways may have some effect in some cases, but usually those who are in greatest need of such admonitions are those least receptive to them. "Humane education" as practiced in the past no doubt has made some pet owners more aware of the results of letting their animals breed, and has contributed to some slight extent to reducing the surplus, but obviously it is no answer whatever to the question of how to eliminate the surplus. For the pet population has been exploding almost in direct proportion to the amount of "education" dished out by humanitarians.

What should have become by this time an obvious fact, it still is highly fashionable in humane circles to finance any discussion about the surplus with a "humane education" program, in the name of animal control. We refer to the elimination of surplus pet animals in order to reduce the growing pressure on shelters, pounds and other existing animal control programs which we may have.
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The animals abandoned by pet owners no longer able to keep them, and to provide for impoundment of bite cases and the inevitable strays and their "wild" offspring which will otherwise be a serious menace regard
SPAY AND NEUTER CLINICS

WILL NOT DO THE JOB

Since the appearance in Report to Humanitarians of our two articles dealing with spay clinics and the pet population explosion, (both published in June, 1973) we have received some scathing denunciations for being "against low-cost public spay and neuter clinics and subsidized spaying". But not one attempt to rebut our position has been made, not even with facts and logic.

Actually, as we made clear in the articles, we are against low-cost spay and neuter programs. They are especially needed, possibly essential, as an education of the general public, pet owners and non-owners alike, and of local government officials, to the need for effective local pet animal control measures. Just one dollar spent on such education can accomplish more than a thousand dollars spent to make a pet owner realize his responsibilities."

The above photograph, which portrays so strikingly the horrors of the pet population explosion, is from the Monterey County (California) SPCA's spring, 1973, Quarterly News, edited by Lady Kinnoull, who is a countess as well as a most dedicated and accomplished humane society worker. This is one of the best humane society publications to be found anywhere.

ANTI-CRUELTY LAWS AND ENFORCEMENT

Humanitarians have been complaining bitterly for decades about the inadequacy of anti-cruelty laws which are state-wide in scope, but were passed really about a century ago, are agricultural rather than urban oriented, and usually can be enforced only by eliciting action on the part of a state's attorney, who considers any such case an unimportant nuisance item, and usually pays circuit court judges and juries.

In addition to the state laws and their cumbersome enforcement, we need local shelters and pounds. As we have shown in previous issues, these elements of the pet trade are responsible for a substantial part of the surplus.

This new ordinance, to be effective, cannot be merely an extension of some of the provisions of present ordinances. It must deal with the problem in an entirely new, unique, way. We must be able to put out of our minds past concepts of animal control, of what the public will and will not accept, and think in terms of broader approaches to a problem which already many communities are beginning to recognize as one of major local importance.

In communities where this recognition is not achieved, civic and public concern about the surplus and who really want to do more than mouth slogans must undertake an all-purpose educational campaign directed to local news media, churches, city and/or county officials, veterinarians, shelter and pound officials, pet owners, non-owners, and in general to the public.

This kind of an educational campaign, concentrated in a relatively short period of time, would be a hard job. But it could well be less—total time that the present sort of half-baked, halfhearted educational measure which spreads a pie over a long period of time that they get nowhere. Such can be accomplished quickly by an enthusiastic, all-out drive in which many elements of the community participate.

And it must be remembered that the task will be entirely eased by having at the start the support of a large part of the non-pet-owning households which would welcome any attempt to do what they have been urging for so long: bring roaming pets under control. The only really difficult part of the campaign would be selling the more sentimental animal lovers who cannot see the forest for the trees, the managements of shelters and pounds who dislike any disturbance of the even tenor of their ways, and the relatively small number of individuals involved who are concerned only about protecting their animal sources of income.

THE ONLY ANSWER

The only way to end the surplus production of puppies and kittens is to force pet owners to do what they have been persuaded to do through education and propaganda. Its provisions must cover, in addition to the effective local pet animal control ordinance, to the elimination of the surplus, (a) the "save-a-life"s. For this reason, if for no other, we would be warmly in favor of low-cost public spay programs.
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A Unified Pet Animal Control and Anti-Cruelty Program

OBJECTIVES

- Take animal control and welfare activities out of the "dog-catcher" category and give them a respected position in the community, by:
  a. Creating a Pet Animal Control Authority, with an executive director, controlled by a board which would include a representative of the humane society.
  b. Provide for the local humane society's full participation in animal control, if it so desires, by granting authority to the Board to contract all of the Authority's responsibilities to the humane society, for a fee.
  c. Provide for more adequate financing of animal control by retaining all license fees for such use, and substantially increasing the total amount of fees.
  d. For the first time, place cats on an equal footing with dogs in "surplus control" operations, by:
    a. Licensing cat ownership.
    b. Extending all discouragements of surplus production to cats.
    c. But making it unnecessary for cats to wear collars or identification tags.
  e. Reduce the production of surplus puppies and kittens, by:

SUGGESTED ORDINANCE

The (Council) (Commission) may appoint as the Board, the board of directors of a local humane society, which would exist in its dual capacity.

The Board at its first meeting in each calendar year shall select from its members a Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary, to hold these respective positions at the pleasure of the Board. The Board shall hold meetings at least three weeks in advance.

The Authority is authorized to charge a license fee of up to twenty-five dollars ($25.00) for each horse, goat or other large pet animal owned, except dogs and cats, the sum of fifty cents ($.50) . Such fees shall cover all pet animals owned.

The Authority may revoke said permits to own, raise, breed, sell, or cause to be sold, any dog, cat or other pet animal, in the absence of a Board member from more than three consecutive regular meetings of the Board or, in the case of a Board member, from more than three consecutive regular meetings of the Board, or in the absence of a Board member.

(a) As used in this Ordinance, the word "person" means any individual person, partnership, corporation, association or other legal entity; the word "owner" means any person who owns a pet animal; the term "licensed breeder" means an animal breeder having an occupational license as a business engaged in the breeding of purebred pet animals; the term "animal" shall mean any animal covered by the license fee provisions of Section II; the words "humanely" and "humanely" mean without avoidable suffering; the term "human society" means any non-profit incorporation, incorporated or otherwise, for the prevention of cruelty to animals and the promotion of animal welfare; the word "shelter" means any facility operated to receive, care for and dispose of unwanted pet animals; the term "Board" shall include all the members of the Board of Animal Control and Welfare.

(b) There is hereby created a Pet Animal Control Authority, hereinafter referred to as the Authority.

The Authority shall be controlled and operated by a Pet Animal Control Authority Board, hereinafter referred to as the Board. The Board shall consist of seven members, to be appointed by the Mayor with concurrence of the City Council (Board of County Commissioners). The seven members shall include one veterinarian, one employee of the (City) (County) (who may be an administrative employee of the Authority), one person nominated by the board of directors of a humane society, one licensed breeder, and one representative of the (City) (County) board of health. The remaining members of the Board shall be appointed from the general public, and shall be persons who have demonstrated an interest in and control of animal welfare problems.

Members of the Board shall hold office for the term of three years. If within one month prior to expiration of the three-year term of any Board member a successor has not been selected by the (Council) (Commission), the remaining members of the Board may appoint a person to fill the vacancy when it is created. Absence of a Board member from three consecutive regular meetings of the Board shall constitute automatic resignation, and any vacated member's place on the Board shall be filled as hereinafter provided.

(c) The Authority shall be operated by a staff, under the direction of a paid executive director who is to be appointed by the Board, and whose tenure shall be at the pleasure of the Board.

The Board shall be in charge of animal control and welfare programs, and the amendment of the ordinance affecting such programs. No Board member shall be a member of any humane society, or an employee of the humane society, unless appointed by the Authority.
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(d) The permit shall be for a period of one year, and the li-
cense fee shall be based on the total number of separate, indi-
vidual pet animals covered by this Section owned by the applicant for a permit at any time during the preceding 365 days.

(e) Pet owners may apply for a permit at offices designated by the Authority. Persons who, for reasons of public convenience, to "permit officers" appointed and paid by the Authority who may be assigned to visit homes, shops and other places where pet animals are usually kept: for the purpose of ascertaining the presence of any pet animal covered by the provisions of this Ordinance, the pet animal ownership and other pertinent information. Such permit officers are authorized to enter without warrant the premises of persons believed to own a pet, for the purpose of ascer-
taining the number of pet animals and the conditions of ownership pertinent to this Ordinance.

The Authority is authorized to pay a reasonable stipend or compensation to any officer or employee of the City who is engaged in making the inspections for the enforcement of this Ordinance. The permit officers shall be clothed with authority to bite to the person or property to be examined, and to seize any pet animal which is owned by or under the control of any person, public or private, not in accordance with the provisions of this Ordinance.

(f) Any person who the Authority has reason to believe may own one or more pet animals is required to furnish a signed statement giving appropriate information and answering questions propounded by the Authority or its authorized representative designated to deter-
mine whether the animal is owned, and to whom it may be sold, given, lent or otherwise disposed of under the provisions of this Ordinance. Any false statement so made shall be a violation of this Section and subject to the penalty thereof.

(g) Any permit to own a dog shall be evidenced, in addition to the permit certificate, by a metal tag which is to be attached to a collar to be worn by the dog at all times when not on the propri-
est premises of the owner. The number of the tag shall be numbered to correspond with the number of the certificate.

(h) License fees collected pursuant to this Section shall be used solely to pay the expenses of the Board and of the Authority in administering the provisions of this Ordinance.

(i) Animals owned by anyone in violation of the provisions of this Section may be immediately impounded by the Authority or its designated representative.

(j) Any permit to own pet animals issued by the Authority in conformance with this Section may be revoked at any time follow-
ing a finding by the Authority that the owner is not in confor-
mance with any of its authorized regulations and the provisions of this Ordinance.

SECTION III. Humane Treatment of Animals.

(a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the (City) (County) that pet animals shall be treated humanely, and shall be humanely fed, watered, protected from the elements and cared for.

(b) No permit shall be issued under Section II to anyone not providing humane treatment as specified in paragraph (a) above unless the permit to be issued under this Section shall be numbered to correspond with the number of the certificate.

(c) Any permit to own pet animals issued by the permit officers, or by anyone to whom a permit previously has been issued, is not treated in accordance with the provisions of this Section, it shall be subject to immediate impoundment.

(d) No person shall beat, torment, inflict injury on, neglect, abandon, fail to provide humane shelter or sustenance for, or otherwise mistreat, or fail to provide humane transportation by any animal, or cause or permit any dog fight, cock fight or other combat between animals, or between man and animal. No person shall sell any chicks, ducklings or rabbits under eight (8) weeks of age for use as food, or as a pet, except in the case of a pet store, utilizing for bona fide breeding purposes by a licensed breeder.

(e) Pet ownership may be allowed by anyone except humane society shelters, licensed medical researchers, or any other animal welfare organizations as approved by the Authority.

IV. Impoundment and disposition of animals.

(a) All pet animals shall be kept under restraint.

(b) The Authority and its designated agents are hereby autho-
rized to impound any pet animal not under restraint, or for which a permit to own has not been issued, or which is owned by anyone in violation of any provision of this Ordinance.

(c) The Authority is authorized to accept impoundment any unwanted pet animal covered by the provisions of this Ordinance which is turned over to it by its owner or by anyone finding such pet animal other than on the premises of its licensed owner. The acceptance of any pet animal by the Authority shall be without recourse by its owner, whose act of failing to keep the pet animal under restraint shall be prima facie evidence that the pet animal is abandoned. The Authority is authorized to impound, provided, that if an animal kept under restraint by its owner is offered for impound-
ment by any other person, the latter shall be deemed guilty of a violation of this Section and the animal shall be returned to the owner without charge if able to furnish proof of such circum-
stances.

(d) The Authority is authorized to establish facilities for impoundment with suitable buildings, equipment and personnel, for the purpose of impounding any animals under the provisions of Authority's other duties, with suitable compensation. The choice of these two alternatives shall be made by the Board. In either event, the facility shall be known as the Pet Animal Control Cen-
ter. The public is invited to use the society's name and designation as a humane shelter.

(e) Animals impounded shall be held for a minimum period of seven (7) days, except for those animals that are badly injured or diseased, or which have been relinquished to the Authority by their owner.

Any animal impounded that has bitten a person or animal shall be impounded for such period as may be declared necessary by the (City) (County) board of health.

(f) Any impounded animal not previously disposed of by the Au-
thority under the provisions of paragraphs (g), (h) and (i) of this Section may be redeemed by its owner by payment of an im-
poundment and boarding fee to be determined by the Authority, ex-
cited to cover all costs involved with the impoundment of the animal. If an animal is impounded for the purpose of humane treatment and is not redeemed by its owner, such animal shall be given or sold to a biomedical laboratory or to a dealer in animals.

(h) No impounded female dog or cat is to be given away or sold unless it has been spayed, or in the case of puppies and kittens, not more than six (6) months of age. Every spayed female or neutered male pet animal shall be treated humanely, and shall be treated as such by the Authority, inflicted injury on, neglect, abandon, fail to provide humane shelter or sustenance for, or otherwise mistreat, or fail to provide humane transportation by any animal, or cause or permit any dog fight, cock fight or other combat between animals, or between man and animal. No person shall sell any chicks, ducklings or rabbits under eight (8) weeks of age for use as food, or as a pet, except in the case of a pet store, utilizing for bona fide breeding purposes by a licensed breeder.

(i) Any impounded animal not disposed of in accordance with the provisions of this Section shall be humanely disposed of by the Authority.

SECTION V. Control of surplus breeding.

(a) The (City) (County) has determined that uncontrolled breeding of the (City) (County) has determined that uncontrolled breeding of the production of many more puppies and kittens than is desired for replacement of pet animals which have died or been lost, and to provide pet animals for new owners. Those leads to many pet ani-
mals which are unwanted, become unmanageable, and are later abandoned or donated to the (City) (County) that every possible effort is made to dispose of them to a holder who is not the owner, shall be a violation of this Ordinance, and the Authority is authorized to again impound the animal without any im-
poundment to the person in violation.

(b) The Board is directed and authorized to effect an arrange-
ment with licensed veterinarians in the (City) (County) to pro-
nounce any unspayed female dogs and cats or puppies and kittens in the (City) (County), the importation into the (City) (County) of any unspayed female dogs and cats or puppies and kittens for resale is prohibited, unless the said animal is to be used for bona fide breeding purposes by a licensed breeder.

(c) As an alternative means of effectuating a reduction in the number of dogs and cats, the Authority may establish a public spay clinic at the Pet Animal Control Cen-
ter, utilizing for that purpose any funds available to it.

(d) The Authority is hereby authorized to appoint humane offi-
cers whose duties shall be to enforce the provisions of this Or-
dinance, and to have access to the property of any person to inspect premises of pet animal owners to determine if any violation of this Ordinance has occurred, without any court order or warrant, and shall have the authority of a law enforcement officer to ar-
rrest without warrant persons believed to be in violation of this Ordinance.

SECTION VI. Penalties for violations.

(a) Violation of any provision of this Ordinance shall be a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not to exceed three hundred dollars ($300.00) or three (3) months in jail, or both.* (*Note: although the maximum permissible penalty is stated, authority cannot exceed those provided for misdemeanors under state law.)

(b) The Authority is hereby authorized to appoint humane offi-
cers whose duties shall be to enforce the provisions of this Or-
dinance, and to have access to the property of any person to inspect premises of pet animal owners to determine if any violation of this Ordinance has occurred, without any court order or warrant, and shall have the authority of a law enforcement officer to ar-
rrest without warrant persons believed to be in violation of this Ordinance.
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS about the PROPOSED UNIFIED PET ANIMAL CONTROL ORDINANCE

We sent copies of the first draft of the proposed Ordinance given in the preceding article to a number of people who are experienced in this field. The following are responses to questions and comments received, and to other possible questions that may arise.

QUESTION

It seems to me that the major difference between animal licensing and owner licensing is to be found in your inclusion of cats as well as dogs and kittens.

ANSWER

No, this is not the difference between animal and owner licensing. Cats and other pet animals can be licensed under either system.

QUESTION

What then, is the essential difference?

ANSWER

(1) When the animal is licensed, failure to obtain a license is punished by an impoundment of the unlicensed animal. The animal, not the owner, is the one who suffers. With owner licensing, if the owner fails to license each animal and pay the license fee on each one, he violates the Ordinance and is subject not only to the penalty of impoundment, but also to a fine and jail. That is an entirely different story.

(2) With owner licensing, it is necessary to catch, identify and impound the animal in order to penalize the owner, whereas under animal licensing it is necessary only that the owner own an unlicensed animal, or did own during the preceding year, the animal in question. In the case of a licensing ordinance, this may be done by the testimony of neighbors or other indirect evidence. The animal does not have to be caught and impounded.

(3) Under this Ordinance, each pet owner must make an annual written declaration of the number of pets owned during the preceding year. Failing to make a false statement in this declaration would be a violation of the Ordinance, a misdemeanor subject to fines and imprisonment. It is like preparing and signing a federal income tax statement. Some pet owners might wish merely to state that they own the number of animals but experience with tax returns indicates most declerants would not fudge.

QUESTION

Why complicate animal control by putting pigs, pigeons, cats, rabbits, etc., into the Ordinance and requiring a small license fee for them?

ANSWER

For three reasons:

(1) This reduces the number of households owning no pets. The owners of even one rabbit must make and sign the declaration. In so doing he must list all other pets that he owns, to the penalty of impoundment. The inclusion of all pet animals helps greatly to get a declaration. For example, when the animal lover on the person who would like to evade the tax, the latter might say, "Oh, we own a dog or cat to keep the rats out of the basement, and we don't want anything to get into the garbage "bake" of the cannasseur, who may be paid a commission or on a "per pes" basis. This gives the opportunity to avoid not to make a predatory canvaissier.

(2) Small pets of this kind have feelings, just as do dogs and cats. By including them in the Ordinance, they are covered by all of its provisions about humane care and treatment. We should not be just dog and cat lovers.

QUESTION

You seem to think your proposed Ordinance is unique. But other societies also have suggested licensing owners and other

ANSWER

True. Our proposed Ordinance draws on both the experience and proposals of others. But nowhere else, we believe, will you find an Ordinance which brings together in one package both animal control and animal welfare provisions, which includes breeders and pet shops, and which has an additional possible practical elimination of the pet animal surplus in a comparatively short time.

QUESTION

Do not oppose your idea of county and city regulations combined, or argue that the general effectiveness. A state law controlling breeders and animals ignores local boundaries.

ANSWER

The proposed Ordinance is not intended to supplant state control laws, such as the excellent one of Illinois and the proposed one of California. The fact that cities and counties have ordinances dealing with crime does not prevent the state and federal governments from establishing and regulating pet shops and breeders. But no state law or regulatory body could possibly hope to deal with all the individual pet owners. An Ordinance of this kind could be done. In only this way can we hope to deal effectively with the pet shops and breeders, and to subject pets to the same rate of taxation as domestic animals. Breeders contribute significantly to the surplus, but we undoubtedly cannot hope to succeed by devoting all our attention to them.

QUESTION

I like most parts of your proposed Ordinance, but other parts would be difficult to get accepted in this community.

ANSWER

That is the principal reason why no animal control effort to date have been successful in eliminating the surplus. That is why the following idea: To accomplish its main purpose, the proposed Ordinance would have to include at least the provisions of Sections II and IV without radical change.

QUESTION

In my opinion, no animal control ordinance can deal successfully with cats. They cannot be caught and impounded if unlicensed. And they cannot be safely reared to wear collars and tags. And many cat lovers would object violently. 

ANSWER

We have tried to license cats. Some have done so, successfully including Seattle, Washington.

QUESTION

Fea is the number of households owning no pets. The owners of even one rabbit must make and sign the declaration. In so doing he must list all other pets that he owns, to the penalty of impoundment. The inclusion of all pet animals helps greatly to get a declaration. For example, when the animal lover on the person who would like to evade the tax, the latter might say, "Oh, we own a dog or cat to keep the rats out of the basement, and we don't want anything to get into the garbage "bake" of the cannasseur, who may be paid a commission or on a "per pes" basis. This gives the opportunity to avoid not to make a predatory canvaissier.

(2) Small pets of this kind have feelings, just as do dogs and cats. By including them in the Ordinance, they are covered by all of its provisions about humane care and treatment. We should not be just dog and cat lovers.

QUESTION

You seem to think your proposed Ordinance is unique. But other societies also have suggested licensing owners and other

ANSWER

True. Our proposed Ordinance draws on both the experience and proposals of others. But nowhere else, we believe, will you find an Ordinance which brings together in one package both animal control and animal welfare provisions, which includes breeders and pet shops, and which has an additional possible practical elimination of the pet animal surplus in a comparatively short time.

QUESTION

Do not oppose your idea of county and city regulations combined, or argue that the general effectiveness. A state law controlling breeders and animals ignores local boundaries.

ANSWER

The proposed Ordinance is not intended to supplant state control laws, such as the excellent one of Illinois and the proposed one of California. The fact that cities and counties have ordinances dealing with crime does not prevent the state and federal governments from establishing and regulating pet shops and breeders. But no state law or regulatory body could possibly hope to deal with all the individual pet owners. An Ordinance of this kind could be done. In only this way can we hope to deal effectively with the pet shops and breeders, and to subject pets to the same rate of taxation as domestic animals. Breeders contribute significantly to the surplus, but we undoubtedly cannot hope to succeed by devoting all our attention to them.

QUESTION

I like most parts of your proposed Ordinance, but other parts would be difficult to get accepted in this community.

ANSWER

That is the principal reason why no animal control effort to date have been successful in eliminating the surplus. That is why the following idea: To accomplish its main purpose, the proposed Ordinance would have to include at least the provisions of Sections II and IV without radical change.

QUESTION

In my opinion, no animal control ordinance can deal successfully with cats. They cannot be caught and impounded if unlicensed. And they cannot be safely reared to wear collars and tags. And many cat lovers would object violently. 

ANSWER

We have tried to license cats. Some have done so, successfully including Seattle, Washington.

QUESTION

Few have tried to license cats. Some have done so, successfully including Seattle, Washington.

ANSWER

Few have tried to license cats. Some have done so, successfully including Seattle, Washington.

QUESTION

You have long advocated a higher license fee for cats as well as dogs. "Keep under restraint".

ANSWER

So is restraint of dogs and rabbits. Actually, cats can be kept indoors more easily than dogs. They adapt easily to little pens. The majority of owners of cats let them outdoors is not to provide the cat with an opportunity to roam and get run over, chew up, and full of fleas and lice, but for their own convenience.

QUESTION

When Governor of Illinois Adlai Stevenson vetoed a bill that would have imposed fines on owners of stray animals allowed to run unleashed at large, he said: "It is in the nature of cats to do a certain amount of uncontrolled roaming. I am afraid this bill could only encourage evidence of and empyema.

ANSWER

Our answer to that is that it is in the nature of cats to do, by breeders and pet shops, and which has an additional possible practical elimination of the pet animal surplus in a comparatively short time.

QUESTION

One of the reasons there is so much opposition to cat restraint that passage of the Ordinance is endangered, the application of restraint to cats can be lifted. But let us start with what is right.

ANSWER

Mrs. Ann Little, of Hendersonville, North Carolina, has no difficulty keeping her several cats "under restraint". A simple, relatively inexpensive wire enclosure accessible from the "cat door" provides all of the cat amenities: climbing perches, scratching posts, and a "cat bathroom". The cats are free to climb and gambol, without the danger of being run over and without annoying neighbors who love their gardens more than cats.

QUESTION

Four dollars per dog or cat seems a little high. The animal lover who takes in all the stray cats or dogs that come to her door may have 15 or 20 cats under her care at one time. At four dollars a head this would amount to $60 to $80 a year.

ANSWER

These kindhearted people think they are helping to deal with the problem of unwanted pet animals, when actually they are helping to perpetuate the problem. The consequence, frequently, are so anxious to find homes for these stray cats, they have taken in that they will give them to people who are not prepared to provide the animals with a good home, or will permit them to continue breeding. They may then be passed on to the females or require by the new owners.

QUESTION

These kindhearted people think they are helping to deal with the problem of unwanted pet animals, when actually they are helping to perpetuate the problem. The consequence.

ANSWER

Mrs. Ann Little, of Hendersonville, North Carolina, has no difficulty keeping her several cats "under restraint". A simple, relatively inexpensive wire enclosure accessible from the "cat door" provides all of the cat amenities: climbing perches, scratching posts, and a "cat bathroom". The cats are free to climb and gambol, without the danger of being run over and without annoying neighbors who love their gardens more than cats.
new Ordinance, you make such a different- 
ial optional with the Pet Animal Control 
Board. How come?

ANSWER
The answer to your question is found in 
the following comment on our proposed 
Ordinance by Ms. Katherine K. Billman, 
Commissioner of the Seattle Department 
of Licenses and Consumer Affairs, which 
amines the progressive animal control ordinance of the City of Seattle-

The initial license rate schedule has been very 
satisfactory, perhaps because of a long-
practiced and generally accepted neighborhood canvassing program. If this is a 

cause of our success then communities without such a canvassing program might 
not be able to implement a schedule.

QUESTION
Why complicate the Ordinance with a Pet 
Animal Control Board and Authority? Why 
not give responsibility for administering 
the Ordinance to some existing city or 
county department, such as the board of 
health?

ANSWER
Humane societies have experienced all 

kinds of frustrations in trying to deal 

with local animal control officials and depart-
ments in effecting improvements in the 
pound or animal control programs will not 

have to ask that question. Police, health 

officials, and courts look to us for look on 
animal control almost solely as a means of 
caring for animal nuisances and health 

hazards. The law has usually left the hu-
mane treatment, and only mildly in stop-

ping the production of surplus puppies and kittens. Inexperience and jealousy-protected lines of authority which cannot be budged to accomplishing 
something worthwhile.

The proposed Board and Authority would 
sidestep such hamstringing affiliations, 
and give authority to a broad-based group of non-profit, non-commercial individuals, 
in which city departments, veterinarians and other interested groups as well as the hu-
mane organizations themselves will be unable to dominate the administration of the 

Ordinance.

However, we recognize the common sense 

truth in a statement made by Ms. Billman 
of Seattle in commenting on our Ordinance: 

"I noticed that phrases such as 'which 

base,' 'benefits,' and 'will not' appear in 

several places. Unlike many other model 

ordinances, yours recognizes that 'cannot' 

provisions are based on common sense 

without regard to existing laws, prevail-

ing local attitudes, political structure, 

social pressures, and the interests of 

people. The Ordinance recognizes that 

the humane publican is not 'entitled to 

the diversity among the types of ani-

mal problems faced by these communities' 

therefore he 'best way' to approach an-

imal control and welfare.'

Nevertheless, we suggest that anyone 

trying to obtain passage of an effective 

pet animal control ordinance either drop 

the line as much as possible. To wind up 

with only half an ordinance may result in 

less than one of the Animal Control 

Board and Authority.

In a few cities or counties an accept-

able substitute for the Board and Authori-
ty already is available. In Seattle, for 


example, administration of animal 

control is under the Department of Licenses and 

Consumer Affairs headed by a woman direc-

tor.

QUESTION
Should not the terms of the Pet Animal 

Control Board be staggered?

ANSWER
There would be disadvantages. We 

suggest, however, that an occasion may 
arise when Board members fail to adopt 

pet animal control ordinances subsequent to 

the provisions of the Ordinance, and it may be desirable to "clean house." This can be done at the 
end of any three-year period, by putting 

quite a long time to have sufficient turn-

over of unsatisfactory members.

QUESTION
In your Ordinance, proof of rabies in-
oculation before the permit is issued is 

required for dogs only. I would suggest 

that the ordinance be extended to cats. 

The incidence of rabies in domestic ani-
meats is again increasing. Because 

household pets at times come in contact with 

wild animals such as skunks and rac-

coons, and since cats are as likely, if 

not more likely, to come in contact with such 

animals, their inoculation should also be 

required.

ANSWER
But under the provisions of our 

proposed Ordinance, pets other than dogs 

would have to be confined. Granted, it is 

much more difficult to enforce this provision 

for cats, and in the case of the ordina-

tance for cats would cover only unusu-

al cases, as following complaints from 

neighbors about regular cat depredations. 

Humane Information Services goes along 

with the requirement for rabies inocula-
tion of dogs, which account for most of the 

bite cases in our state (see E9 something •

Fl. Law S:ta:te 8 2 8. 0 3 ) •

The foregoing all-too-incomplete 

summa-

tion of the provisions of the Ordinance are hereby repealed . If any 

part of this Ordinance shall be held by 

the courts to be invalid, such part shall 

be of no force or effect.

ANSWER
Not the non-pet-owners, who would be 

protected from animal nuisances. Not the 

veterinarians who might deal with one of the 

kind who is "spooked" by more mention of the 

term "low-cost spaying," and does not read 
carefully the terms of Section VI(b) . Not 

from pet shops and individuals.

Pet shops, which have been contributing 

without hindrance to the surplus, possibly 

would object, although they are so vulner-

able to elimination altogether that the risk 

therefor discrimination would seem to be the 

better part of valor. But the well-managed, 

humanely-minded shop would probably be 

accurately interfered with and it would be 
easy to deal with this opposition at any 

public hearing or in the press.

The kind of backseat driver who is 

just out for the fast buck, breeding with-

out regard for the existing market for 

puppies and kittens, might well be 

easily silenced. If he is not over-

breeding, and produces quality animals, 

the surplus of surplus puppies and kittens 

and other costs per animal will not hurt him.

So, the kind of opposition that is most 

likely, most vocal and most difficult to 

oppose is the local, strong-political, expan-
sional, explosive animal lover who already 

has his or her mind made up, is consis-
tently against anything that would 

make pet ownership more difficult or costly.

SURPLUS — FROM PAGE 2

How local law enforcement agencies more 
directly responsible to the local 
people. The pet animal control ordinance 
provides a convenient and appropriate 
vehicle for achieving this important humane 
objective.

YOU ARE ASKED TO DO THIS

The foregoing all-too-incomplete sum-

mary constitutes the justification and 

rationale for the proposed pet animal control ordinance described in detail in 

this Report. We realize that many humani-

tarians claim to have such a short atten-

tion span that they never read anything 

and don't bother to read carefully anything so de-

tailed and relatively complicated, which 

the humane movement continues to be 

affiliated with innocuous humane publica-
tions and simplistic, ineffective pro-

grams.

Fortunately, most of the readers of 

Report to Humane have shown them-

selves to be made of sterner and more in-

tent stuff. We will assume you to read 
carefully all of the accompanying arti-

cles about the proposed pet animal control 

ordinance, and then act on the basis 

of the local humane circles to do likewise.

Then, the local society might well hold a semi-

cially, discussion group to discuss the 

ordinance, and please keep us informed.

ORDINANCE — FROM PAGE 4

SECTION VII.

Revenue and appropriations.

Conflicts. Severability.

(a) There is hereby created the Pet 

Animal Control Fund. All fees collected un-

der this Ordinance shall be deposited in the 

(City) (County) treasury to the credit of the 

Fund. All such money in the Fund is hereby 

appropriated to be used by the Board and by the 

personnel authorized by the Board, in carrying out 

the provisions of this Ordinance, including payment of sala-

dary and other expenses incidental thereto. If any 

part of this Ordinance shall be held by 

the courts to be invalid, such part shall 

be deemed severable and the invalidity
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A comprehensive article dealing with a complicated subject such as a pet animal control measure has two main objectives:

(1) To stimulate thinking about a very important phase of human work, and to bring together different facts and considerations which must be taken into account in order to reach sound conclusions about alternative programs.

(2) To serve as the basis for a specific action suggested by the article.

We know the accompanying articles relating to our proposed Pet Animal Control Ordinance, which is the first of two objectives. For example, Mrs. Katherine D. Dillman, of the Seattle Department of Licenses and Consumer Affairs, which has responsibility for enforcement of its pet animal control ordinance, commenting on the first draft of our proposed ordinance states: "...the proposal has a great deal of merit and will be used as reference material as Seattle continues to redraft its current, scattered body of ordinances into one comprehensive package."

But Seattle is already far in advance of most communities in its pet animal control work. Many places are just now, and very much need a basic approach to these problems. We hope that some of our readers will be able to take steps necessary in obtaining adoption of our "model ordinance", as a demonstration to others that it is practical and effective.

Won't you let us have your own reactions to this proposal, and also let us know if you intend trying to do something about it. If you would prefer to discuss the problem further, why don't you come with the entire proposal, or with some parts of it? So, please read the whole article carefully, then write and let us know what you think.

ABOUT THE WHITTELL ESTATE

Some of our members have heard about a substantial bequest which has been granted by the trustees of the George Whittell estate to Humane Information Services, although none of this money has been received yet.

We are pleased, indeed, that the trustees, after a thorough investigation of the activities of humane societies in the United States, have so honored us. These grants were not made in response to any specific appeal of our officers appearing in some legal notice, but after careful consideration by the trustees of written briefs submitted by applicants, personal visits by the trustees to our main office facilities, and long discussions with the society managements.

Each grant is earmarked for certain humane animals by the society, and for providing needed additional building space in accordance with a specific requirement of the will. When the trustees decided that our need for additional office space was extremely evident, we have grown to the point where we can not only use, but are in need of, filling cabinets or equipment, and even the president has a private office for discussion of confidential matters.

Nobody in the humane movement needs additional space more than HIS, and we are fortunate, indeed, that Mr. Whittell is interested in the humane movement.

None of the grant which will be received by Humane Information Services can be used for the repayment of debts, or any other general purpose, which must continue to be met from the regular dues and contributions of its members.

So, if you have heard about this bequest and received the impression that we were now in financial clover, please understand that we are just as much in need of your dues and contributions as ever.

This is indicated by our operating statement for the first six months of 1974, shown below. Although income for this period exceeded expenses by $1,460.11, which was entirely because we received a "final accounting" grant of $4,000.00 from a foundation which had been giving us $1,000.00 a year in the past, and which we will no longer receive. This $4,000.00 must be spread over the entire year 1974 and the first half of 1975 if we are to avoid a serious deficit. Actually, our regular, expected-to-receive dues and contributions are more than $3,000.00 below our minimum operating expenses, and any difference has been made up by drawing on income from the "emergency nest egg" which Dog gave to the society during the first year if ever it is needed. However, this is not a matter of concern because the "emergency fund" is always ample to take care of any emergency, even a large one, and we have been working toward the goal of a "Just-About-Nothing" fund, which was the result of hard work, won the respect and support of the public and the profession.

In the opinion of Humane Information Services, any shelter or pound which does not provide any kind of pickup service is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>$4,450.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>$4,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expense</td>
<td>845.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Expense</td>
<td>375.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>243.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>809.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>559.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>436.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Maintenance</td>
<td>155.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance, etc.</td>
<td>160.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>120.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>282.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on Foreign Exchange</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>197.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$7,868.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Net Worth</td>
<td>$4,002.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>$10,146.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Recurring</th>
<th>$436.14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Recurring Expenditures and Contributions</td>
<td>$436.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or Estates</td>
<td>4,013.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>611.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,146.97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HUMANE INFORMATION SERVICES, INC.

Operating Statement

January 1 through June 30, 1974

**Income**

$5,321.80

**Expenses**

$4,450.00

**Net Income**

$8,688.86

**Balance on Hand**

$10,146.97

**NOTICE**

PET ANIMAL CONTROL ORDINANCE

Any shelter or pound on our mailing list has tried to comply with the requirements for pickups, we greatly appreciate hearing from you, giving as many details as possible. If you should wish for pounds which does not provide any kind of pickup service is

**PLEASE LET US KNOW**

If any shelter or pound on our mailing list has tried to comply with the requirements for pickups, we greatly appreciate hearing from you, giving as many details as possible. If you should wish for pounds which does not provide any kind of pickup service is

**LETTER TO THE EDITOR...**

LIKE A MOUTHWASH?

I truly can't say I enjoy your paper. It is full of many things that I would like not to believe or accept. Yet your objectivity has forced me to change my number of previous ideas and open to new ones. Your paper, once advertised on TV--I hate it, but I use it! I close a check which makes me a patron member.--Mrs. Hobart S. Johnson, Woodside, California.

**REPLY**

It tastes better as you continue using. Most people know instinctively when they are having their legs pulled, and prefer the truth even if it sometimes hurts.

AND STILL MORE ON FLEAS

"Please, at your earliest convenience, send more specific details (all fleas, except dogs and cats). How about ticks? Worms? Would it have a detrimental effect if a dog is on medication for heartworms? Please send whatever information you have available. I have several people and one very young puppy who all need help. Thank you."—Ms. Patti Bylands, Miami Springs, Florida.

**REPLY**

We have no veterinarian on our staff, and cannot undertake to give professional advice on these matters. The letter from one of our readers, who claims that a brown yeast works. We asked several vets about it. One pooch-pooed the idea. And we feel he had good sense and know-how, but couldn't give no scientific reason why it would work. Maybe Dr. Schnelle, who wrote us about flea collars, will write again about brown yeast. Come on, Doc! So, all we can do is suggest that you consult your local or your national veterinary association. And to the lady who sent us that first letter about fleas, several years ago, a plague on your household! You really stink up something.

MASSACHUSETTS LAW BANS LEGHOLD TRAP!

As we go to press, word has been received that the Governor of Massachusetts has signed into law S. 1879, as amended by a Senate-House conference committee. The Act prohibits "the use of steel-jaw leghold traps" except "in or under buildings", which exception is intended to allow for pest control, and except for under-water sets in which "all reasonable care is taken to insure that the mammal dies by drowning within a reasonable length of time". The Act also prohibits other devices set in such a manner as to "knowingly cause continued suffering to any animal", or take it alive unhurt, except that such devices may be used upon special authorization by the Natural Resources Committee, which voted to give such authorization to the Humane Information Services, Inc., St. Petersburg, Florida 33705. We hope that some of our members will set such traps and report to us, giving as many details as possible.

This Act becomes effective July 1, 1975. It appears from information received by HIS that passage of this Act is attributable almost solely to constant, daily lobbying by Mrs. Dorothy C. O'Brien, of Belchertown, Massachusetts, ably assisted by a few supporters led by Mrs. Sandra Schawbel, of Newton. The bill first was acted upon in executive session by the Natural Resources Committee, which voted to give it "in effect, to a "study committee". But Mrs. O'Brien did not give up and, by sheer persistence and hard work, won the respect and support of the committee members. Legislators to have the bill recalled, revised and passed by both houses. That is the result of dedication, know-how, and expenditure of time and money, required to pass worthwhile state legislation. Our hats are off to Mrs. O'Brien.

HELLO AND GOOD-BYE!

In July, Humane Information Services was happy to add to its staff a new assistant to the president, Stephen H. Byrd, who had been serving as a director and volunteer staff member of the Mississippi Animal Rescue League.

The League has a new, partly completed shelter in Jackson, heretofore operated entirely by volunteers. However, the directors of the League found that the shelter was small for their needs, and persuaded Mr. Byrd to return to Jackson for this purpose.

Humane Information Services regrets losing the services of Mr. Byrd, who is one of the more promising of the younger generation of dedicated humanitarians, but who did not wish to stand in the way of effective development of the League's shelter and state-wide program. We expect...