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In order for any program of dog-owner education to be practically acceptable, it is important to keep legislative changes to a minimum. I would propose only one major change: that dog owners be required to apply for a license before obtaining a dog. At the time of application the prospective owner could be supplied with an information package containing advice on dog behavior, training and husbandry. In this fashion, the owner would receive relevant information at a time when it would be most beneficial. The first few months of a puppy’s life are crucial. This is the time when experiences are new and exert a maximal effect on shaping the dog’s personality. All too often, owners discover this fact when it is much too late. For example, some dog-training books instruct owners not to begin training until the dog is 4-6 months old… utter nonsense! At the latest, training should commence as soon as the puppy comes into the home. Owners should also be instructed on how to prevent the development of overly aggressive and/or destructive tendencies. The mandatory early license application would, it is hoped, help identify impulse buying and the giving of puppies as unsolicited pets. In addition, the foreknowledge of what to expect from a dog and how to prevent or correct annoying behavior problems would help to make the dog-human relationship more enjoyable for both parties.

I would not advocate raising the license fee substantially in the U.S., but it is essential that there be better licensing controls. Licensing could be easily and effectively controlled by a) making it illegal to sell or give a dog to anyone who has not already applied its educational efforts for a license; b) encouraging people who regularly come into contact with dogs (e.g., veterinarians, trainers, groomers, animal control officers) to report those that are unlicensed; and c) imposing an escalating scale of fines for license dodgers and dog owners who regularly fail to adhere to other local ordinances.

Such a program would require the cooperation of a number of large organizations. It would be nice to see the humane societies and SPCAs lose their present major role as extermination facilities and instead be allowed to administer the licensing program along with animal control agencies and to concentrate on education. At the time of license application, the prospective owner would be given a registration card, which would later be signed by a veterinarian when the pups receive their shots. (Subsequent mandatory, periodic injections would also be recorded on the card.) When the full quota of puppy shots has been administered and before the dog is no more than four months of age, the owner may obtain the dog license tag. The collar tag could be color-coded to facilitate the identification of expired licenses. Thereafter, the license could be renewed every two or three years so as to ease the administrative burden. The time of issuance of the initial license tag would be an ideal opportunity to test the owner’s comprehension of the information package. This could be in the form of a series of multiple choice questions much like the written test for obtaining a driver’s license. Although a low score on the test should not necessarily be used to prevent someone from owning a dog, the test would allow the licensing authority to concentrate its educational efforts on potentially poor pet owners. (However, in Toronto, I believe that people are not allowed to adopt a pet if they fail to qualify as responsible pet owners after completing a questionnaire.)

The aims of the animal control agencies (sometimes acting with the humane societies and SPCAs) would be first, to selectively remove unlicensed dogs, and second, to control the licensed population. The latter task should emphasize a quality care and educational program and preferential treatment for licensed dogs. For example, owners of lost or impounded dogs would be notified immediately if the dog is properly tagged. An unlicensed animal would be kept for a specified time, and if not claimed, euthanized as a public health hazard (no evidence of rabies injections), whereas a licensed dog would be kept for a longer period. There should be a sliding scale of fines, with the highest fines for unlicensed animals, or for allowing aggressive dogs or estrous females to run freely. On the other hand, if an owner fails to adhere to local ordinances, e.g., by letting the dog go unleashed, the fine could be minimal (perhaps only a warning), provided the owner is present and the dog is under control, or the dog is close to home and otherwise well-behaved.

Of course the question remains: Where is the money going to come from? I believe that with a potential two- or threefold increase in license revenue and with a swinging increase in fines, the licensing program may well turn out to be self-supporting. However, money will definitely be needed to get the program off the ground and to finance the information package. I feel that the Pet Food Institute, or individual pet food companies, would be ideally suited for this privilege. This is not because I believe the pet food industry should feel responsible because they realize millions of dollar profit from the dog-owning public. (I think it is mainly the responsibility of pet owners if they see fit to spend that much money on pet foods each year.) Instead, I feel that financing the program would be in the best interests of the pet food industry. It would most certainly bring them some good press, and the opportunity to publish an accurate information booklet that would reach every dog owner is an ideal advertising platform for their products.

---
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There has been increasing public concern in the U.K. and other European countries about some of the intensive methods of livestock production used in modern agriculture. The battery system of egg production, which produces almost all of the eggs consumed in Britain, has aroused particular opposition, but there is also strong feeling about housing systems which effectively immobilize...
their inhabitants, such as certain types of veal calf and pig rearing units. In a test-case in West Germany recently, an egg producer was charged with "continuous cruelty" by his 60,000 strong battery flock. A high court decided that it was cruel to deprive the birds of the ability to follow their behavioral instincts to scratch, preen and stretch their wings. This ruling cannot, however, be regarded as final.

The effects of such production techniques on the quality of life of the animals involved have led some interest groups to campaign for changes in the British Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Codes of Practice relating to animal welfare. More restrictive codes are sought which would limit the methods of production available to the farmer by preventing the use of certain aspects of popular intensive systems. It is generally agreed that the costs of producing livestock products affected by these proposed restrictions would rise, although it is not clear by how much. It is not difficult to understand how this increase in costs might come about.

Farmers, just like other businessmen, attempt to produce a saleable product at the least possible cost to themselves. In this way they hope to assure themselves of some profit, and hence to earn a living. In itself this profit motive cannot be criticized, but in attempting to maintain their profits, farmers have adopted more intensive systems of animal production. In turn, the benefits from farmers using these new techniques have accrued to consumers in the form of relatively less expensive food. Clearly, by restricting the use of factory farming methods (which are associated with lower unit costs of production) there may be significant effects on the cost of producing food and, ultimately, on the price paid by the consumer.

The effects of such production techniques on the quality of life of the animals involved have led some interest groups to campaign for changes in the British Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Codes of Practice relating to animal welfare. More restrictive codes are sought which would limit the methods of production available to the farmer by preventing the use of certain aspects of popular intensive systems. It is generally agreed that the costs of producing livestock products affected by these proposed restrictions would rise, although it is not clear by how much. It is not difficult to understand how this increase in costs might come about.

Farmers, just like other businessmen, attempt to produce a saleable product at the least possible cost to themselves. In this way they hope to assure themselves of some profit, and hence to earn a living. In itself this profit motive cannot be criticized, but in attempting to maintain their profits, farmers have adopted more intensive systems of animal production. In turn, the benefits from farmers using these new techniques have accrued to consumers in the form of relatively less expensive food. Clearly, by restricting the use of factory farming methods (which are associated with lower unit costs of production) there may be significant effects on the cost of producing food and, ultimately, on the price paid by the consumer.

Estimating the total net change in production costs which would result from a switch to less intensive systems is not easy. Various contradictory claims have been made by both farmers and welfare groups, focusing attention on the more obvious costs of change—how much it costs to produce a free range or a strawyard egg as opposed to a battery egg. But whatever the size of any direct increase in costs in the changeover from one system to another, this is only one facet of the total economic cost. There are also likely to be significant changes in the structure and pattern of resources used in U.K. agriculture as a result of the adoption of less intensive systems of livestock production. The indirect costs associated with these latter changes need to be fully recognized and understood before any changes in the Codes of Practice relating to animal welfare are implemented.

The farming sector of the U.K. has, over time, responded to a particular range of prices and available technology. Farmers have made decisions about the choice and scale of production based upon the different levels of profit associated with different production systems. It is this process of innovation and adoption of new technology in response to competition between farmers that has resulted in the prevalence of factory farming techniques, especially in the pig and poultry sectors. If, however, the welfare codes are revised, farmers would then have to base their production decisions on a different set of prices and technology, and the effect on the structure of the U.K. agricultural industry may be dramatic. For instance, extensive ‘outdoor’ systems of pig production approved by the welfare groups require less capital, but more land and probably more labor, than an intensive piggery. There may also be significant diseconomies of size, especially for labor, associated with less intensive systems of egg production e.g. the strawyard system proposed as an alternative to battery egg production. All this suggests that the growth of larger and more capital intensive units in U.K. agriculture may be seriously questioned by radical changes in the animal welfare codes. There may even be a reversal of the outflow of labor from agriculture seen in recent decades.

A move to less intensive systems could affect the use of energy by the farming sector. In these energy-conscious times the increase or decrease in energy used as a result of changing the production process in farming needs to be recognized and assessed in relation to the overall use of energy by society.

More extensive production systems with a shorter period of animal housing and probably lower stocking densities generally, may reduce problems of environmental pollution resulting from animal waste disposal or utilization. Similarly the problem of smell nuisance arising from some intensive units may also be reduced.

Another important consideration is that even if the costs of alternative intensive systems of production do not differ greatly, there may, nevertheless, be significant costs in adjusting from a production structure based upon one method of animal production to another based upon revised animal welfare regulations. These adjustment costs may be so high that any proposed changes would, if effected immediately, place a substantial cost burden on existing producers. If the various welfare groups wish to obtain the support of farmers they should recognize this problem of the adjustment costs facing producers and either press for compensation on their behalf or accept that any proposed changes in the relevant Codes of Practice would have to be phased in over a period of years. This latter alternative of gradual change is also likely to be more acceptable to foreign suppliers of food imports to the U.K.

It should be clearly recognized by all concerned that the imposition of stricter animal welfare regulations in the U.K. would require, for consistency and effectiveness, the banning of imports of the relevant farm products from countries with lower welfare standards. Since the U.K. is a relatively large importer of these energy-conscious times the increase or decrease in energy used as a result of changing the production process in farming needs to be recognized and assessed in relation to the overall use of energy by society.

Further consideration is that even if the costs of alternative intensive systems of production do not differ greatly, there may, nevertheless, be significant costs in adjusting from a production structure based upon one method of animal production to another based upon revised animal welfare regulations. These adjustment costs may be so high that any proposed changes would, if effected immediately, place a substantial cost burden on existing producers. If the various welfare groups wish to obtain the support of farmers they should recognize this problem of the adjustment costs facing producers and either press for compensation on their behalf or accept that any proposed changes in the relevant Codes of Practice would have to be phased in over a period of years. This latter alternative of gradual change is also likely to be more acceptable to foreign suppliers of food imports to the U.K.

It should be clearly recognized by all concerned that the imposition of stricter animal welfare regulations in the U.K. would require, for consistency and effectiveness, the banning of imports of the relevant farm products from countries with lower welfare standards. Since the U.K. is a relatively large importer of food, this action would have important implications for international trade relations, especially within the European Economic Community. The assessment of the full impact would require considerable further analysis. An immediate ban would obviously reduce the quantity and increase the price of imported foodstuffs available to the U.K. consumer. Again, it is likely that such a policy would only be accepted by all affected groups if introduced gradually.

We hope that this brief discussion of the impact of animal welfare considerations on the producers and consumers of food has identified the factors that should be included in any objective analysis of what is often an extremely emotional subject. Welfare groups, consumers and politicians alike should be made aware that farmers, by using the least cost intensive methods of animal production available to them, do so in response to competition among themselves (and with foreign producers). This process of competition has resulted in the particular structure of farming observed in the U.K. today. If society considers that these least private-cost methods impose too high a social cost, in terms of public anxiety, environmental pollution etc., and that farmers should be prevented from using them, then significant costs are likely to be incurred. Amongst these is the direct cost to the consumer of an increase in the price of
their inhabitants, such as certain types of veal calf and pig rearing units. In a test-case in West Germany recently, an egg producer was charged with “continuous cruelty” to its 60,000 strong battery flock. A high court decided that it was cruel to deprive the birds of the ability to follow their behavioral instincts to scratch, preen and stretch their wings. This ruling cannot, however, be regarded as final.

The effects of such production techniques on the quality of life of the animals involved have led some interest groups to campaign for changes in the British Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Codes of Practice relating to animal welfare. More restrictive codes are sought which would limit the methods of production available to the farmer by preventing the use of certain aspects of popular intensive systems. It is generally agreed that the costs of producing livestock products affected by the proposed restrictions would rise, although it is not clear by how much. It is not difficult to understand how this increase in costs might come about.

Farmers, just like other businessmen, attempt to produce a saleable product at the least possible cost to themselves. In this way they hope to assure themselves of some profit, and hence to earn a living. In itself this profit motive cannot be criticized, but in attempting to maintain their profits, farmers have adopted more intensive systems of animal production. In turn, the benefits from farmers using these new techniques have accrued to consumers in the form of relatively less expensive food. Clearly, by restricting the use of factory farming methods (which are associated with lower unit costs of production) there may be significant effects on the cost of producing food and, ultimately, on the price paid by the consumer.

Estimating the total net change in production costs which would result from a switch to less intensive systems is not easy. Various contradictory claims have been made by both farmers and welfare groups, focusing attention on the more obvious costs of change—how much it costs to produce a free range or a strawyard egg as opposed to a battery egg. But whatever the size of any direct increase in costs in the changeover from one system to another, this is only one facet of the total economic cost. There are also likely to be significant changes in the structure and pattern of resources used in U.K. agriculture as a result of the adoption of less intensive systems of livestock production. The indirect costs associated with these latter changes need to be fully recognized and understood before any changes in the Codes of Practice relating to animal welfare are implemented.

The farming sector of the U.K. has, over time, responded to a particular range of prices and available technology. Farmers have made decisions about the choice and scale of production based upon the different levels of profit associated with different production systems. It is this process of innovation and adoption of new technology in response to competition between farmers that has resulted in the prevalence of factory farming techniques, especially in the pig and poultry sectors. If, however, the welfare codes are revised, farmers would then have to base their production decisions on a different set of prices and technology, and the effect on the structure of the U.K. agricultural industry may be dramatic. For instance, extensive ‘outdoor’ systems of pig production approved by the welfare groups require less capital, but more land and probably more labor, than an intensive piggery. There may also be significant diseconomies of size, especially for labor, associated with less intensive systems of egg production e.g. the strawyard system proposed as an alternative to battery egg production. All this suggests that the growth of larger and more capital intensive units in U.K. agriculture may be seriously questioned by radical changes in the animal welfare codes. There may even be a reversal of the outflow of labor from agriculture seen in recent decades.

A move to less intensive systems could affect the use of energy by the farming sector. In these energy-conscious times the increase or decrease in energy used as a result of changing the production process in farming needs to be recognized and assessed in relation to the overall use of energy by society.

More extensive production systems with a shorter period of animal housing and probably lower stocking densities generally, may reduce problems of environmental pollution resulting from animal waste disposal or utilization. Similarly the problem of smell nuisance arising from some intensive units may also be reduced.

Another important consideration is that even if the costs of alternative intensive and less intensive systems of production do not differ greatly, there may, nevertheless, be significant costs in adjusting from a production structure based upon one method of animal production to another based upon revised animal welfare regulations. These adjustment costs may be so high that any proposed changes would, if effected immediately, place a substantial cost burden on existing producers. If the various welfare groups wish to obtain the support of farmers they should recognize this problem of the adjustment costs facing producers and either press for compensation on their behalf or accept that any proposed changes in the relevant Codes of Practice would have to be phased in over a period of years. This latter alternative of gradual change is also likely to be more acceptable to foreign suppliers of foods imported to the U.K.

It should be clearly recognized by all concerned that the imposition of stricter animal welfare regulations in the U.K. would require, for consistency and effectiveness, the banning of imports of the relevant farm products from countries in the EEC with lower welfare standards. Since the U.K. is a relatively large importer of food, this action would have important implications for international trade relations, especially within the European Economic Community. The assessment of the full impact would require considerable further analysis. An immediate ban would obviously reduce the quantity and increase the price of imported foodstuffs available to the U.K. consumer. Again, it is likely that such a policy would only be accepted by all affected groups if introduced gradually.

We hope that this brief discussion of the impact of animal welfare considerations on the producers and consumers of food has identified the factors that should be included in any objective analysis of what is often an extremely emotional subject. Welfare groups, consumers and politicians alike should be made aware that farmers, by using the least cost intensive methods of animal production available to them, do so in response to competition among themselves (and with foreign producers). This process of competition has resulted in the particular structure of farming observed in the U.K. today. If society considers that these least private-cost methods impose too high a social cost, in terms of public anxiety, environmental pollution etc., and that farmers should be prevented from using them, then significant costs are likely to be incurred. Amongst these is the direct cost to the consumer of an increase in the price of
The subject of animal welfare is undoubtedly one of great public concern. However, it is also one of great complexity, and if changes in the regulations governing animal production methods are to be made, those changes should take full account of the implications for producers, consumers and society in general. The farming industry should not interpret the interest in animal welfare as a threat to its livelihood nor should consumers dismiss lightly the likely changes in costs or structure of farming that may result from a revision of the Codes of Practice relating to animal welfare. The appropriate animal welfare policy for society will be identified only when all the interested parties become fully aware of the consequences of their actions.

[Ed. Note: Independent of any proposed changes in the British Codes of Practice, the U.K. veal calf industry (Quantock Veal) has taken the initiative of switching from individual crate rearing to the use of straw-filled group pens. According to the company’s marketing director, the system is working out to be cheaper for the farmer. (See Int J Stud Anim Prob 1(5):283-284, 1980.) Also, for further discussion see V.R. Eidman and D.D. Greene, “An Economic Analysis of Three Confinement Hog Finishing Systems”, University of Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin #535, Minneapolis, MN, 1980. The authors conclude from their comparative analysis that more intensive housing systems do not in and of themselves constitute a clear-cut economic advantage for producers; rather, “The ‘right’ system for an individual producer depends ultimately on the producer’s preferences, managerial ability, and financial situation.”]  

As the American population has increased so has the number of pet owners and subsequent number of pets. This growing population of animals, specifically cats and dogs, has created additional responsibility for the field of animal control.

When animals are abandoned, mistreated, improperly supervised or pose a population problem, responsibility for monitoring, controlling, and caring for them falls on professional animal control personnel. Since it is impossible to find homes and provide continuing care for all animals, it then becomes necessary to put them to death. Euthanasia technicians are charged with the responsibility of providing a “painless” and “merciful” death. However, what may be a physically painless death for the animals may be a psychologically painful event for the euthanasia technicians.

To understand the psychological pain experienced by a person who must euthanize animals one must first understand the contradiction inherent in the job.

---

**Abstract**

The emotional effects of euthanizing unwanted animals on professional animal control personnel are examined using written statements of and discussions among twenty-six euthanasia technicians at a workshop during a national session of the Animal Control Academy (Tuscaloosa, AL). Emotional conflicts arise in significant part from the dilemma that the same public which is responsible for the problem of unwanted animals also has a markedly negative perception of euthanasia, and by extension, of those who perform euthanasia. During discussions, the euthanasia technicians revealed a variety of strategies for coping with feelings of isolation, alienation, and sorrow. These included intellectualization, avoidance of unnecessary contact with the animals, and belief that the animal is being spared greater suffering. The participants tended to place the burden of guilt attached to destroying healthy animals on irresponsible owners rather than on themselves.

As the American population has increased so has the number of pet owners and subsequent number of pets. This growing population of animals, specifically cats and dogs, has created additional responsibility for the field of animal control.

When animals are abandoned, mistreated, improperly supervised or pose a population problem, responsibility for monitoring, controlling, and caring for them falls on professional animal control personnel. Since it is impossible to find homes and provide continuing care for all animals, it then becomes necessary to put them to death. Euthanasia technicians are charged with the responsibility of providing a “painless” and “merciful” death. However, what may be a physically painless death for the animals may be a psychologically painful event for the euthanasia technicians.

To understand the psychological pain experienced by a person who must euthanize animals one must first understand the contradiction inherent in the job.

---

*Dr. Owens is Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa Station, Tuscaloosa, AL 35486. Mr. Davis is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Psychology, University of Alabama. Mr. Smith is Director of the Animal Control Academy, University of Alabama and a program of the Humane Society of the United States.*