(No. 38) -- Spay-Neuter Programs Needed for Pet Animal Control

Humane Information Services, Inc.
Spay-neuter clinics or their equiva-

lents are needed as part of a complete pet animal control program. Each part of this program is operation of the other. Humane Information Services has been and continues to be in favor of low-cost spay-neuter clinics and other programs having the same purpose. TYPES OF PROGRAMS (1) Subsidies for individuals. All spay programs involve a sub-

sidy for the individual by either individual pet owners, humane soci-

eties, cities and counties, or veterinarians. One form of subsidy by individual owners who have their animals spayed or neutered is the differential license fee, es-

pecially low for sterilized animals. This, in effect, amortizes the cost of spaying or neutering over a period of time. The differential over the life of the animal offsets, more or less, the initial cost of the operation. For example, if the differ-

ential is six dollars, and the animal lives ten years, it would pay sixty dol-

lars toward the cost of spaying by a private veterinarian. Although generally recognized as such, this really is a sub-

sidy by the city or county. The Los Angeles animal control section says that for that City this subsidy amounts to $500,000.00 per year. However, if the li-

cence fee for unaltered animals is raised as a result of the differential, it is established, so that the average fee is not changed, there is no government sub-

sidy. In that case, the subsidy is by the owners of unsterilized pets who pay the higher fee. If ever a subsidy were justi-

fiably disliked, this is it. For it is those owners who cause the problem in the first place. Veterinarians who oppose public low-

cost spaying and neutering programs may have overlooked the fact that by aggressively supporting higher license fees with a sub-

sidy for individuals, they may better affect being a public subsidy of spay-

ing and neutering by private veterinarians. Other subsidies similar in principle comprise arrangements of various kinds under which part or all of the cost of spaying or neutering is paid by individuals who is paid directly by a humane society. Usually, arrangements are made with a few veterinarians who agree to take the refer-

ral of sterilized animals. In some cases, this lowers the cost to both the pet owner and the humane organization providing the subsidy. One national society has conducted such a pro-

gram for many years, with participation fluctuating as funds available and the current climate for obtaining changes. Various local humane societies, usually the women’s auxiliaries, have raised funds set aside for a specified purpose, usually designated as the “spay fund.” Usually the subsidy is given only to pet owners who cannot afford to pay the fees charged by private veterinarians or humane society clinics. Humane Information Services takes a rather dim view of this type of program, because it is too limited in effects and too much of the financial burden is borne by the individual. There are other important needs for the funds. Obviously, it has made no appreciable dent in the surplus. It does not fit well into a com-

plete animal control program. Under it, the major subsidy is by the participating veterinarians, with the program being directed and referrals made by a city, county or humane society. Generally, the fees charged are higher than those under the low-cost spay-clinic plan. This method meets with fewer objections from veterinarians, especially local or hu-

mane society-operated plans, and for vari-

ous reasons seems to have the best chance for survival. However, the arrangement is subject to change or cancell-

ation at any time by the participating veterinarians, and less reliability can be suggested for any one clinic or the wheel of com-

plete pet animal control. (2) Humane society clinics. Many hu-

mane societies, mostly those with animal shelters, have set up spay clinics as a part of their regular operations. Some and neuter operations at the Dallas SPCA shelter on a Sunday, gaining excellent ex-

perience and contributing to solution of the surplus problem. Dallas area vets have agreed to the use of paramedics for sterilization operations, possibly as a defensive reaction to the prospect of a municipal low-cost clinic. Obviously, if paramedics can be used for this purpose, the argument that there are not enough licensed vets in the coun-

try to perform the operations that would be required to substantially reduce the surplus is knocked into a cocked hat! On the whole, it may be said with con-

fidence that low-cost spay-neuter clinics can be operated by cities and counties without any serious financial burden on the community. Not only can the clinics be operated without substantial cost to the commu-

nity’s taxpayers; as we shall see later, there is a resulting very large saving in the operation of pet animal control facili-

ties and programs. They represent a good device for keeping animal control costs at a minimum. (See SPAY-NEUTER, page 2, column 1) **REPORT TO HUMANITARIANS**

**Spay-Neuter Programs Needed for Pet Animal Control**

name of that City. However, the same kind of arrangements have been in effect else-

where, although on a smaller scale, for some time. The San Diego plan was described in some detail in our Report to Humanitarians No. 15. Under it, the major subsidy is by the participating veterinarians, with the program being directed and referrals made by a city, county or humane society. Generally, the fees charged are higher than

more years.

This self-sustaining basis can be even more confidently predicted if volume is sufficient to require two or more veterinarians, or if the neutering of male ani-

mals is done by well-trained-veterinary assistants. In Report to Humanitarians No. 6 (June 1973) we quoted from a let-

ter received from an indignant student of veterinary medicine protesting that spay-

ing is not the simple job some humanitari-

ans have considered it to be, that it is a major surgical operation conducted un-

der aseptic condi-

tions, comparable to a human ovariohyster-

ectomy. But a para-

medic well trained in this work would be trained under the veterinari-

an and who becomes very experienced doing this one type of operation is quite capa-

ble of satisfactorily performing it under general supervision. The vets react an-

grily to such statements, because they want no encroachment on their means of livelihood by paramedics, even though fre-

quently they use the latter for various kinds of veterinary treatments in their own practices. However, in their letter Human Information Services believes that if a vet is avail-

able to handle the occasional complica-

tions, the use of paramedics for this task is perfectly feasible. We have observed vet students from Texas A & M doing spay and neuter operations at the Dallas SPCA shelter on a Sunday, gaining excellent ex-

perience and contributing to solution of the surplus problem. Dallas area vets have agreed to the use of paramedics for sterilization operations, possibly as a defensive reaction to the prospect of a municipal low-cost clinic. Obviously, if paramedics can be used for this purpose, the argument that there are not enough licensed vets in the coun-

try to perform the operations that would be required to substantially reduce the surplus is knocked into a cocked hat! On the whole, it may be said with con-

fidence that low-cost spay-neuter clinics can be operated by cities and counties without any serious financial burden on the community.

Not only can the clinics be operated without substantial cost to the commu-

nity’s taxpayers; as we shall see later, there is a resulting very large saving in the operation of pet animal control facili-

tries and programs. They represent a good device for keeping animal control costs at a minimum.
Only because local humane societies in many communities long ago took over many or all of the functions of pet animal control has this not been recognized everywhere. In the United States, the legislative function of local government, like garbage collection and public health programs, has been taken over by humane organizations, and the local government has not had the burden lifted partially or entirely from them by humane societies, who could more readily see the need for low-cost spay clinics than as a means of reducing other costs of pet animal control. Humanitarians have based their appeal for establishing such clinics on much generosity by humane organizations, and not enough on the needs of the community and local government.

NUMBERS OF CLINICS NOW IN OPERATION

The Animal Protection Institute (API) recently made a survey intended to determine the number and character of low-cost spay and neuter clinics operated in the United States. Questionnaires were sent to over 100 organizations: many are afraid that many local humane societies did not consider it worthwhile to return the questionnaire, because the results obviously are very interesting. In view of the results, each of the four types of spay programs have been in operation in Pinellas County, Florida, headquarters of Humane Information Services, but they are not included in the tabulation sent to us by API. Only two municipally owned or administered low-cost spay clinics are listed, although there are six in California and one in Arizona. The three Los Angeles clinics and one in Palo Alto are municipal enterprises, but the clinics in San Mateo, Marin County and Phoenix, Arizona, are operated by humane societies with support from their local governments.

This tabulation gives at least some information about 46 programs, and those listed by name and address only. Humane Information Services already had information about the other organizations listed.

Using the combined information available to us, we have attempted to classify each program under one of the four types previously discussed. There are municipalities, each of which might have more than one clinic. Unfortunately, this is a very rough classification, and is presented on that basis for what it is worth. It is not perfect.

This classification indicates that there are 17 programs of type 1, and 15 of type 2, with 13 of type 3. There must be in the United States at least twice that number of type 2 and 3, and considerably more than 50 of type 4, which is unknown, but probably is less than a dozen.

**VETS' OPPOSITION TO LOW-COST SPAY AND NEUTER CLINICS**

In view of the financially appealing advantages of keeping spay and neuter clinics to local governments, why is it that after several years of strenuous effort by dedicated, hardworking humans in many communities throughout the country, only a handful of these clinics have been established? Many veterinarians blame the vets, who have opposed this approach to the problem both openly and clandestinely. There is no doubt that the principal obstacle.

The vets are viewed as authorities on any subject involving animals, and their evaluative and advisory capacities are widely recognized by city councils or county commissions. The vets are experts, and the local government is composed largely of business and professional people. The latter are inclined to listen sympathetically to all business and professional opinions. The veterinarians' inclination to set up a government agency to compete with them.

There are at least three reasons for the veterinarians' opposition to low-cost spay and neuter clinics:

(1) **The low-cost clinics offer direct competition to the veterinary profession.** This is certainly the reason most commonly cited by humanitarians for the opposition by vets. But even if the veterinarians are right about it, there is probably the least significant of the three reasons. Many vets claim that spaying is one of the least remunerative of their services, and some say that they had just as soon not have it. "It is the principle involved," they say.

(2) **Low-cost spaying could lead to low-cost distemper shots and broken egg revenue for the veterinary profession.** If you operated or worked for a private veterinary clinic with an investment of $5,000.00 and annual income of $5,500.00, how much more, or you might well have similar fears.

(3) **Mass public spaying could help to greatly reduce the number of spay and neuter populations and hence the number of patients for the vets.** The vets are said to believe that mass pet plywood will put many of them out of business, as the human contraceptive "pills" has put some teachers and toy makers out of work.

Vets deny this allegation, claiming that they have many more animals to treat than they are capable of handling. The surplus pets produced by irresponsible owners are not the kind of pets that usually receive veterinary attention, they say.

The vets usually do not come out openly to fight spay clinics by citing the real reasons for their opposition. Their modus operandi has been to keep quiet and spread others to believe the clinics are costly and ineffective, and a violation of American traditions of free enterprise. They have sought and obtained allies among humane societies having somewhat similar basic motives.

When the prospects for establishment of a public spay and neuter program appear good, it is interesting to see how many county organizations, are likely to offer some substitute arrangement involving use of private veterinary facilities, such as the San Diego County, with low rates charged by private clinics, or free spaying for indigents. But, in several cities or counties, an attempt to draw a red herring across the trail was made, the offers were quickly withdrawn when the local government decided to go ahead any way.

An example of these obstructionist tactics cited by the clinic proponents is the San Diego plan, or a cut in rates on the road to a solution of the pet population explosion.

**CONFRONTATION OR CONCILIATION?**

There is a growing tendency now among the leading proponents of low-cost spay clinics to come right out in the open to persuade by "framing" rather than by "sneaking." They point to what they believe to be evidence that the vets are enjoying a partial monopoly, and are keeping down the number of admissions to veterinary schools, by tacit agreements to avoid competition from the low-cost veterinarians including spaying and neutering, and by relentless opposition to the establishment of spay and neuter clinics. This, they say, is as the licensing of veterinary paramedics or general veterinary clinics operated by humane societies, and to low-cost public spay and neuter clinics.

So what can the latter lose by a knock down-and-drag-out battle fought in public? This evaluation is quite different from the usual way. Nevertheless, if a campaign to establish a low-cost public spay and neuter program appears to be a red herring across the trail was made, it is quickly withdrawn when the vetans believe that the only way to fight against the vets would be outnumbered. They are unwilling to use the power of their regular membership and lose their backing in a minority group to a public meeting. They are found on the road to a solution of the pet population explosion, to which they have extolled the meetings as milestones in molding public policies on animal welfare. They claim that spaying is one of the least remunerative of their services, and some say that they had just as soon not have it. "It is the principle involved," they say. This is the reason most commonly cited by humanitarians for the opposition by vets. But even if the veterinarians are right about it, there is probably the least significant of the three reasons. Many vets claim that spaying is one of the least remunerative of their services, and some say that they had just as soon not have it. "It is the principle involved," they say. This is certainly the reason most commonly cited by humanitarians for the opposition by vets. But even if the veterinarians are right about it, there is probably the least significant of the three reasons. Many vets claim that spaying is one of the least remunerative of their services, and some say that they had just as soon not have it. "It is the principle involved," they say.

The vets usually do not come out openly to fight spay clinics by citing the real reasons for their opposition. Their modus operandi has been to keep quiet and spread others to believe the clinics are costly and ineffective, and a violation of American traditions of free enterprise. They have sought and obtained allies among humane societies having somewhat similar basic motives.

When the prospects for establishment of a public spay and neuter program appear good, it is interesting to see how many county organizations, are likely to offer some substitute arrangement involving use of private veterinary facilities, such as the San Diego County, with low rates charged by private clinics, or free spaying for indigents. But, in several cities or counties, an attempt to draw a red herring across the trail was made, the offers were quickly withdrawn when the local government decided to go ahead any way.

An example of these obstructionist tactics cited by the clinic proponents is the San Diego plan, or a cut in rates on the road to a solution of the pet population explosion.

**CONFRONTATION OR CONCILIATION?**

There is a growing tendency now among the leading proponents of low-cost spay clinics to come right out in the open to persuade by "framing" rather than by "sneaking." They point to what they believe to be evidence that the vets are enjoying a partial monopoly, and are keeping down the number of admissions to veterinary schools, by tacit agreements to avoid competition from the low-cost veterinarians including spaying and neutering, and by relentless opposition to the establishment of spay and neuter clinics. This, they say, is as the licensing of veterinary paramedics or general veterinary clinics operated by humane societies, and to low-cost public spay and neuter clinics. So what can the latter lose by a knock down-and-drag-out battle fought in public? This evaluation is quite different from the usual way. Nevertheless, if a campaign to establish a low-cost public spay and neuter program appears to be a red herring across the trail was made, it is quickly withdrawn when the local government decided to go ahead any way.

An example of these obstructionist tactics cited by the clinic proponents is the San Diego plan, or a cut in rates on the road to a solution of the pet population explosion.
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Enforcement of 1976 Amendments of Animal Welfare Act

USDA Not Yet Enforcing Dog and Cock Fighting Prohibition

Last winter Congress made important changes in the Animal Welfare Act which centered on the transportation of puppies and other warm-blooded animals (excluding farm animals, rats, mice and aquatic mammals) by air transport. This is intended to eliminate. These sessions also are attended by representatives of some of the most pastime and amateurs upon whom rests the responsibility of keeping the professional industry on its toes. Dr. Schwindaman conducts these sessions with admirable objectivity and non-partisanship.

The "input" meeting to assist in implementing the new amendments of the Animal Welfare Act was held in a remote hotel in College Park, Maryland, on October 11, 1976. Dr. Thomsen, staying at a Washington hotel, had to leave very early on a bus which meandered through much of the District of Columbia and its Maryland suburbs before disposing of him nearly two miles from the meeting site. No taxi was available, so with only a Florida raincoat for protection against the biting Northern wind, Doc was left to battle the fierce caress of the hills and dales to the meeting room.

Was the latter selected to discourage attendance by a "bunch of emotional animal lovers," or because it was provided free by the University? We will never know, but if the former possibility is correct, it worked well. Some society representatives present were from Humane Information Services, the Humane Society of the United States, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Humane Association, the American Institute for Zoological Photography, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI), American Humane Association, WAPOG, American SPCA, Washington Humane Society, and others.

If we missed anyone, please pardon.

NO FUNDS TO CURB DOG AND COCK FIGHTING

One of the first bits of information passed out to those in attendance was that no action was presently planned to enforce the new provisions of the Act prohibiting interstate activities connected with dog and cock fighting. Reason: no money yet available for enforcement.

TRANSPORTATION REGULATIONS COMPLICATED

The APHIS then passed out some tentative proposals which might eventually be included in the rules and regulations designed to enforce the new provisions of the Act prohibiting interstate activities connected with dog and cock fighting. Reason: no money yet available for enforcement.

THE "INPUT" MEETING

Such "input" sessions are attended by gangs of lawyers, executive directors and public relations counselors for the organizations representing the interests to be protected. They are knowledgeable, articulate and aggressive. Intent on protecting the interests of their respective organizations, they try to effect a compromise which will result in the least possible criticism of the new regulations.

The final regulations adopted must be published in the Federal Register by January 21, 1977.

During the audience discussion of this commendably frank talk, Dr. Thomsen pointed...
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common bond, a love for animals, to do so.

Secondly, such a fight would be likely to induce equally aggressive tactics by the vets. They have far more money and other resources at their disposal than do the spay clinic advocates. The net result might very well be to stop the establishment and close potential clinics than the publicity might promote.

Thirdly, we really have not tried very hard to relax our political controls. The vets have come to our side on many of these problems. Humane societies frequently have been as obstructionist and indifferent to the vets' criticism. Some vets have been willing and cooperativeness to listen to reason and how to talk to the public in a way that people and public officials learn the facts.

More important, perhaps, than all of the others is that we need the vets' support for effective animal control programs which can accomplish even more in reducing spaying of low-cost spay and neuter programs.

In short, we should not cut our noses to spite our faces, much as a good fight might help to relieve the feelings of those whose plans have been upset by the actions and attitudes of vets.

The vets would always agree with the vets and others with a vested interest in the pet animal surplus. We are not as interested in and vitally involved with any wrong actions they may take or principles they may espouse, but not the vets or anybody else personally. We may attack what they say and do, but not on the basis of their motives or integrity. Our purpose in discussing so frankly this problem is not to convince theestablishment but rather to gather the issues so they may be dealt with more effectively than in the past.

OTHER REASONS FOR OPPOSING CLINICS

The vets are by no means the only source of opposition to low-cost spay and neuter clinics. Let us be equally frank in discussing other possible reasons for the opposition, and for the lethargy displayed by communities faced with the pet population problem which might be dealt with more effectively than in the past.

(1) The professional managers of many of the larger humane society shelters are subject to the same pressures of losing "business" and jobs, and of competition from local government animal control programs. In any event, they often incline to support the latter. The boards of directors, and officers of the local humane society, with the exception of those whose plans have been upset by the publicity, might cause them to take quick action.

(2) The professional managers of many of the larger humane society shelters are subject to the same pressures of losing "business" and jobs, and of competition from local government animal control programs. In any event, they often incline to support the latter. The boards of directors, and officers of the local humane society, with the exception of those whose plans have been upset by the publicity, might cause them to take quick action.

In any event, clinic proponents are put on the spot with respect to the possibilities of a chemical contraceptive. They should rely on the fact that the clinics still would be needed. The choice of using the contraceptive by furnishing low-cost injections would exist. Spay clinics already in operation might merely shift from neutering by operation to neutering by injection. And other reasons for spaying, to make a better pet, are more important.

THE ACTUAL EXPERIENCE WITH LOW-COST PUBLIC SPAY AND NEUTER CLINICS

The only experience with low-cost public spay and neuter clinics is for a period of several years has been in California. The first clinics were established by the very progressive Department of Animal Regulation of the City of Los Angeles now are known to everyone who works in the field. Table 1 contains the available pertinent data.

Let's consider some of the claims based on these figures, or even fewer data for other cities and counties where clinics have been established:

EFFECT ON PROPORTION OF DOGS ALTERED

(1) (From Theodore J. Sorich, reference given at bottom of Table 1.) "Availability of three reduced cost spay/neuter clinic programs in Los Angeles, 1976-77, demonstrated that the price license fee for spayed or neutered dogs, appears largely responsible for the fact that 35.4% (corrected figure by Humane Information Services) of Accident License applications applications (in 1975-76) were for altered dogs. In 1977, only 18% of the City License applications were for altered dogs."

But the increase in the ratio of altered dogs to the total number licensed does not necessarily indicate that the spay and neuter operation of the clinics. The shift to a substantial license fee differential in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animals handled by LA City shelters*</td>
<td>100,662</td>
<td>109,216</td>
<td>118,082</td>
<td>133,044</td>
<td>140,432</td>
<td>153,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutered dogs</td>
<td>74,087</td>
<td>81,873</td>
<td>87,260</td>
<td>99,440</td>
<td>110,835</td>
<td>104,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of dogs spayed or neutered</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From reports of the Los Angeles Department of Animal Regulation.

(2) (From Theodore J. Sorich, reference given at bottom of Table 1.) "The other possible reasons for spaying, to make a better pet, are more important.

In any event, clinic proponents are put on the spot with respect to the possibilities of a chemical contraceptive. They should rely on the fact that the clinics still would be needed. The choice of using the contraceptive by furnishing low-cost injections would exist. Spay clinics already in operation might merely shift from neutering by operation to neutering by injection. And other reasons for spaying, to make a better pet, are more important.

**In our Report to Humane Societies No. 37 we suggested to the APHIS a possible way of getting around this big obstacle to effective spay and neuter operations. At the HSUS conference we urged Dr. Schwindaman to give consideration to this and other suggestions. The government grind slowly and cumbersonously. Some bureaucrats in the administrative pyramids are not necessarily sympathetic to our practical suggestions as not in accordance with the administrative procedures act, or something like that. We are still working on it, and it is not the kind of constant human work....
The Horse Protection Act was passed by Congress in 1970, and strengthened by amendments in 1976. This Act was intended to stop the cruel practice of soring gaited horses, particularly Tennessee walking horses, in order to exaggerate a show horse's gait. Many thousands of these horses have been subjected to this very cruel practice during recent years.

THE REASONS FOR SORING

Originally, the high-stepping gait of the Tennessee walking horse was a result of breeding and training. It consisted of a high reach of the front feet combined with a long, gliding stride behind—a gait which could be maintained by a sound walking horse on long trips. Thus, it is not the gait itself which is cruel, but the means of obtaining it. After World War II the competitions among Tennessee walking horse owners and trainers developed into prestigious horse shows. The prizes awarded increased greatly, and winners received increasingly high returns from horse sales and stud fees. And the operators of horse shows were under increasing pressures from audiences to show the spectacular high-stepping prize-winning horses.

These large money rewards obtained by owners, trainers and horse show management from the showing of these horses constituted a strong incentive to shortcut the extensive training required to turn a well-bred colt or filly into a show winner, by soring the horse's front feet. This is done by applying chemical or mechanical irritants (see photographs). In order to escape the resulting severe pain when the front feet strike the ground, the horse quickly raises its feet. The result is a long rear stride and a high, far reach in front. This gives a remarkable imitation of the performance of a sound, well-trained gaited horse.

REPEATED SORING REQUIRED

But the horse will not perform in this manner unless it feels pain, and must be sored for every performance. Thus, it is not a matter of putting the horse through a painful operation once, with no pain for the remainder of its life. The pain is continuously inflicted on the walking horse, and sometimes the horses bleed when being shown. If not properly cared for after performances, they develop permanent calluses or scars that bleed repeatedly.

Sometimes the horses bleed when being shown. If not properly cared for after performances, they develop permanent calluses or scars that bleed repeatedly.

It is the 

CRUELTY

Thus, it is the CRUELTY which makes the best sored horses not only incapable of performing at top level, but unable to perform at all when not sored. The only excuse for this cruelty is that it makes money for the owners, trainers and show management. Many other cruelties to animals are defended as being necessary to the production of food, for fighting disease, or to avoid even worse suffering by the animals themselves, such as club-footed pigs. The soring of horses offers no excuse whatever except the greed of those who participate in the process.

PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY OF SHOW MANAGEMENTS

It is manifestly impossible to control the practices of owners and trainers in training their gaited horses. The place to catch the offenders is the horse show. If a sored horse could not be shown, there would be no incentive to sore.

There are held annually in the United States to about 600 major horse shows and only one, more than 1,000 smaller ones. About 1,800 horse shows held annually are affiliated with the American Horse Shows Association or the Tennessee Walking Horse Association, or both. When the number of gaited horses exhibiting at a show is multiplied by the number of shows, it is obvious that the number of animals involved is quite large, even allowing for duplication. It is probable that from 30 to 35 thousand Tennessee walking horses are shown each year. Other gaited horses (Arabian, Morgan, Morgan, Quarter, etc.) may also be sored, although not to nearly the same extent as walking horses. Probably over 200,000 of these gaited horses are shown. In addition, must be counted the number of horses trained by soring which do not turn out to be suitable for showing.

LAW ENFORCEMENT BY SHOW MANAGEMENTS

The two leading horse show associations Namely, have rules or soring and show requirements under the Horse Protection Act with respect to soring. The associations provide judges, stewards and veterinarians for the shows, for one reason or another, the practice of soring has continued. There are many reasons for this. (1) Basically, although this cannot be proved, the entire industry from breeder to trainer to exhibitor to owner is so determined to win that no practice which might be a barrier to winning is considered.

(2) It is not always easy to determine positively that the horse has been sored for the show, or even if the trainer claims that he has not sored the horse. In disputed cases the presence of inflammation in the horse's front feet is often detectable by an expensive ($45,000) machine which uses infrared thermography to make a photograph, can be used in court. Thus, it takes time, money and trained technicians to detect the less obvious cases of soring.

(3) The show managers claim that it is too expensive to employ a sufficient number of veterinarians, judges and stewards to effectively police the shows. If the laws require that the horses be shown, even to detect sored horses while the show is in progress, as they cannot be caught in advance. To do the job right, they say, would cost so much that the show could not operate at a profit. Without shows, the entire walking horse industry would collapse.

(4) Prosecutors and judges in the courts have been reluctant in some cases to bring successful prosecutions of cruelty.

(5) The APHIS of the USDA, for reasons indicated in this article, has not been adequately funded, and the enforcement of the laws it passed by providing necessary annual appropriations, success will be achieved within the next five years. If you want to help in insuring this result, write to: Chief Staff Veterinarian for Horse Protection, Animal Care Staff, Veterinary Services, APHIS, USDA, 770 Federal Building, Hyattsville, Maryland 20782, and to your Congressman, stating that you want

SUCCESSION IN VIEW

Humane Information Services believes that the APHIS staff is determined to put a stop to this reprehensible treatment of horses and that if the necessary annual appropriations are provided, the laws it passed by providing necessary annual appropriations, success will be achieved within the next five years. If you want to help in insuring this result, write to: Chief Staff Veterinarian for Horse Protection, Animal Care Staff, Veterinary Services, APHIS, USDA, 770 Federal Building, Hyattsville, Maryland 20782, and to your Congressman, stating that you want
that the public spay and neuter clinics fill a real need in helping to reduce the number of unwanted animals, which will be always with us, even if we believe that we have cut the present surplus problems.

In any event, it is obvious that conditions impossible to evaluate quantitatively already had initiated a substantial decline in numbers handled before the clinics were in full operation.

It is notable that the decline in animals handled in the years during which the LA clinics were in operation far exceeded the declines from 1970-71 to 1971-72. Actually, we do not yet have data for a sufficient number of years, on a sufficiently number of the factors involved, to draw any verifiable conclusion about the effects of the operation of municipal low-cost spay-neuter clinics. A closer look at the history of the Los Angeles Department of Animal Regulation itself has shown that in the early years before the clinics were established, the number of unwanted animals handled and destroyed by the department was substantially more than that which occurred after the clinics were in operation in other California cities.

EFFECT ON ANIMAL CONTROL COSTS

(3) Another claim made for low-cost municipal spay clinics is that they will reduce the costs of animal control. For example, the number of pets which will disappear, that is, be abandoned or lost, will be reduced. But this is misleading, because even with the decrease, some pets will disappear, which is the reason that spay-neuter clinics have been initiated.

The total estimated savings in handling costs to the city for the end of the year is $816.00, compared with what would have been the terror, if the eight dogs of $52.72. Consequently, Mr. Sorich figures that each dollar spent for spaying, on the average, will produce $52.72. Of the cost paid by the dog owners, would have prevented the occurrence of $9.79 in future animal control costs. Although this amount does not represent the exact savings, it is considerable and indicates that the use of spay-neuter clinics can save the city a substantial amount of money that can be used for other purposes.

One of the most important benefits of spaying and neutering pets is the reduction in the number of unwanted animals. The reduction in numbers handled, it is a simple matter of multiplying this figure by the marginal cost per animal for handling. If the reduction in numbers handled is attributed to the clinics in Los Angeles is accepted, the total savings to the City in the number of unwanted animals will substantially exceed the subsidized costs of operating the clinics. Municipal Information Services believe that if a substantial net saving will result. The clinics, we believe, actually reduce rather than add to the total municipal or county budgetary outlays.

The principal components of such a complete program were described in Report to Humanitarians No. 24 (June, 1976) and No. 29 (1976). It may be said with some confidence that it will not be possible to replace the entire program, not even the most basic, at some future date.

If you believe in spaying and neutering, we recommend that you read this Report to Humanitarians No. 24, and will not be repeated here. For the reasons already given, we recommend reading or rereading that Report. No shelter, pound or animal control office in the state of California, or its delegate, if she or he is put out of business by the clinics, and neither should any veterinarian.

The clinics are not the solution of the problem of the surplus of dogs, or even the most important part of the solution, for a number of reasons.

1. The puppy mills and other undesirable types of "purebred" breeding of dogs, which contribute substantially to the surplus, cannot be stopped by low-cost spay and neuter programs.

2. Even a complete program of "free spay for pet owners" we hear so much about will continue to let their animals breed, since even the "low-cost" sterilization for children will never be more than what is willing to pay. Many of them will not spend a dime on pet animal health care because there are plenty to be had from the neighbors!

3. If a pet owner has a male dog which will impregnate puppies or kittens, he can always take them to the shelter or pound, or drop them at the park.

The low-cost spay-neuter clinics by themselves will never solve the surplus problem, although they may be necessary as a stop gap to the point where they can reduce significantly the surplus of the population. But people as a whole will not stop contributing to the surplus unless they are forced to do so.

The really important function of low-cost spay-neuter clinics is to facilitate programs of pet animal control which can put sufficient economic pressure on owners to force them to reduce the number of unwanted puppies and kittens. The principal components of such a complete program were described in Report to Humanitarians No. 24 (June, 1976) and No. 29 (1976).

In any event, we want it to be understood by all that Humanitarians Information Service does not consider the spaying and neutering of domestic cats as a major problem.

IF YOU BELIEVE IN SPAYING AND NEUTERING, AS WE DO, AND IF YOU BELIEVE THAT LOW-COST MUNICIPAL OR COMMUNITY-SPAY-NEUTER CLINICS FILL A REAL NEED IN HELPING TO REDUCE THE TRENDS OF SURPLUS PRODUCTION OF PUPPIES AND KITTENS, AS WE DO, AND IF YOU
IMPORTANT!

When you change your address without notifying us, our Report will be returned to you and will have to be resent at a cost of 25 cents of scarce operating funds. It is amazing how many of our members move in the course of a year.

Your former mailbox either stamps the Report "Address Unknown" or writes on it that your address is illegible or correct. If not, when we eventually receive word from you we will have to make still another stencil, which costs more money. Also, every change of address changes may cost us, in materials and labor, as much or more than your annual dues!

Please cooperate by informing us in advance of your address correction.

Also, in writing to us about anything, please use our correct address shown at the top of page one or on the coupon, page two. We still get letters and even contributions addressed to our former address, which are sent back to us.

The post office will not forward mail after a year has elapsed, although sometimes our officers or friends have to try to get us our mail. So, please be sure to use our present address in any communication to us.

In sending us the names of persons or organizations to whom you would like us to send our Report, please give the full name and full address information and don't forget to use the "Mr.," "Mrs.," "Miss" or "Ms." Some people are insulted if the wrong designation is used.

Thank you.

SPAY-NEUTER — FROM PAGE 6

clinic in your city or county, then here are the steps you can take as an individu­al:

1) Talk with a member or members of the board of directors, and with the executive director, of your local humane soci­ety or animal control organization or human­itarians. If they operate the pet ani­mal control program of your city or county, try to convince them to give to them the authority and start-up funds to operate a low-cost public clinic for the city or county, with the prospect that it will be self-supporting after the first year.

If the city or county will not furnish the money for start-up costs, try to find some public or private organization or firm willing to advertise to obtain the money needed to establish the clinic on a lease basis, or suggest that the city council or county commission change the budget to provide it. If you can convince the city or county officials that this new clinic will soon contribute more in revenue than it costs the society to operate it.

2) Talk with members of the city council or county commission along the same lines. Try to persuade them within a short time after the reports that we have sent them that animal control work will be less than it otherwise would be, and public complaints about animal control will go down.

3) Talk with reporters on the staffs of your local newspapers and TV and radio stations about the pet population explosion and how low-cost spay-neuter clinics can help.

4) Talk with the pastors of local churches, officers of the League of Women Voters, and other organizations, to enlist their support for a low-cost spay-neuter clinic.

5) Write to Humane Information Services telling us what you have done or are doing, and the results. We cannot always answer letters or phone calls, but if we are interested we will try to answer them.

6) Write to Congressmen requesting hearings and a favorable mark-up of the bill. Some animal lovers have been working on a bill for such a purpose recently, but are afraid that they will lose the support of Jewish voters if they co-sponsor this bill. We need to get more correctly affect it that the Jewish groups do not understand this, or think that the Brown bill is a means of "getting the camel's nose under the tent," and so are opposed to the bill. All other groups that understand that living livestock producers, meat packers and humane societies, are in favor of the bill.

So, right now a flood of letters to members of Congress, asking them to co­sponsor the Brown bill to be introduced in January by Congressman Brown of California, would be most helpful. You don't need to have a bill number or anything else at this time. So, write now to your own Congressman, United States House of Representa­tives, House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515.

We need to members of the House Committee on Agri­culture, requesting hearings and a favorable mark-up of the bill. These things must be taken step by step, and timing is of the essence. So those who want their voice in behalf of animals to be as effective as possible will write now.

More success in eliminating cruel methods of euthanasia

Humane Information Services' aggressive campaign to eliminate cruel methods of eu­thanasia continues to achieve results.

Humane Information Services' aggressive campaign to eliminate cruel methods of euthanasia continues to achieve results.

In September we received a call from the president of a local humane society who had read an article and was trying since February to persuade the local pound to shift from this cruel drug to a more humane drug. She also learned the name of the society in Kansas City, and was able to talk to the director.

In September we received a call from the president of a local humane society who had read an article and was trying since February to persuade the local pound to shift from this cruel drug to a more humane drug. She also learned the name of the society in Kansas City, and was able to talk to the director.

She also learned the name of the solu­tion to these problems in the city of Greater Kansas City, which is Repose, a barbitu­rate solution. This is humane if properly injected. Perhaps veterinarians have been devoting increasing attention to details about their methods. Other humane societies, seeing the popularity of this campaign, recently have been devoting increasing attention to this important area.

Before Humane Information Services started the trend, the subject of euthanasia near­ly everywhere was swept under the rug, because humane society officials did not wish to call attention to the large num­bers of animals they were forced to de­stroy, and because news stories or publica­tions that featured the subject of euthanasia were most closely studied by the public.

So the suffering went on with little or no attempt to stop it. Even now, we receive occasional letters from readers who urge us to give less attention to killing and more to helping animals alive.

But the movement is here to stay, and we will continue to do all we can to help those suffering, not to please animal lovers who wish to think only of the pleasant aspects of life.
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR...

WOLVES—DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

"We noted the letter from Lonnie Williamson of the Wildlife Management Institute (Report No. 36) in which he states that "literally hundreds of thousands of dollars" were spent to prevent Alaska from killing about 100 wolves, while the problems of the National Wildlife Refuge System are being ignored.

"Mr. Williamson is so completely wrong his letter borders on irresponsibility...Defenders of Wildlife shared the costs of fighting to save...We hope Lonnie Williamson is more careful in future letters for publication."—Toby Cooper, Wildlife Programs Coordinator, Defenders of Wildlife, Washington, DC.

REPLY:

We anticipated that Mr. Williamson’s letter would draw rebuttal. We print letters expressing viewpoints differing from our own. In this case, we think that too much money was spent both in killing the wolves and in trying to prevent it. That is because of our strong belief in following priorities in spending animal welfare funds, based on: (1) the number of animals involved; (2) the average amount of cruelty per animal; and (3) the prospect that the expenditure will achieve results.

"Frankly, we hope Lonnie Williamson is more careful in future letters for publication."—Mrs. Herbert O. Albrecht, Springfield, Pennsylvania.

LEGHOLD TRAPS

Some time ago we received 15 letters written by pupils in Mrs. Stanford’s class in Cedar Hills School, 7735 West Sycamore, Oak Creek, Wisconsin 53154. The letters protested the use of leghold traps and stated that the use of such traps is killing all only a vanity need. All were good, but we liked especially the following one from Peter Schmiktenburg:

"Dear Sirs: I would like to stop steel traps and any kind of animal traps. I have been killing all of these innocent animals. How would you like someone wearing you?"

That last line would make a good slogan for any campaign to stop the use of leghold traps. And Mrs. Stanford evidently knows how to conduct practical human education. Congratulations to her and the children.

LEGHOLD TRAPS

By conventional standards, our Christmas at Humane Information Services should be a dismal one. We have no time to exchange cards and letters and give presents, we have no grandchildren to talk with on the phone, and we will eat fish for Christmas dinner! And a speech of 16 lines is too much for the mail we are getting.

Yet our hearts will be full of genuine Christmas cheer. That is because we measure happiness not in terms of what affects us, but what affects animals. And during the past year we have had great progress in helping animals. Getting into "animal work" as we require a complete dedication which to some people makes us "wasted personalities," but is just a self-esteem捷 protecting animal well-being. Our members are in the same psychiatric group, and know what we mean. But it doesn’t keep us from being happy about it. On the contrary, we believe we have much more going for us than those who are made happy or sad only by what directly affects them. When we help animals, it gives us a lift that nothing else can. Since animals are in such great need of help, we can’t help but be out of the stuff of which our happiness is made.

And this has been a great year for Humane Information Services. Some of our programs really are rolling, at last, and our plans for the future are even more promising. Sure, we are short of funds, since we spend practically all of our time doing meaningful humane work rather than seeking publicity and contributions by devoting our efforts to public relations. We know of no national humane society that is accomplishing more, even with much greater financial resources. We hope many people even more to aggressive fund-raising efforts in the future, but never at the expense of using what we get to really help suffering animals. How can we be happy Christmas?

So thank you, dear fellow humanitarians, for helping us to have such a fine Christmas. We hope all of our readers —and who has not yet decided to become paying members—are feeling really blissful this Christmas season. If you don’t, we think it inappropriate to suggest a remedy: send us a nice big Christmas donation. That will make you feel better, it will be used directly and effectively to help the animals.

We wish all of you a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year!

Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Humane Society of the United States, November 1975.

—Mrs. Howard D. McEwen, Sonoma, California.

—Mrs. Roberta B. Karcher, Bristol, Indiana.

"You have my deep admiration for your intelligent, well-written, thoroughly-researched articles and the economical use of paper and postage...You are able to make fair judgments on the animal problems which you take up."—Mrs. Herbert O. Albrecht, Springfield, Pennsylvania.

"Your position is such a help—and an eye-opener."—Mrs. Dawnalyn E. Munds, Wellington, Kansas.

"Your position is so valuable to me—it is truly a wonderful informative service. Keep up the lengthy reporting!"—Mrs. Miles E. Nickerson, Boothbay Harbor, Maine.

MEMORIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

have been received from:

Mrs. Howard D. McEwen, Sonoma, California, "in memory of my dear friend Ruth Maxwell Denny".

Miss Helen A. Stiebeling, Hillsboro, New Hampshire, "in memory of Julie, Maggie and Toby".

Ms. Virginia Thomson, Royal Oak, Michigan, "in remembrance of my mother Luti...Sept. 19. She was 75, though not in appearance, spirit or action. Throughout her lifetime she gave—in a private, quiet way, for she had a hearing problem...To my mother, with love..."