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Merchandising Pet Animals By Shelters*

Few shelters operated by humane soci­eties consider themselves as either sell­ers or merchandisers. They are engaged in “finding good homes” for as many as possi­ble of the pet animals they receive. Un­fortunately, in their zeal to “adopt out” the maximum number of animals, they easily forget the “good” part of the objective. Just “finding homes” satisfies them, regard­less of the treatment the adopted ani­mal is likely to receive, how it may con­tribute to the overabundance of the unwanted animals, or how soon the adopted animal may be back in the shelter, unwant­ed. Just as a perturbation of shelters have what could rightly be called a really good adoption policy.

One reason for this is that the members and managers believe that any kind of a home is better than euthanasia. They are afraid that to follow a strict adoption policy will reduce the number of animals adopted out. They look at the immediate effects, and fail to understand the long-term effects.

Another reason for poor adoption poli­cies is that most shelters are hard up for money. The more animals adopted out, the more money that will come into the shelter in the form of donations or “adop­tion fees.” Both of these reasons are based on misunderstanding of the possibilities of “merchandising.”

THE SHELTER’S COMPETITORS

The shelter has competitors: (1) The owners of unspayed male dogs and cats which are free of charge to anyone who will take them. Many of these owners advertise for homes in the newspapers, which sometimes accept such ads free or at reduced rates. Children are sent around the neighborhood to see if anyone will appropriate any unplanned total of puppies. Easy come, easy go. Cheap pets beget cheap treatments.

(2) Pet shops, which sell dogs and cats through “packages.” These are described in Report to Humanitarians No. 26 and 37. None of these five essential features of merchandising are now being fully utilized by any shelter. Both of these shelters account for dogs and $10 for cats after similar treatments. These two shelters account for more than one-third and $20, which in­cludes spaying or neutering (compulsory), license fee, worming, and inocula­tions against rables, distemper, hepati­tis, leptospirosis and canine parainflu­enze.

We nominate as one of the best “dog pounds” in the country the shelter oper­ated by the Pinellas County (Florida) Dog Control, of which Mr. Kenneth Miller is manager and Dr. Arthur O. Lindblom, Jr., is director. Mr. Miller’s adopt­ion fees are uniform $20, which in­cludes spaying or neutering (compulsory), license fee, worming, and inocula­tions against rables, distemper, hepatitis, leptospirosis and canine parainflu­enze.

The St. Petersburg SPCA charges $22 for dogs and $10 for cats after similar treatments. These two shelters account for a major share of the new animals go­ing into St. Petersburg homes, since pet shops find it difficult to compete.

*
Throughout this article the term “price” is used as synonymous with “re­quired donation” or “suggested donation,” and “adoption fee” regardless of what it is called, it is the price paid for an animal when it is adopted from the shelter. In New Jersey and possibly other states the law defines a “shelter” as “any establish­ment where dogs are boarded and distributed without charge.” But the time has long passed when shelters could per­form these services, funded only by ordi­nary contributions. The price charged for adopted animals is becoming an increasingly important part of total fund­ing for humane shelters. One of the purposes of this article is to show how this source of revenue can be substantially increased, at the same time decreasing the treatment of surplus dogs and cats and improving the treatment of pet animals. But these sug­gestions do not in any sense imply that the shelter should become “just another pet shop,” or substitute commercial for humane objectives. On the contrary, adop­tion fees should be increased rather than reduced and utilized for humane and educational projects.
MERCHANDISING — FROM PAGE 1 —

MERCHANDISING
AN ATTRACTIVE PRODUCT

The shelters have available one of the most attractive products to be found anywhere: adoptable dogs, cats, puppies and kittens. If careful selection is made from the many animals turned in to the shelter, can be of higher quality than those offered by pet shops. This danger of obtaining a diseased, genetically imperfect, psychologically misfit puppy from the pet shop was clearly brought out in Report No. 36 and 37.

The animals of suspicious health and disposition can be euthanized, still leaving a sufficient number of highly adoptable animals, even though the most careful selection some animals adopted will not be 100% guaranteed to be wholesome. The pet shop, on the other hand, sends in an order for so many puppies of a specified breed and age, and, for cost reasons is constrained to dispose of all the puppies received, regardless of health or other considerations. The same applies equally to kittens, long since mer­chandised, “including a stool examination, health guarantee on every animal, on a free-replacement basis. Certainly, some adopters will try to return animals for other reasons, claiming some health rea­son, but this is a cost of doing business faced by nearly every successful mer­chandiser (ask the returned-goods manager of any department store, most of which know that it is easier to turn the customer over backwards to please the customer).

A gradually increasing proportion of the animals offered for adoption have papers, but are “purebreds,” some with registration papers. This reflects the rapid increase in puppy sales by pet shops and backyard breeders, many of which became unwanted when the owners learn about the costs and troubles connected with these animals. The general tendency among shelters is to ignore the “purebred” feature and discard the papers, because of the desire to avoid complaints by neighbors, or to meet zoning restrictions, or to utilize land donated by a generous member or legator, or provided by the city or county near a garbage dump. The road leading to the shelter is frequently unpaved, dusty and unattractive, often for years. How many times have we tried to reach a shelter at some vaguely-described location, by watching for signs which prove to be homemade, poorly located and hard to see or read from a passing automobile.

Contrast this with the pet shop located in some well-patronized shopping center, with an attractive front and a display window. These impulse buyers frequently become high-risk owners, but they can be weeded out by a well-designed adoption health examinations, and receive the re­quired health shots. Dog Control, for ample, gives tickets for dis tiers, hepa­tic, leptospirosis, canine parvovirus, and rabies, and worms any dogs that find him need it. All this, plus the $5 license fee included in the $20 adoption. The SCFA’s fees are $22 for dogs and $1 for cats.

Few pet shops permit picture taking of their establishments, but we received a cell phone picture of the puppies and the Big Top Pet Shop, both in Petersburg. However, most of the photo graphed pet fur looks like this: lighting and cage wire. We wished to see examples of dogs offered at different prices, of these puppies, in the Spanish (left) price at $129 and a whi­t Pomeranian at $139, marked down from $1.

That’s what the would-be proud dog owner has to face. We wish, in convenience, “papers,” and the shelters.

LOCATION AND ATMOSPHERE

Unfortunately, few animal shelters are found in convenient, well-marked, attra­tive surroundings. The location usually is dictated more by the desire to avoid complaints by neighbors, or to meet zoning restrictions, or to utilize land donated by a generous member or legator, or provided by the city or county near a garbage dump. The road leading to the shelter is frequently unpaved, dusty and unattractive, often for years. How many times have we tried to reach a shelter at some vaguely-described location, by watching for signs which prove to be homemade, poorly located and hard to see or read from a passing automobile.
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that such buyers acquire a pet that would otherwise be destroyed or suffer a long life and which is neutered against adding to the surplus, than from a pet shop which offers cheap puppies and kittens. Humane Society shelters encourage their customers to breed the animals. If a pet shop can afford to pay rent in a good location, the shelter can advertise itself more effectively and efficiently with the aid of mechanizing. The extra expense does not come out of other funds, but from the increased "talking of the trade." Until recently the "petmobiles" operated by many humane society shelters were popular methods of attracting adopters for adoption on the spot, with little or no attempt to wean out undesirable adopters. Now, the trend seems to be away from this method of promoting adoptions, as shelters have become increasingly conscious of what was brought out in the first paragraph of this article. Actually, there is no good reason why adoptions resulting from petmobile displays should be any different than those made at the shelter. If none of the department stores' familiar "layaway" plan can be used, with the adopter picking up the animal at the shelter after the required number of payments have been complied with, the petmobile becomes merely a convenient show window for the "merchandise." MAKING ADOPTION EASY People who acquire pets cheaply are much more likely to treat them accordingly. That is a common charge in articles that appears at the dormitory entrance, he or she is more likely to abandon it when the pet is a "cheap" policy, even if it is only a kitten or puppy purchased from a pet shop. In fact, a very good case can be made in support of the claim that the production of surplus kittens is directly traceable in no small measure to the fact that pets can be acquired so cheaply. It is safe to assume that there is no expensive piece of imported china than to a cheap dime-store article. The same is true for the less expensive items of a household. Of course, this principle does not apply in all cases. Some affluent householders do not object to the price Mayonnaise. And the Pinellas County Dog Control at Christmas adopts out hundreds of dogs, companions, a Humane Commission, for $5, which includes licenses, at all the shelters, and spaying or neutering. Records show that no higher proportion of these dogs show up after the holidays than for dogs put out for $20 during the rest of the year. But this is no conclusive evidence that cheap pets do not get cheap treatment. Very many humane society members seem to believe, but this does not prevent some adopters from making plans to adopt the animals to be destroyed is to make it easier to find them in the telephone book. Recently, however, we have developed a humane society shelter which we never had visited. We looked in the phone book under "Humane Society," under "Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals," and under "SPCA" at the place in the book where it would be expected to appear, also under "Paws." Adoption centers are not to be found under none of these headings. Finally, it turned up at the beginning of the "Pet" category as "SPCA." In St. Petersburg the Dog Control center operated by the County, which is an excellent fa-
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The Campaign Against Trapping
Promising or Futile?

Trapping is one of the greatest sources of cruelty to animals.*

* In all history, the mind of man has not committed greater cruelty than the steel trap. Never before has a device caused such widespread suffering. Every year, literally millions of innocent creatures are driven to endure agony, freezing, thirst and slow death because of this trap. Why?

That is the question posed in a humane publication in 1976. The writer answered his own question: “merely to satisfy the whims of women.”

We would like to try, in this article, to give a different answer: “Because humanitarians and humane and wildlife organizations are the powerful and the one group who has not yet won the war against trapping.”

This is one of the few fields of animal welfare with which humane societies and wildlife and environmental organizations are together in a common cause. That should make it easier to obtain results.

The vested commercial interests having an economic stake in trapping are smaller in numbers than the opponents of trapping, and should be smaller in influence with Congress and the state legislatures. These vested interests are not among the big campaign contributors. They do not command the numbers of voters or writers of letters to Congressmen and legislators that respond to the urgings of humane and environmental groups. True, the hunting fraternity is exemplified by the powerful National Rifle Association generally opposes anti-trapping legislation, but there is some division in their ranks on this issue. In Florida, humanitarians took advantage of this division to persuade the State’s Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission to ban the leghold trap. In view of these facts, and the terri ble results of trapping, we have anticipated great progress toward abolition of the steel-jawed leghold trap, if not all trapping. In fact, however, progress has been slow, and some critics be just about the same stage as when the agitation against trapping began decades ago.

In addition to Florida, New Jersey has banned the trap in its more heavily-populated counties. Massachusetts has a law that is seldom enforced and hard to enforce. Ohio has just conducted a referendum on trapping which was defeated overwhemingly. In Oregon, some of which have been treated in past issues of Report to Humanitarians, have been shown to be without merit. But these are merely some of the campaigns involving public and legislative acceptance of restrictions on trapping, which include all of the conditions which make it possible for animals to avoid trapping. Unless these obstacles are overcome, the campaign will die. Why have they not thus far proved effective?

To understand the answer to this question requires a review of the different approaches to trapping.

DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO THE ELIMINATION OF CRUEL TRAPS

There are four general approaches to the problem of cruelty to animals: (1) The public conscience of the public to the cruelty of trapping and persuade consumers to stop buying fur garments; (2) Accept the fact that women will continue to wear fur, and change fur production to form or “humanized” and other species; (3) Obtain voluntary action by trappers, an approach which has been tried in Canada; (4) Obtain legal legislation to ban trapping or the use of leghold traps.

PROPAGANDA AGAINST FURS

One of the most aggressively-directed, enthusiastically-supported (by humanitarians), and persistently-conducted campaigns in the history of the humane movement has been the effort to persuade consumers not to buy furs. This has been successful in the fur markets themselves. Recently fur skin prices have been declining, in some cases up many hundreds percent over the lows of a few years ago.

This is one who believe in the effectiveness of these “don’t buy” drivers directed at (See TRAPPING, page 6, column 1)
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TRAPPING—from page 5

long sheds on Space mink farm, Beevernille, Sussex County, New Jersey, where as
20,000 mink are produced annually. Mr. Space cooperated with Humane Information
services in tests of carbon dioxide for killing trapped furs. On this farm the furs were
neck breaking. On this farm the furs were
or two, but for some others they are

The fine ladies who so energetically
run these consumer campaigns against furs
have given evidence of willingness to co­
coperate or have close relations with veteri­
narians we have not yet discovered how
they could obtain the restricted drug.
However, we are convinced that a way could
be found to make the pelting process hu­
mane. The mink ranchers’ organisations
have given evidence of willingness to co­
operate in such a program.

We have received no indication, how­­­er,
that humanitarians would be willing to
engage in such cooperation. They are too
opposed to taking any animals’ lives to
provide furs, which they view as totally
unnecessary luxuries the use of which is
unjustified under any circumstances.

VOLUNTARY ACTION BY TRAPPERS

Beginning about 1964 the Canadian Asso­c­iation for the Protection of Fur-Bearing
Animals (C.A.P.F.B.A.), and in 1968 a similar
program for the exchange of a Conibear
trap for a leghold trap. Other types also
were exchanged, but the program was not
so successful. The reason was that it was
to acquaint trappers with the concept of
the quick-killing types of traps, of which
the Conibear was the most popular.
This program had been completely termin­
ated by 1973, reflecting a variety of condi­
tions.

We list this as one of the four differ­
ent approaches to the trapping problem
on­ly because it still seems to be looked up

humane trappers. It is something like a
efforts to eliminate or reduce the sur­
of dogs and cats by subsidizing the sp­
ing of individual animals, still view these
as the most effective potential me­
of controlling breeding. As indicated
in a previous report, we do not agree with
this, and for similar reasons do not as­
sume that any permanent program for subsid­
izing trappers’ use of what are supposed to
human traps.

EFFECTS TO DEVELOP

There are two possible bases for op­
taining trapping: (1) opposition to tak­ing
the life of any of God’s creatures; (2) op­­­­on to doing so by causing suf­
ing. Only the second reason will find
favor among most non-humanitarians, who
believe that killing a mink or a lamb or a cat
will in no way reduce trapping.
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foregrounding, it cannot be said that such efforts have produced a really humane and reasonably universal trap. As the FCCHT itself has said, “To date there has been no successful attempt of any of the space-age technologies to turn their talents to humane trapping." Near and far, the proposals that have been received by the Committee, yet success still seems to elude those working in this field. However, it must be acknowledged that FCCHT did not cease producing with a satisfactory result before 1976.

Vigorous criticism of these past efforts to develop a humane trap recently surfaced in Canada, and might even result in legislation. We do not yet become embroiled in this controversy, so are permitting any of the details in this article.

Suffice it to say that after a real effort to obtain and analyze the available facts, it is the conclusion of Humane Information Services that a really humane and reasonably universal trap has yet been developed, or is now in early prospect. We have, however, been quite unsold in evaluating the various approaches to the problem of trapping we have to be realistic about such things.

In conclusion, we must say that in the humane movement in this country who have unreservedly endorsed the “human killer trap” as now available to substitute for the leghold trap should reexamine the facts.

THE “TENDER TRAP”

For years, Humane Information Services has had one of the most vocal advocates of development of the “tender trap,” developed by two humanitarians of San Diego, and promoted by Defenders of Wildlife and other organizations. The trap is designed to work in this country, is a modified leghold trap with “offset” jaws wrapped with some kind of weather stripping. When the trap is sprung, it usually does not hurt the animal. The animal’s death is caused by being caught in it without harm. But the animal still suffers the trauma of being helpless, wounded, tormented, thirsty, starved and cold while awaiting the trap’s execution, if it does not become a “wiring-off.”

Humane Information Services accepts an aggressive search for a small, easily-punctured plastic bag which could be attached to the animal’s fur. The bag in which chewed by the trapped animal trying to escape, would release a humane poison, killing the animal on the spot, or heavily tranquilizing it. A disadvantage of such a trap is that it is very difficult to be made waterproof and therefore offset jaws and the poison or tranquilizer would be inaccessible.

This appraisal of the two bills sounds very conventional. Given more information about the subject, we would question the subject, we would question the favor, the Williams-Long bill. The Anderson bill, however, is somewhat more complex. This appraisal of the two bills sounds very conventional. Given more information about the subject, we would question the favor, the Williams-Long bill. The Anderson bill, however, is somewhat more complex.

TWO MAJOR QUESTIONS

First, what is the need for passage of the two bills? Experienced lobbyists for some of the wildlife and environmental organizations believe that there is no need for any such legislation.

Second, suppose it were possible to pass the kind of legislation that the proponents desire. It purports to ban interstate and foreign commerce in fur from states or countries that allow the use of leghold traps. It also purports to ban the use of leghold traps for domestic purposes. It purports to ban the use of leghold traps for domestic purposes. It purports to ban the use of leghold traps for domestic purposes. It purports to ban the use of leghold traps for domestic purposes.

But what is the use of passing such a bill? In the mind of those who support the use of the tender trap, the bill will drive for trapping legislation losing its steam, with disappointed supporters losing interest and dropping out of the effort.

Neither the Anderson nor the Williams-Long bill is that far from the truth, but does have a chance of passage. If it does become law, it would have to be strengthened in succeeding years to strengthen it. The idea is to get a foot in the door now.

Second, suppose it were possible to pass the kind of legislation that the proponents desire. It purports to ban the use of leghold traps for domestic purposes. It purports to ban the use of leghold traps for domestic purposes. It purports to ban the use of leghold traps for domestic purposes. It purports to ban the use of leghold traps for domestic purposes. But what is the use of passing such a bill? In the mind of those who support the use of the tender trap, the bill will drive for trapping legislation losing its steam, with disappointed supporters losing interest and dropping out of the effort.

Also, a few notable exceptions to the above would be the “inhumane” traps (as if there were such a thing as a “inhumane” trap). It does not mention leghold or steel-jawed traps. The Anderson bill would provide broad powers to the Secretary of the Interior, entailing the issuance of research permits and a new set of rules and regulations. Trapping on public lands would not be banned but merely regulated. The Williams-Long bill includes the following additional powers: permits and certificates—a wonderland of bureaucracy and “management.” In addition, it adds a new section to the Lacey Act to define the problem of “inhumane” trapping. Furthermore, it calls for an annual appropriation of $500,000 for a “research program.” (Note below the testimony of the California Department of Fish and Game).

A BAD BILL. All in all, the Anderson bill is a federal, bureaucratic quagmire that no one can inherit or lump together, while trapping continues as usual.

A GOOD BILL. On the other hand, the Williams-Long bill would effectively ban the use of leghold and steel jawed traps both here and abroad. It requires no rules and regulations, no permits or certifications, no advisory commission or research, and no appropriations.
GRANT FROM GEORGE WHITTLE ESTATE

This year Humane Information Services received a grant from the estate of George Whittell, the California philanthropist who died in 1969, leaving substantial bequests to wildlife and humane societies.

The principal beneficiaries under the will were the National Audubon Society and the Humane Society of St. Petersburg.

One portion of the estate was set aside for animal welfare societies. Under the terms of the will the latter bequest was administered on the trusts, who wanted great lengths trying to insure that the funds received by the humane societies would be used for worthwhile projects.

The will itself specified that a portion of the funds disbursed should be used to acquire land or buildings needed in pursuit of the organizations' work, with the buildings carrying the name of the benefactor.

NEW OFFICE BUILDING

In its application for a share of the funds, Humane Information Services proposed to acquire a building suitable for its greatly-expanded activities which had made our old office building completely inadequate. Because of this pressing need, and in anticipation, a special grant, Humane Information Services arranged to purchase and convert to office use a large Colonial-style residence located on three large lots near the center of St. Petersburg, at the corner of Ninth Avenue and 45th Street North.

The total area of usable space is 2,560 square feet, which has been converted to office use. There are four executive offices on the second floor. On the first floor are a large workroom for mailing and filling, another workroom, a conference room and a reception room which also are used for overflow work during lunch hours, an executive's lunchroom, and a utility room. There is enough space to provide for considerable expansion, our staff.

Part of the allotment for an office is being used to provide alterations and additional equipment.

NEED FOR CONTRIBUTIONS INCREASED

These projects are to be funded by the Whittell grants for a limited period of years, during which the unused funds are invested at interest. The Whittell grants are not intended to be used for carrying on our present office operations or for our regular work of research and program development, publishing Report to Humanitarians, and general administrative expenses.

Therefore, receipt of the Whittell grant does not diminish our needs for regular membership contributions or bequests. In fact, we have for some time been operating at a sizable deficit by “living off our fat,” consisting partly of receipts from the sale of our old office building for double its original cost. In fact, rising costs for nearly everything involved in our work of raising our annual deficit and the urgency of greater financial support from our members.

PROJECT GRANTS

Humane Information Services also applied for and received several grants for specific projects. These funds will be used to expand our work with shelters and pounds, to address, for example, the problem of the increasing numbers of homeless animals, the overcrowding of our shelters, the need for more space to provide adequate care for our growing number of cases.

NEW FIELD REPRESENTATIVE

For the field work required to implement the Whittell project on shelters and pounds, we have employed Mr. Steve Goodman, whose photograph appears above. He also works on several other projects including food services.

Steve is a graduate of the University of South Florida. He is 25 years of age, but has the misfortune of looking like a high-school junior. If he should contact you sometime, don’t let appearances fool you. Steve is proving to be a capable investigator.

Being a national organization, we needed someone who can be away from headquarters long periods. Steve has no family obligations, and likes to travel. He is now on a trip to British Columbia, Canada, on an assignment in the way out and back he will visit shelters, pounds and humane society officials to obtain information we need.

When Steve arrived at Humane Information Services, he was immediately sent to three different shelters where arrangements had been made for him to work as a shelter attendant. In addition, he already has visited nearly 100 shelters and pounds, where he observed euthanasia and obtained information on operating poli and methods. So, although he has been with us only about six months, Steve has had an opportunity to gain a more varied experience with shelter operations the many who have been engaged in humane work.

Steve also was sent out to obtain photographs and other information on the poultry and egg industry. The operates of the hatcheries, farms and processing plants refuse to permit picture taking since they have everything to lose and nothing to gain by doing so. Nevertheless, Steve managed to get in and took pictures and obtained cage dimensions, etc., used in Report to Humanitarians.

We also sent Steve to a horse stable for information and photographs, some of which we have never seen in a humane publication. Again, it is difficult to get these plants with a camera. But Steve was able to picture the scene and we believe we will be of much interest to humanitarians when we find space to publish an article on the subject.

So, if and when you encounter Steve in his travels about the country, be sure to have you overlook his youthful appearance and accept him on his merits.

TOP LEFT: front view of our new office building. Top right: rear view. Lower left: Emily's office, strategically located so she can oversee all of the general office operations. Lower right: Steve Goodman, our new field investigator, at the entrance of our office. Notice the subtropical verdure, here and in top photographs.

OUR CHRISTMAS MESSAGE

We meet quite a few retirees in St. Petersburg who admit Christmas means little to them anymore. The kids have flown, the co-op store seems little point in having a tree or even putting up wreaths, or other decorations. Christmas presents must be melancholy early that it doesn't even feel like Christmas. And everything about Christmas is so commercialized—on TV, in the streets, in the papers—that it may even be depressing.

We know how they feel, because we, too, are without many close family ties. But also have the solution: helping animals. That will not only brighten your outdoor Christmas, but also will make every day in the year seem like Christmas! For the life of Christmas is loving and giving. To have that spirit you don't need a lot of relatives, or children around a tree. It is inside of you, and gives a tremendous lift to the spirit. All we at Humane Information Services need do is stay and think of the suffering spent to so many millions of animals as a result of our efforts. It's a selfish satisfaction, as so many of you know from your own efforts for animals.

If you can't get involved personally or physically, you can share this great gift by sending a generous Christmas Contribution to Humane Information Services, so that it will be possible for us to extend our efforts to cover even more animals. Then, on Christmas Day, think several times about what you have done. It will bring a glow to your heart and a lift to the spirits. We know, because it does that for us. So have a healthy and happy holiday!