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ARTICLES ON SPAY CLINICS AND THE PET POPULATION EXPLOSION EVOKE STRONG RESPONSES

The second article in our series on spay clinics and the pet population explosion, which appeared in Report To Humanitarians No. 24 (August 1973), stirred vigorous responses from individual humanitarians, humane societies and other groups. Many requests for reprints resulted in the printing of 

That article dealt very candidly with the most controversial aspects of the problem. Much of the response was, not surprisingly, highly favorable. We obtained many new members who have been on our mailing list for a long time without any previous indication they were reading our reports.

A sample letter of agreement is from the American Veterinary Medical Association:

"The AVMA agrees that this approach in isolation will be relatively ineffective in resolving the problem. Rather than a question of the welfare of all animals in this way. It is, however, as you so often assume sheeter management duties. Our problem is factual and your recommendations are practical and precise."

At its annual convention in Philadelphia July 16-19 the American Veterinary Medical Association recognized the importance of the "pet population explosion is really a 'people problem' rather than a 'pet problem.'" The AVMA council's report was more explicit. Its president, Dr. John F. Quinn, concluded that the "pet population explosion is really a 'people problem' rather than a 'pet problem.'" He stated that the "pet population explosion is really a 'people problem' rather than a 'pet problem.'"

The second article in our series on spay clinics and the pet population explosion, which appeared in Report To Humanitarians No. 24 (August 1973), stirred vigorous responses from individual humanitarians, humane societies and other groups. Many requests for reprints resulted in the printing of 

That article dealt very candidly with the most controversial aspects of the problem. Much of the response was, not surprisingly, highly favorable. We obtained many new members who have been on our mailing list for a long time without any previous indication they were reading our reports.

A sample letter of agreement is from the American Veterinary Medical Association:

"The AVMA agrees that this approach in isolation will be relatively ineffective in resolving the problem. Rather than a question of the welfare of all animals in this way. It is, however, as you so often assume sheeter management duties. Our problem is factual and your recommendations are practical and precise."

At its annual convention in Philadelphia July 16-19 the American Veterinary Medical Association recognized the importance of the "pet population explosion is really a 'people problem' rather than a 'pet problem.'" The AVMA council's report was more explicit. Its president, Dr. John F. Quinn, concluded that the "pet population explosion is really a 'people problem' rather than a 'pet problem.'"

The AVMA joins many others in expressing their agreement for putting your thoughts on paper, minus with reducing the pet surplus; (2) they frequently seem to exhibit little real sympathy for those fighting cruelty, and take the sides of others, such as rodeo promoters, who exploit animal suffering for profit. On the other hand, some humanitarians and humane societies seem to obsequiously cater to the vets, taking as law their opinions on almost any animal-related moral and ethical details. Human: Information Services believes that humanitarians and veterinarians have many common goals, and that working together in solving human problems wherever possible. Such cooperation is too often balked by intransigence and intolerance on the part of both groups. This has been especially noticeable in connection with the incurring the feared ill effects. It appears that both groups can, with a bit of compromise and necessary high overhead expense which must be paid for by a constant flow of dues, contribute solutions.

So, when we encounter a really courageous and sincere attempt to help our "people," believe it should be brought to the attention of humanitarians. The following letter was received from John A. Hoyt, president of the Humane Society of the United States:

"Dear Sir: I wish to commend the outstanding statement relative to elimination of surplus domestic animals set forth in Report To Humanitarians No. 24. It is incisive and easy to read. It reflects specifically the philosophy and objectives of The HSUS concerning this massive and growing problem. However, it omits some important points that merit further consideration and debate on the part of humanitarians. I offer you answers to the surplus animal dilemma..."

I wish to identify wholeheartedly with your article's over-all objective and your approach to the "people's issue"... There is no way in which this kind of effort will significantly reduce the surplus. We believe that spaying versus castration is the "pet population explosion is really a 'people problem' rather than a 'pet problem.'"

At its annual convention in Philadelphia July 16-19 the American Veterinary Medical Association recognized the importance of the rapid growth in the population of dogs and cats, adopting a statement which grew out of a report prepared by an AVMA council. According to Dr. John F. Quinn, president of the AVMA, as quoted in the American Humane Association publication Animal Voice, "The 'pet population explosion is really a 'people problem' rather than a 'pet problem.'"

The AVMA joins many others in expressing their agreement with this letter, from John A. Hoyt, president of the Humane Society of the United States:

"...the AVMA agrees that this approach in isolation will be relatively ineffective in resolving the problem. Rather than a question of the welfare of all animals in this way. It is, however, as you so often assume sheeter management duties. Our problem is factual and your recommendations are practical and precise."
EFFECTS OF DIFFERENT SPAY POLICIES ON RECEIPTS AND ADOPTIONS OF ANIMALS AT SHELTERS AND POUNDS

by Arthur B. Braddock,
Director of Human Education

This is a statistical analysis of the effects of different spay policies on receipts of animals, adoptions and actual spayings at shelters and pounds, intended for officers and directors of shelters, and public officials concerned with animal control programs. The humane animal lover is warned that it requires concentration, and may be tough going.

In many communities one of the most important sources of unspayed female and unneutered male dogs and cats that contribute to the production of surplus puppies and kittens is the humane society animal shelter and public business. Thus, we have the anomaly of humane societies through one side of the mouth preaching the gospel of spaying and neutering, and on the other side of the mouth telling some who would adopt out unspayed or unneutered that he can have the unspayed female of his choice, so long as he pays the adoption fee.

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

The humane movement has been bemoaning the surplus of dogs and cats for decades, and urging the need for reducing or eliminating the surplus. Why, then, do they continue to adopt out unspayed females?

The answers are very simple. First, the directors and officials of these shelters claim that if they refuse to adopt out unspayed females, then members of the public who are ignorant of the whole problem and don't want to see their unwanted female pets meet an almost sure death will find some other means of disposing of them. The animals will be taken to the country and dropped by the roadside, left in a public park, or abandoned in some other way. The shelter officers are convinced that any tightening of the adoption conditions to exclude unspayed females will result in greatly increasing this abandonment, and hence reducing receipts of females at the shelter.

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

The societies that continue to adopt out unspayed females admit that it does result in adding to the surplus and continuing it indefinitely over the years. But they are afraid that the adverse effects enumerated above of a spay-requirement policy would bankrupt the society. Others disagree, and argue that the spaying of females is unnecessary.
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Humane Bills in Congress Lag for Lack of Vigorous Support by Humanitarians

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

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

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

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

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

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

At this meeting it was unanimously agreed that these bills are important, and their successful passage is necessary to humane legislation.

After much discussion of the pros and cons of different measures, it was agreed that the important bills having the best chance of passage and deserving the vigorous support of the cooperating societies, are the Bayh-Anderson trappine bill and the Gunter bill extending the provisions of the federal Humane Slaughter Act to for the slaughter of animals processed for export to the United States. Of these, the Gunter bill appeared much less controversial and to have the best chances for passage.

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

For example, NAHL recommends scores of the news bulletins and other publications put out by humane societies in this country. We have run across very few references to the Gunter bill, explaining what it would do and suggesting that members write to their Senators and Congressmen in behalf of the bill. As a result of lack of publicity in the humane publications, the number of letters received by members of Congress relating to this bill has been pitifully small. And most of these have resulted from special educational promotions of NAHL. Congressmen should have been receiving thousands of letters. Here is a bill which is almost non-commercial, which would eliminate the suffering of millions of animals annually yet would harm nobody; but it rests in peace in the files of members of Congress because animal lovers and humanitarians are either too unimportant or too indifferent to write a few letters to their own Senators and Congressmen, and to members of the House Agriculture Committee.

So doubt this lack of information and urgency reflects the fear on the part of humane societies generally, from the local to the national level, of losing their tax exemption privileges by becoming involved in legislative activities. This is a very legitimate and understandable concern. But, as we have explained several times in Humane Legislation Digest, the prohibition is against devoting a "substantial" proportion of the society's budget to legislative activities, which means that local societies having large expenditures for the operation of animal shelters and anti-cruelty work would be spending only a minute proportion of their total budget by including in their news bulletins information on the Gunter bill and what should be done about it. The prohibition, also, does not affect the way the ability of active members, directors and unpaid officers of the societies, as individuals, to write letters, to sign articles for the local press in behalf of the bill, or to send contributions to the National Association for Humane Legislation, which is very badly in need of funds to carry on even the most essential part of the campaign for this and other important humane legislation.

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

EXEMPLARY IMPORTANT!

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

These letters can be used effectively in talking with individual members of Congress who may be interested in co-sponsoring the bill. They all know how the humane movement has worked for the humane legislation were explained in our Humane Legislation Digest, for the Protection of Animals. Other excerpts from this excellent leaflet will be found on pages 2 and 3 of this supplement.
Punching Eyes Out With a Nail


During the month of January, 1968, ISPA Field Officer John Walsh met with members of the five leading humane societies in Brazil and visited many slaughter houses in various parts of the country. The methods of killing animals were cruel and barbaric, and methods of transporting livestock to the slaughter houses, primitive.

One of the worst acts of cruelty noted in Walsh's report is connected with the use of an instrument called the "Ferrao". The Ferrao is a metal pipe with a wooden center. At one end is a nail sharpened to a fine point. The Ferrao is used as a prod to move cattle and other livestock and the nail is constantly jabbed into the animal to make him move faster. It was noted that in rural areas, the Ferrao is jabbed into the eyes of the animal causing the loss of both eyes so that the animal will not wander off before slaughter.

The current method of killing the cattle in Brazil is by striking them on the head with a hammer, or by the use of the "choopa", a round iron bar, several feet long, with a chisel-like point at one end. The killer stands on a platform above the cattle and drives the Choopa down into the cervical vertebrae of the neck, which causes immediate paralysis if used properly. It is extremely difficult to direct the Choopa using this instrument and the animal often must be struck repeatedly.

In regard to the use of the hammer, Walsh noted that in some slaughter houses, cattle were hit as many as thirty times on the head and although they fell down, they remained conscious. The conscious animal was then shackled by one rear leg, hung upside down, and its throat slit. In most slaughter houses there was no effort to render swine unconscious before shackling them and slit­ting their throats.

Your Financial Support is Badly Needed

Many humanitarians agree that the most effective way to stop cruelty and the suffering of millions of animals, as portrayed on these pages, is by legislation. The minimum requirement for obtaining legislation is first to have effective bills introduced, and second to let your representatives in Congress know that you want them to support these bills, and third to make contact with key members of Congress to see that they are fully informed about the legislation.

The National Association for Humane Legislation is registered with both the U. S. House of Representatives and the U. S. Senate under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, Public Law 601. It must make periodic reports on its receipts and disbursements for lobbying activities. It is experienced in legislative work, and is doing an effective professional job in promoting humane legislation so badly needed to eliminate gross animal suffering.

Tax-exempt humane organizations such as our parent society, Humane Information Services, cannot spend any "substantial" amounts on legislative activities, nor board a part of the expenses of H. I. S. He has been very careful from the beginning to comply strictly with the law and regulations. He has been unable to use any of the funds for the legislative work of N A H L, which is entirely out of funds and in debt after paying the expenses of advertising and promotion. Won't you please send a contribution to be used for carrying on this important work, which will further our objectives and contribute to the saving of millions from pain and suffering? Please send your check to:

The National Association for Humane Legislation, Inc., 675 Fishlakes Point Drive South, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705.

Please--Your Help Is Badly Needed.

Current estimates indicate the world population of livestock used wholly or partly, in the production of food, numbers about 6 billion domestic animals. This would include nearly a billion cattle, more than a billion sheep, more than a half billion goats and buffalo, 22 million horses and other beasts of burden, and between 2½ billion and 3 billion poultry. Approximately a half billion animals are slaughtered each year for food consumption, as well as for skins, hides, and feathers.

Recent estimates show humane slaughter laws affect only about 11 per cent of the animals killed for human consumption.

In many countries, livestock face a lifetime of suffering through ignorance and neglect. Branding and dehoming cause stress and suffering, as does failure to provide proper shelter from intense heat or cold. Animals unfortunate enough to be the products of these factory farming techniques are sometimes subject to a great deal of discomfort and pain. The sweat box method forces swine to be kept in overcrowded enclosures. Enclosures are so hot that the animals become lethargic and inactive, thereby resulting in a rapid weight gain and tender meat. Calves are crowded in pens at two weeks old, forced to stand on stilts to make manure removal easier and in some cases the calf is deliberately infected to make the meat softer.

TRANSPORTATION

The transportation of livestock throughout the world has been of great concern to ISPA. The photos show primitive and cruel methods by which livestock are transported in many Latin American, African, and Asian countries. Many of the photos were obtained by ISPA field staff working in these countries to alleviate animal suffering.

In some countries cattle are dragged off river banks and pigs by a rope which is tied around the neck. The animal is hoisted out of the water by a rope placed around the horns and is slung over the water and tied down. Many times a horn breaks or the animal becomes loose and falls on the deck or the railing of the ship, breaking its legs or ribs. Many times the animal suffers a broken neck or severe cervical strain from this method. Even modern sea-going freighters will load and unload cattle by this method in many ports as the cover shows. Swine in many countries are herded into the bottom of the net. The animal is hoisted by means of a crane and swung over the side of the ship. The photo at top of Page 3 shows their legs protruding through the net. Many times legs are broken when the net is dropped into a waiting truck or on the pier.

Pigs on the bottom of the net are sometimes forced into unconsciousness because of the weight of the other animals on top of them. Livestock are gassed or prodded to move by means of sharp nails on the end of long poles in many countries. In some areas, the livestock are deprived of food and water for periods up to 5 days while they are being transported by trains, trucks, or ships.

This is not a minor bill affecting only a small number of animals. The meat equivalent of over five million head annually is imported by the United States, and this import of meat is increasing steadily. This imported meat comes from about two dozen countries scattered throughout the world, with Australia being the largest supplier.

The methods used in slaughtering and pre-handling these food animals in many foreign plants are crude and inhumane in the extreme (see excerpts from leaflet of the International Society for the Protection of Animals). Methods used for slaughtering beef animals in Australia and New Zealand are humane, but sheep and lambs still are slaughtered there by methods not permitted in this country. When the Gunter bill becomes law, all of the foreign plants producing meat products for export to the United States must meet the humane requirements of the United States Humane Slaughter Act. This undoubtedly would encourage plants producing for domestic use to introduce humane methods, which are more efficient as well as humane.

A few people have suggested that to require use of humane slaughtering methods in these plants would constitute interference in the domestic affairs of other countries. That obviously is completely untrue. The United States would be merely setting up requirements which must be met for meat products imported into this country. No foreign country would be forced to do anything. Surely we have the right to exclude from this country products that are objectionable, for any reason, to domestic consumers. The latter certainly have as much right to demand that the meat they eat be from humanely-slaughtered animals as from sanitary­ly-slaughtered animals.

Imported meat usually cannot be differentiated from domestically-produced meat, so United States consumers have no choice. They are protected against imported meat that has been unsanitarily slaughtered, and all plants producing meat for export to the United States must meet the humane requirements of our domestic laws. The USDA inspects such plants regularly, and certifies those from which imports are permitted. It would require little additional inspection to include a humane slaughter requirement along with the sanitary requirement.

The other objection to doing something now about this very urgent humane problem is that passage of the bill at this time might aggravate the current beef shortage and contribute to higher prices in this country. There is no basis in fact for this objection. It may be said with complete confidence that beef supplies and prices in this country would not be af-
It has been noted that in some countries semi-wild cattle have their eyes poked out by means of a nail on the end of a stick, so that they can be more easily handled and brought into the slaughter house. Slaughter methods in most countries would cause anyone interested in animals many sleepless nights if they were able to view the suffering which takes place. Many countries still resort to the hammer as a slaughter instrument. Some Asian countries use knives called matadors to slit the brain or spinal column. Some Latin American countries use a 6 foot iron or wooden bar with a chisel shaped lapse on the end called a “choopa” to stun cattle. ISPA field staff have witnessed the slaughter men Wade into the pens crowded with pigs swinging a 5 foot wooden club with a heavy iron bolt on one end, striking the animals on the head and neck. The unconscious pig is then shackled by a back leg to an overhead conveyor. Many times the pig regains consciousness before the throat is slit and occasionally a conscious animal Bob knows to be dropped into a vat of boiling water used to remove dirt and hair.
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Slaughter Practices in Brazil

We had the opportunity to watch the Brazilian methods of slaughter on several occasions and at different kinds of slaughterhouses.

The methods in any of them, as far as the handling of the animals is concerned, are cruel and brutal. Roughness and brutality is always present. The causes for this are not only low wages, which make a selection of better trained and more experienced workers difficult, but a total lack of inspection and/or care for the animals.

Up to the present, no community slaughterhouse in this county exists which even made an attempt to start humane slaughter of cattle! In most of the abattoirs, small and large alike, the hammer is being used. In addition, although prohibited nowadays, the “Choopa” is still very much used by many municipal and state slaughterhouses.

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

Due to the importance of the hygienic point of view, so much emphasized by the World Health Organization, we believe that improvements in these methods are most urgent. To gain the hygienic point of view but as a sanitary condition as well. We are certain that the consumer in the United States and in other countries will demand and require meats which are produced by humane slaughtering methods. The consumption of meat from Brazil is in no way informed of the methods of slaughter on several occasions and at different kinds of slaughterhouses.

SAVE MANY MILLIONS OF ANIMALS FROM THE CRUELITIES DESCRIBED IN THESE PAGES

Write as follows ...

Write your own Congressman, at House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, asking him to actively support the Gunter bill, H.R. 8505, to extend provisions of the federal humane slaughter act to foreign meat packing plants exporting meat products to the United States.

Write to the two U.S. Senators from your state, addressing them at Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, asking them to introduce or co-sponsor in the Senate a companion bill to H.R. 8505, by Representative Gunter, which would extend the provisions of the federal Humane Slaughter Act to foreign meat packing plants exporting meat products to the United States.

Members of the Committee are: W. R. Poage, of Texas; Frank A. Stubblefield, of Kentucky; Thomas S. Foley, of Washington; E. Kika de la Garza, of Texas; Joseph P. Vigorito, of Pennsylvania; Walter B. Jones, of North Carolina; B. F. Sisk, of California; Bill Alexander, of Arkansas; John R. Harlow, of Louisiana; Ed Jones, of Tennessee; John Melcher, of Montana; Mathias, of Idaho; Robert D. Price, of South Dakota; Spark M. Hatusuma, of Hawaii; George E. Brown, of California; Dawson Mathis, of Mississippi; Charles Rose, of North Carolina; Jerry Litton, of Missouri; Bill Gunter, of Florida; Charles H. Taapke, of California; William C. Wampler, of Virginia; George A. Goodling, of Pennsylvania; Robert B. Mathias, of California; Wiley Hays, of Iowa; John D. Wein, of Missouri; Robert D. Price, of Texas; Keith S. Sebelius, of Kansas; William D. Hixson, of North Carolina; Paul Findley, of Illinois; LaMar Baker, of Tennessee; Charles Thome, of Nebraska; Steven D. Symms, of Idaho; Edward Young, of South Carolina; James P. (Jim) Johnson, of Colorado; Edward M. Hadigan, of Illinois.

Send any replies you receive to: National Association for Humane Legislation, Inc., 675 Pinellas Point Drive South, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705.

slaughter methods in brazil

slaughter methods in brazil

slaughter methods in brazil

slaughter methods in brazil as reported by St. Cloud H. Poole, President Sociedade Zoológica Educativa-São Paulo

Slaughter Practices in Brazil

We had the opportunity to watch the Brazilian methods of slaughter on several occasions and at different kinds of slaughterhouses.

The methods in any of them, as far as the handling of the animals is concerned, are cruel and brutal. Roughness and brutality is always present. The causes for this are not only low wages, which make a selection of better trained and more experienced workers difficult, but a total lack of inspection and/or care for the animals.

Up to the present, no community slaughterhouse in this county exists which even made an attempt to start humane slaughter of cattle! In most of the abattoirs, small and large alike, the hammer is being used. In addition, although prohibited nowadays, the “Choopa” is still very much used by many municipal and state slaughterhouses.

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

Due to the importance of the hygienic point of view, so much emphasized by the World Health Organization, we believe that improvements in these methods are most urgent. To gain the hygienic point of view but as a sanitary condition as well. We are certain that the consumer in the United States and in other countries will demand and require meats which are produced by humane slaughtering methods. The consumption of meat from Brazil is in no way informed of the methods of slaughter on several occasions and at different kinds of slaughterhouses.

SAVE MANY MILLIONS OF ANIMALS FROM THE CRUELITIES DESCRIBED IN THESE PAGES

Write as follows ...
WHAT TO DO ABOUT THE CRUELTY OF TRAPPING

It goes no good for humanitarians to wring their hands and denounce the cruelties of trapping. The time has come for action. Write letters to the two U.S. Senators from your state, addressing them at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, urging them to support the Anderson bill, S. 1637.

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

Write to each of the House Representatives Subcommittees on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, addressing each at the House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, urging his support for the Anderson bill, S. 1637.

Write to every member of the House of Representatives who has decided not to support the Anderson bill, H.R. 9207, H.R. 9379 (Anderson et al.) and the Bayh-Anderson bills to Bayh trapping bills S. 1637.

Ours is a crisis which demands action by all humanitarians alike, should be satisfied, except for one important condition.

The condition is that perhaps 90 percent of the suffering of an animal caught in any kind of a leghold trap, including the "Tender Trap," comes after the animal is already injured. It is the attempt to get away from the trap, rather than the actual closing of the trap's jaws, which creates the maximum pain involved in trapping. The animal may sprain ligaments or break a leg in its struggles to free itself. Or, it may bite its leg off if it is forced to lie close to the jaws of the trap which is called a "wring-off." A very substantial proportion of the pain caused by leghold traps do wind up as wring-offs, which are unable to hunt or defend themselves effectively and which are doomed to infection or being killed by a predator. Animals which remain in the traps, regardless of how "humanely" caught, may suffer extreme pain or freeze to death. The provision in the Bayh-Anderson bills that support inspection would be difficult to enforce. And, of course, the mental trauma of the trapped animal is probably as much to be regretted as the physical suffering.

These considerations, however, do not necessarily invalidate the "Tender Trap" and the Bayh-Anderson bill approach to solving the trapping problem. Attempts have been made to insert tranquilizer tabs in the paddding, to be ingested by the animal in its attempts to chew the padding and get away from the trap. It is not inconceivable that this could be the purpose of the animal to lie quietly until the trap releases itself or means of euthanizing the animal on the spot.

Our sister society, Humane Information Services, has done an extensive amount of research on different drugs from the standpoint of their possible use in euthanizing trapped animals. Tranquilizers for example, would not be effective in the padding of the "Tender Trap." This gives us some ammunition in any discussions between the humane societies and other organizations who are considering the trapping problem. Attempts have been made to encounter the criticism of animal rights groups, which are speaking out against the trapping problem at this time. It is the responsibility of the humane societies to realize that the trapping problem is not going away. It is the responsibility of the humane societies not to become so completely involved in one trapping bill as to lose sight of the real purpose of trapping.

The purpose of trapping is to provide a space between them when the trap is sprung. The jaws are wrapped with a leather cover which contains a spring or a weight which has to be tripped in order to close the jaws of the trap. The animal is firmly held, but there is little or no pain except where the "Tender Trap" is concerned. This trap has a hinged jaw which is ground down so that the animal is held tenderly by the ears. The provision in the "Tender Trap" is that the animal is held tenderly, but that there is little or no pain except where the "Tender Trap" is concerned.

The objection to this second approach, obviously, is that it would require a considerable period of time, as existing steel-jaw legion traps in use were lost or became inoperable.
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The "Tender Trap" is an ordinary steel trap for the trapping and capturing of animals and birds on any federal lands, which could be revised to provide a trap which is non-lethal or non-humane. The approved traps as determined by the Secretary of the Interior would be used to prevent the spread of fur in the United States and foreign countries. The objection to the "Tender Trap" is that it would require a considerable period of time, as existing steel-jaw legion traps in use were lost or became inoperable.
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If the pet owner decides not to have the female animal spayed, the shelter has the choice of: (1) repossessing the animal after a reasonable time (if it was adopted), or (2) forgetting about the whole thing, and retaining the spay fee, together with any other fees already paid, for the purpose of defraying the general expenses of the shelter. Or, the unused spay fee may revert to the owner, who may write it off as a tax deduction. This is especially true of female animals, which almost always have a spay fee of $5 to $7. This is the type of spay fee most often charged by humane societies. The spay deposit is refunded only if the animal is spayed at a spay clinic operated by the shelter.

At St. Petersburg, the spay fee is $5 for neutering, but only $2 for spaying. The spay deposit of $15 is returned only if the animal is spayed at a spay clinic operated by the shelter. If the animal is spayed by a private veterinarian, the spay deposit is kept by the shelter as a way of encouraging the pet owner to spay the animal. The spay deposit is used to cover the cost of the spay procedure and to cover any possible complications that may arise. The spay deposit is refunded only if the animal is spayed at a spay clinic operated by the shelter.

The spay deposit is used to cover the cost of the spay procedure and to cover any possible complications that may arise. The spay deposit is refunded only if the animal is spayed at a spay clinic operated by the shelter. If the animal is spayed by a private veterinarian, the spay deposit is kept by the shelter as a way of encouraging the pet owner to spay the animal. The spay deposit is used to cover the cost of the spay procedure and to cover any possible complications that may arise. The spay deposit is refunded only if the animal is spayed at a spay clinic operated by the shelter.
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

So many thought-provoking, constructive letters have been received since our last Report that we could not possibly reproduce here many of the hundreds we have received. A few are quoted in the lead article in this issue, and others which relate to pet animals, who deserve a future feature. Communication with the national humane societies and many of our local and state societies has been so encouraging that we would be happy to publish, in a future issue, excerpts from those letters which deserve a wider audience.

We continue to receive letters commenting on our series of articles on running dog tracks. One member saw fit to publish the very thoughtfully-written letter that appeared in last week's issue, to the national humane society, believing that we may have over-emphasized the pessimistic aspects. And another member has sent us a copy of her excellent letter to the Boston humane society, which we have not been able to have published — and we believe that that letter should be read some day by all the members of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. We are most grateful to all our readers who have written to us and who have helped us make this the most widely-read feature in the history of Humane Information Services. The many letters and postcards we have received, telling us how much this feature is helping to spread the message for animal welfare, are most encouraging and should help to encourage others to write us.

The latest copy of the Report to Humanitarians has been published. It is the first copy ever printed in this country, and we are most grateful to all our readers who have written to us and who have helped us make this the most widely-read feature in the history of Humane Information Services. The many letters and postcards we have received, telling us how much this feature is helping to spread the message for animal welfare, are most encouraging and should help to encourage others to write us.

We are doubly pleased to receive such compliments from a humanitarian society of your great dedication, ability, and fitness.