

The fact that only a few animals are found homes is surely related to the attitude of those who are in charge. Maybe they are thinking that only they themselves are ideal pet owners, and would rather see the animals dead than exposed to the risks of life. This attitude can often be found with people who would like to keep all animals themselves or, if they find this impossible, euthanize them. Psychologically we might call it an egocentric behavior caused by pity. This attitude definitely cannot be justified when it robs animals of their chance to live just in order to restore one's own peace of mind. It should in fact be possible to find new homes for still more animals (which in turn could influence the sales performance of breeders and pet shops) while at the same time improving the ways of finding these homes and following up the respective cases. Proposal # 2 for improvement - The intake gathered by the Hokensho should be euthanized only by the Hokensho themselves under conditions which can be agreed upon as suitable. Any society for the protection of animals must stop euthanizing animals lest it will lose credibility. Supposedly in a certain historical situation the objectively speaking cruel way of killing animals practiced by the administration provided the opportunity for JAWS to take over the task of euthanizing them in a friendlier way. Although the original motivation deserves praise, the way things developed left the administration unconcerned because they don't have to face the problem any longer; on the other hand, those people who are engaged in "humane killing" are merely trying to cure symptoms and as a consequence of the sheer numbers they are confronted with can hardly contribute to solving the problem actually, i.e. by reducing the number of victims. To defend their activities, these people will ask how one could deal with thousands of animals without killing them, but this defense becomes nothing but an excuse when no attempt at solving the basic problem by putting emphasis on spaying is made.

A society for the protection of animals should not be something like a funeral service; in order to work in a positive manner, emphasis must be placed upon different purposes - Hanshin branch could make a press release and give the task of euthanizing animals back to the Hokensho. I have no information as to how the euthanizing is financed, but in any case the administration must have their own budget which - supposing JAWS have even financed their part of the process - might not even have been fully used. However, as the euthanizing of these animals is in fact a public work the administration cannot possibly refuse to provide suitable premises for this purpose, and if these premises are created newly the level e.g. to be found in Tokyo should be applied. The administration has no excuse whatsoever to handle things differently. The cost of drugs used for humane killing amount to 500 ¥ per dog and 200 ¥ per cat (this being a high estimate), and in case the administration should not be able to provide a sufficient budget, those people concerned could offer a subsidy. (In case veterinarians should have profited from humane killing until now that would mean another scandal itself!) Concerning the question of staff, every Hokensho has veterinarians on its payroll (maybe even the same ones who participate in JAWS' activities); suitable conditions for humane killing must be maintained which could be checked by those who have carried out the task so far. In short, there is no reason why the euthanizing of animals should not be moved off JAWS' premises and returned to the administration.