



NAIA News Summer 2005

Working for the people who care for America's animals

Score one for our side

Campaign leads to victory over reckless pet relocation and shelter importation

For the last six years NAIA has worked relentlessly to expose the mushrooming practice known as humane relocation, the procedure of moving surplus dogs and cats from states, territories and foreign countries into US shelters in regions where the demand for pets is higher than local supply.¹ This scheme displaces local shelter animals and guarantees the spread of serious contagious diseases to animals and humans alike.

But irresponsible, unregulated humane relocation has continued to grow and its

promoters have become ever-more blatant in their activities. On the west coast, the www.AnimalPlace.org posts information on its website about its Compassion without Borders program, an import strategy that brings in Meximutts. In the east, the North



Shore Animal League (<http://www.nsal.org>) and the International Fund for Animal Welfare recently bragged about a shipment

Continued on page 5

Guidelines draw national attention

Responsible dog owners reap rewards in NAIA's new Pet Friendly Ordinance Guide

In the last few decades pet ordinances have moved beyond issues of public health, safety and livestock protection to include measures aimed at making pet owners more responsible and humane. Many of these newer provisions broadly attempt to anticipate and avoid problems by defining or restricting the conditions under which people can own or keep pets. As a result, there are now pet limits to prevent people

from keeping more than a certain number of pets; bans against owning specific breeds; extra licensing requirements for people whose pets have litters; and higher license fees for intact dogs and cats than for neutered ones.

But communities increasingly find that these provisions just don't work. In spite of

Continued on page 2

NAIA Officers & Board

Sharon Beck
Joseph Bielitzki, DVM
Anne Edwards,
Secretary-treasurer
Dennis Foster
Larry Katz, PhD
President
Sheila Lehrke
Asa Mays, DVM
Michael Manning, MD
Ken Marden
Adrian Morrison, DVM, PhD
L. Gabriel Navar, PhD
Mark Schumacher
Cindy Schonholtz,
Vice-president
Robert Speth, PhD
Patti L. Strand,
National director
Ed Walsh, PhD

Staff

Norma Bennett Woolf,
Publications Director



FIDO members form new PAC to fight for dog owners

FIDO is a political action committee created for people who love dogs.

The brainchild of Doberman Pinscher owner Terri Cannon, FIDO was born in California at the height of the battle to preserve canine husbandry practices. The issue at hand was California AB 418, a bill to ban ear cropping, but those who were fighting the bill understood that a loss here would jeopardize all husbandry practices that came under fire from animal rights activists.

Continued on page 2

Responsible dog owners reap rewards in NAIA's unique guide to a Pet Friendly Ordinance

Continued from page 1

repeated attempts to link responsible ownership to pet licensing, animal control agencies still have a poor public image, pet owners turn their backs on licensing programs, and dollars for enforcement are still hard to find.

NAIA's totally new direction for community animal control turns the old model on its head: it eliminates the negative bans, limits, and restrictions and accents the positive by rewarding people who prove they are responsible pet owners. Dubbed the *Guide to Constructing Successful Pet Friendly Model Ordinances*, this revolutionary approach to animal control is already being used by several communities looking for solutions.

"In the few weeks since the guide was first posted to the NAIA website, people from

more than a dozen municipalities have called to discuss its use in their area," said Patti Strand, NAIA national director. "All have been jubilant at its orientation, namely, that the guide recognizes the value of responsible pet ownership to the community and supports those values while offering solutions to the challenges posed by irresponsible pet ownership.

"Many campaigns and licensing programs pinpoint pet sterilization as a hallmark of responsible ownership," Strand said. "The NAIA guide takes us into the 21st Century by extending the reward system to other responsible ownership characteristics and practices and also provides license fee reductions for owners who train their dogs, belong to clubs or associations that promote responsible dog ownership, compete with their dogs in sports, fence their yards, or

permanently identify their dogs. Thus we highlight all of the characteristics that identify responsible owners, increase licensing compliance, and focus on those owners who fail to adequately control their pets."

The NAIA guide is available on the website at www.naiaonline.org/body/pdfs/PetFriendlyGuide.pdf and as a more formal booklet by contacting NAIA at naia@involved.com. NAIA also offers workshops to help communities put the ideas into practice.



FIDO fights for dog owners

Continued from page 1

The key, according to Cannon, was to organize, and the key to organization was finding a vehicle that would attract all dog owners, not just those who breed and keep dogs that traditionally have cropped ears or docked tails.

"FIDO – Friends in Dog Ownership – came to me on the back porch," she said. "The concept came about because of my love for my Dobermans."

More brainstorming developed a mission for FIDO and a plan to present the concept to various groups.

"The primary mission of any FIDO entity should be the protection of canine ownership rights," the women wrote in their proposal.

The FIDO intent to preserve dog ownership would include development of public education and legislative packets, hiring a lobbyist, and preparing "materials consistent with the NAIA position statements on guardianship, ear cropping, tail docking, 'deed not breed,' and responsible ownership."

A diverse group of

well-known dog enthusiasts have accepted the challenge to initiate and develop FIDO as a political action committee to further the cause of animal ownership. FIDO brings together all Friends in Dog Ownership – pet owners, breeders, canine sports enthusiasts, rescuers, veterinarians and everyone else who appreciates dogs.

FIDO

- ❖ provides legislative assistance to dog owners in need
- ❖ actively opposes animal abusers

and extremists who oppose pet ownership and

- ❖ aids conscientious breeders and owners who are fighting unfair restrictions on specific breeds, pet numbers, and responsible breeding practices.

FIDO can fight these battles with your support. To join FIDO, visit the website at www.fido-usa.org. Encourage your club, your veterinarian, your groomer, and your friends who are pet owners to join as well.

Also in this issue

<i>NAIA has been busy</i>	<i>Page 3</i>
<i>California AB 418 is dead</i>	<i>Page 3</i>
<i>Ohio lawmakers try to restore sanity to vicious dog law</i>	<i>Page 4</i>
<i>Bay State announces new animal import rules</i>	<i>Page 5</i>
<i>NAIA hosts dangerous dog conference</i>	<i>Page 6</i>
<i>NAIA opposes Pet Animal Welfare Statute</i>	<i>Page 7</i>
<i>Good temperament is critical when placing rescue dogs</i>	<i>Page 10</i>
<i>The PeTA death connection</i>	<i>Page 13</i>
<i>Harrisburg Humane Society is not connected to HSUS</i>	<i>Page 14</i>
<i>NAIA membership form</i>	<i>Page 15</i>



National director's message

NAIA has been busy!

DOGS! DOGS! DOGS!

The last six months have been focused on dog issues and have been the busiest and most successful on record for NAIA. Last November, we held an excellent Ohio conference on solving dangerous dog issues. From February through most of May NAIA and NAIA Trust members helped defeat an infamous anti-cropping bill in California. In May we also reaped the benefits of five years of work in a crusade to expose and regulate irresponsible pet importation and relocation into US shelters.

Along the way NAIA helped amend Oregon SB 844, a bill that started as an horrendous breed specific proposal but was amended by Senator Ryan Deckert into a solid dangerous dog bill. Respected Am Staff fancier Karen Herrold and NAIA members, Mary Strom and Lorraine Still gave testimony

at hearings, and Patti Strand served on the work group that amended the bill.

Still all attended hearings on this bill and gave excellent testimony. NAIA has also supplied information to lawmakers in Ohio regarding dangerous dog bill HB 189, a bill that would remove the statewide breed specific law. Norma Woolf of Ohio Valley Dog Owners and NAIA and Rick Foreman of OVDO and Queen City Dog Training Club contributed to this bill and gave testimony.

During March, NAIA also created a Guide to Pet Friendly Ordinances, a booklet that helps municipalities solve animal control problems. The guide is available on the NAIA website (<http://www.naiaonline.org/body/pdfs/PetFriendlyGuide.pdf>) and will be part of a packet now being developed.

Also in March, Dr. Larry Katz, our new president, traveled to Washington where he



delivered a presentation about NAIA to USDA.

What's next? In the near future the NAIA website will be a hub of activity. We are adding a new animal issue bulletin board and are creating a resource area for collecting and displaying shelter data. In the Fall NAIA plans to launch some exciting new animal studies.

It's been a busy year so far, but a very, very successful one. Thank you for helping us make so many good things happen.

Patti Strand

It's over! California AB 418 is dead!

Thanks to everyone who worked to defeat the California bill to ban ear-cropping in dogs

By Patti Strand, NAIA National Director

AB 418, the radical anti-cropping bill of California Assemblyman Paul Koretz is dead for another session – and probably wounded forever. There is a small chance that proponents might try to amend their language into another bill, but because they failed in Appropriations, doing so would not make them very popular. Meanwhile the lobbyist hired by NAIA Trust has offered to continue to monitor the situation through the end of the session without charging any additional fee.

In working to defeat this bill through NAIA Trust and the new FIDO Activist group (see article on FIDO on the front page), I've worked with some of the most incredibly dedicated fanciers I've ever encountered.

By defeating AB 418, the crop and dock breed enthusiasts have done what many said was impossible. They not only won a grueling battle in the Assembly where the bill was drafted by a member of the majority party who won the Humane Society of the United States Humane Legislator Award, but they also educated California lawmakers about the



facts of cropping and about the radical agenda of groups like the Association of Veterinarians for Animal Rights, HSUS and PETA. It is my sense that lawmakers are tired of hearing from the radicals. They've overplayed their hand, giving our side the opportunity to displace the animal rights extremist legislative agenda altogether in the state California. That is a worthwhile goal we can all embrace!

This was a multi-faceted effort with a host of contributors each playing an important job.

AKC deserves a huge thank you from everyone. They played an enormous role in

supplying the resources necessary to defeat this crazy bill. The AKC legislative division provided regular alerts, contacted Assembly members repeatedly and provided needed information to grassroots activists. Ronald Menaker, AKC chairman of the board, and Dennis Sprung, president, wrote letters at critical times. The new AKC economic impact studies are fabulous tools for supporting the dog fancy. They are up-to-date and professionally done, and they provide lawmakers exactly the right information at the right time.

Thanks also for the parent clubs who stepped up to the plate to lead the way. Many clubs were engaged in the fight, but we really need to acknowledge the Doberman Pinscher Club of America and the American Boxer Club for their extraordinary support. Special thanks to Terri Cannon for helping us all set up FIDO Activists (see article), a team that worked magnificently throughout the fight to kill AB 418. From writing letters, creating message points, making phone calls, spurring others to write, collecting data, de-

Continued on page 4

Lawmakers try to restore sanity to Ohio vicious dog law, drop breed restrictions

Ohio State Representative Kathleen Walcher introduced HB 189 to update the state's animal control law and ran into organized opposition from the state's dog wardens, prosecutors, and county commissioners.

The issue? Representative Walcher wants to eliminate the breed specific restrictions in the state code, and dog wardens want to retain the ability to charge pit bull owners with a crime for failure to abide by the state's vicious dog law.

Ohio is the only state that restricts dogs by breed. Dog wardens have used these restrictions to force owners of bull-and-terrier breeds and mixes to buy liability insurance and build a locked pen to confine their pets. In addition, while owners of dogs of other breeds or mixes face a citation if their pet runs at large in the community,

owners of pit bulls may face criminal charges for allowing a vicious dog to be unconfined.

Many law enforcement officials in the state say that the only way they can catch dog fighters and drug dealers is to consider every dog of the pit bull type to be vicious, and they impound dogs if owners do not comply. Shelters rarely place pit bulls in new homes. As a result, many good dogs die in shelters when owners cannot get insurance or afford the insurance that is available.

Last September, the Ohio Supreme Court ruled that the state's dangerous and vicious dog law was unconstitutional because it denies dog owners the opportunity for a hearing if their dogs have been accused of bad behavior. Thus there is currently no way to impound or otherwise restrict dogs accused of aggressive behavior.

HB 189 not only removes the breed-

specific requirements from state law, it

- Provides a hearing process for owners whose dogs are accused of aggressive behavior;
- Allows counties to hire hearing officers to determine if the dog is guilty of the allegations;
- Provides canine behavior training for hearing officers;
- Specifies dimensions for fencing to confine dangerous or vicious dogs;
- Provides a detailed description of "serious physical harm";
- Requires an "adequate" leash, tether, or fence for the confinement of any dog;
- Prevents ownership of more than one vicious dog;
- Requires owners to pay for impoundment

Continued on page 12

Harrisburg shelter says "We're not HSUS!"

Tired of being confused with the Humane Society of the US, the Humane Society of Harrisburg Area Inc. held a dogless dog walk on June 15 to emphasize their differences with the national organization.

The Harrisburg shelter website noted¹: "It is a common misperception that HSUS is an umbrella organization that financially assists local shelters. The Humane Society of Harrisburg Area relies solely on your generosity and does not receive assistance from HSUS or any other organization."

"One woman told me that she gave us \$13,000 and never received a thank you note. We checked our records and couldn't find any such donation," shelter spokeswoman Jill Troutman told the *Harrisburg Patriot-News*.² "She discovered it went to Washington, D.C. instead of to our shelter. It's a shame. That gift could have helped thousands of animals in central Pennsylvania."

HSUS runs no shelters and has a zero percent adoption rate according to the shelter website. The Humane Society of Harrisburg Inc. runs two shelters and has a 68 percent adoption rate.

Notes

1. The Humane Society of Harrisburg

Area Inc. website (<http://www.humanesocietyhbg.org/humanedifference.htm>)

2. "Dog-free walkers promote shelter" by Mary Klaus, *Harrisburg Patriot-News*, June 15, 2005.

It's over! California AB 418 is no more

Continued from page 3

livering petitions, identifying swing assembly members and so much more, there is little this group didn't accomplish. It was a huge privilege to work with them. Loosely, this group included Sam Burke, president of the DPCA; Anthony DiNardo, DPCA delegate to the AKC; and Dana Johnson, Maggie Cecil, Rebecca Roe Zaun, Carolyn Horowitz, Melissa Bates, Rob Polk, Lynn Petrangelo, Marge Brooks, Robin Schleifer, Theresa Moore and so many others who did everything that was asked of them and more.

The grassroots California dog fancy was an awesome model for every other state in the country. The California Federation of Dog Clubs engaged and activated their troops. Sharon Coleman's Animal Council kept everyone updated on AB 418 so campaigners could make their contacts count. People who didn't have time to work in the trenches donated money, bought bumper stickers and committed to at least make a

phone call or two.

And then, in the last hours of the campaign when the bill was in the Suspense File in the Appropriations Committee and worn out fanciers were exhausted from weeks of lobbying and beginning to go a little crazy wondering what was going to happen, from out of no where came – drum roll please – LobbyNow!, the cyber-brainchild of DPCA computer genius Dante DeAngeles, a legislative tool that was nurtured, prodded and cheered into existence by Jeff Helsdon, DPCA's legislative chairman so that it arrived exactly when it was needed. The result was that in the last hours of the session, just when we needed a boost over the finish line, there were Dante and Jeff sending fanciers a final opportunity to contact their California legislators by clicking here, signing there and hitting send. What a great finishing rally their efforts brought to our victory!

Next stop for FIDO Activists: We're off to regulate shelter imports in each state!

Score one for our side

Campaign leads to victory over reckless pet relocation and shelter importation

Continued from page 2

of strays they imported from Beijing, China. Obviously, these programs strive to make an absolutely unjustifiable, insane practice, look legitimate. NOT!

After years of documenting these threats, achieving coverage on the front page of *USA Today*,² and alerting health professionals and officials in federal and state agencies of the looming threats to human and animal health posed by these practices, regulatory changes have been instituted at last. As a result, rabies regulations have been strengthened and Massachusetts has taken the lead in setting rules for importing shelter dogs.

In July of 2004, following the importation of a rabid puppy from Puerto Rico into the Massachusetts shelter system,³ the CDC tightened rabies vaccination regulations.⁴ Then in November 2004, a dog from Mexico became the first case of canine rabies in Los Angeles in 30 years,⁵ once again focusing attention on the public health threat posed by dog importation.

Because of documented cases of rabies in dogs imported during 2004, the 2005 revision of the Compendium of Animal Rabies Prevention and Control addressed these issues for the first time, specifically calling for the discontinuation of importing dogs for sale or adoption from places with dog-to-dog rabies. Importantly, the Compendium states that federal regulations alone are insufficient to prevent the introduction of rabid animals into the country and thereby invites the states to do their part.

"We are pleased that Massachusetts is a state in which humane relocation efforts have been so successful in providing homes for stray animals from other states," said Douglas Gillespie, Commissioner of the Department of Agricultural Resources. "But, the time has come to be more vigilant in how we regulate this practice to prevent diseases and other health threats from reaching our residents, pets and livestock in Massachusetts."



With that in mind, it is not surprising that the Massachusetts Department of Agriculture held a special meeting with shelters and rescue groups to announce and explain new requirements. On May 12, 2005, these groups were informed that rescues, shelters and other animal groups will be held to the same standards and regulations as Massachusetts pet shops. These entities meet the state's definition of a pet shop, "a place or premises where birds, mammals, or reptiles are kept for the purpose of either wholesale or retail sale, import, export, barter, exchange, or gift."

In issuing its announcement, Douglas Gillespie, Commissioner of the Department of Agricultural Resources, said, "We are pleased that Massachusetts is a state in which humane relocation efforts have been so successful in providing homes for stray animals from other states. But, the time has come to be more vigilant in how we regulate this practice to prevent diseases and other health threats from reaching our residents, pets and livestock in Massachusetts."

See the Massachusetts Emergency Order on page 14 for complete details.

Because the National Association of State Public Health Veterinarians has formally called for the discontinuance of imports from places where dog-to-dog rabies exists and because they have informed the states that federal regulations aren't sufficient, the NASPHV has set the stage for state by state regulation. This boosts efforts already undertaken by NAIA.

NAIA thanks all the agencies and lawmakers that have treated this subject with seriousness, especially Massachusetts Representative Kay Kahn, who introduced a bill aimed at reducing the public health threats posed by unregulated importation. In addition, we'd like to thank Charlotte McGowan, the NAIA Trust representative in Massachusetts who has worked to bring these issues to the attention of legislators and associates in her state. Hooray!

Notes

1. Redefining Pet Overpopulation: <http://www.naiaonline.org/body/articles/archives/redefining.htm>
2. Humane or Insane: http://www.naiaonline.org/body/articles/archives/humane_insane.htm;
3. Stray pet relocation brings rabies to Massachusetts: http://www.naiaonline.org/body/articles/archives/relocation_brings_rabies.htm;
4. CDC tightens rabies vaccination rules for imported dogs: <http://www.naiaonline.org/body/articles/archives/newvac.htm>;
5. Thriving animal shelter businesses assure more rabies in American pets: <http://www.naiaonline.org/frommexicowithrabies.htm>;



Become a Friend in Dog Ownership

Join FIDO today & get a bumper sticker to proclaim your solidarity with all dog owners, breeders, trainers, & other canine enthusiasts.

It's easy ... just visit the FIDO website at www.fido-usa.org for details

NAIA hosts dangerous dogs conference aimed at finding answers

On November 6-7, 2004, NAIA gathered together a diverse group of canine experts, including owners, breeders, behaviorists, trainers, veterinarians, law enforcement personnel, shelter and rescue workers and public officials to hear and discuss issues surrounding dangerous dogs, and methods for addressing the problem more effectively in the future.

The topic is timely; many communities throughout the US are beefing up their dog laws to tighten descriptions of dangerous and aggressive dogs and to increase penalties for owners who allow their dogs to run loose and threaten their neighbors. In many cities, breed bans and restrictions are on the table. In Ohio, the topic is critical; last September the Ohio Supreme Court ruled that a portion of the state's dangerous dog law is unconstitutional because it denies due process to dog owners.¹

NAIA recognizes that efforts to reduce dog bites fail because citizens, lawmakers, and humane groups tend to emphasize laws and policies that restrict dog ownership rather than ones that penalize irresponsible dog ownership or reward responsible dog owners.² As a result, responsible dog owners can get trapped in the system along with those who are careless or negligent about training and confining their pets and communities get no relief from problem dogs.

The enormity of the problem

As with all NAIA conferences, this one was carefully put together so that topics flowed in a logical manner. The conference opened with a presentation by **Robert Gloster MD, FACEP**, an emergency room physician who served on the American Veterinary Association Task Force on Canine Aggression and Human Interaction. Dr. Gloster outlined the dog bite problem from the perspective of the victims and the doctors who treat them.

While most people who deal with dangerous dogs are well aware of the enormity of the problem, Dr. Gloster set the stage with the following statistics:

- There are 4.5 million dog bites in the US every year.
- Dog attacks cause 15-20 human

deaths, generate 336,000 emergency room visits and more than 460,000 doctor visits, and cost more than \$200 million in direct medical expenses annually.

- Less obvious expenses include phenomenal insurance costs, lost clients for vets as dangerous dogs are euthanized, torn clothes, ruined bicycles, lost homes for dogs, and the emotional trauma of both the attack and the (sometimes long-term) medical treatment.

Furthermore, the doctor said, 70-80 percent of dog bites occur in the home where the dog resides and involve either the owner's child or a playmate. Only 10-20 percent of bites are caused by an unknown animal and about four percent happen to meter readers, mailmen, veterinarians, groomers, and others who come in contact with dogs through their jobs.

An analysis of 1724 bites by the American Veterinary Medical Association concluded that most bites that occurred in homes were to the head and neck and those that resulted from interaction with stray dogs were to the lower extremities and to hands and arms.

Factors involved in dealing with dangerous dogs include:

- Reproductive status: the most frequent biter is an intact male dog.
- Breeding: Dogs that are bred to be aggressive will be aggressive.
- Socialization: Puppies need socialization to learn how to live in human society.
- Training: Beyond socialization, puppies need training so they will at least obey basic commands.
- Health: Some dogs bite because they are uncomfortable or in pain.

When communities confront the problem of dangerous dogs, they often depend heavily on outdated lists of dog related deaths that put pit bulls and Rottweilers at the top.

"We're missing the

boat," the doctor concluded. "We're reacting to the problem after it has occurred. It's a challenge; we need to figure out how to get the bigger picture and win the public relations war."

Nature v nurture?

Steve Zawistowski PhD, senior vice president and science advisor for the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, followed Dr. Gloster with a look at the genetics behind behavior and the social development of the dog.

Zawistowski said that it is a mistake to believe that either nature or nurture is paramount in dog behavior, for the dog is actually a blend of both.

After a brief overview of dog development from its canid forbears, he noted that genes and environment both play a significant role in producing dogs for different purposes and that raising dogs of some breeds in a hostile environment can facilitate the development of aggression.

Each puppy is born with a genotype (nature) – the code that will regulate not only its color, coat type, size, and general health status but also influence its behavior. Behavior can be modified by environment (nurture); the time and effort spent in socializing and training puppies is therefore critical in producing a dog that is a good family member and community resident. And while socialization is a continuing process, it is necessary to start young – the major socialization period in dogs closes at about 16 weeks of age, giving people about four months to have a significant influence on the future behavior of a pet.

Behavior patterns include predation. Most dogs display some or all of a behavior sequence of search, stalk, chase, grab/bite, use a kill bite, or, if carrying the sequence to its natural conclusion, eat the prey they have killed. Some dogs start at the beginning while others jump in at the chase. Most breeds exhibit truncated versions of the sequence: Border Collies search, stalk, and may chase; retrievers and setters



Continued on page 8

NAIA opposes S1139

Santorum-HSUS-AKC bill promotes licenses for hobby breeders

US Senator Richard Santorum of Pennsylvania has introduced S1139, a bill to amend the federal Animal Welfare Act. Dubbed the Pet Animal Welfare Statute of 2005, this bill poses a dilemma for animal welfare advocates: On one hand, it proposes amendments to bring people who import dogs for resale into the system and to provide USDA with better enforcement tools, goals that are worthy of support. On the other hand, it veers from its original purpose to regulate commercial breeders who sell wholesale into a scheme to regulate breeders by the numbers they produce and sell, an untenable goal that NAIA cannot support.

The question is whether it's possible in the current political environment to make any substantive improvements to the Animal Welfare Act without simultaneously creating unacceptable consequences. NAIA firmly believes that any amendment must support and strengthen the Act's fundamental intent – to regulate the handling of animals in commerce – not weaken it by expanding its scope to other categories of animal breeding and sales.

Unfortunately, this fundamental intent has been blurred by multiple attempts to amend it in recent years. Driven by animal activists who oppose pet breeding, these attempts have changed both public and government perception of AWA goals and hampered efforts to identify remaining problems and devise workable solutions. As a result, the one-page law passed in 1966 has become a patchwork of thousands of pages of amendments and regulations extending to an ever-growing array of species in an ever-expanding number of settings. The goals of the Act are still laudable, but they cannot be reached by expanding federal oversight to small scale breeders who produce puppies and kittens as a hobby or avocation in their homes.

Animal industries have significantly upgraded their animal-handling practices in the years since the act was first adopted. Abuses that were commonplace several decades ago are relatively rare today. While recognizing that the AWA spurred many of these changes, we believe that what is

needed now is better enforcement of the current Act. We do not believe that the USDA should broaden its coverage to parties based on numbers or any other artificial standard.

The search for real solutions

The federal government should not expand its authority beyond the large wholesale commercial operations they were intended to regulate. Instead, the Department should seek ways of reducing the number of people currently regulated so that it can focus its resources on the areas of greatest risk. Changing the original focus of the AWA from large commercial operations to residential breeders is a bad idea that would unnecessarily strain USDA's budget, take resources and attention from where they are needed and improperly expand the scope of federal authority into private homes, something the Act was never intended to do. Even if the initial regulation of wholesalers occurred because all of the large-scale commercial breeders of the day sold through middlemen, the intended licensees were still large commercial businesses, not small in-home breeders.

Many of the states where large commercial kennels operate already have their own kennel inspection programs that are working very well. At the local level, counties fund agencies to enforce anti-cruelty laws. In addition, large national dog and cat associations like the American Kennel Club (AKC) and Cat Fanciers Association (CFA) have significant, time-tested inspection programs in full operation. As a result of these innovations, which are functions that did not exist when the AWA was passed, some kennels are inspected by as many as three entities a year, a wasteful and inefficient practice.

NAIA believes that USDA should consider leveraging the authority and expertise of state agencies and private associations that have reasonable inspection programs so they can focus their resources on enforcing current laws and closing down the few operations responsible for most of the problems. Such a plan would allow large and small retail sellers to be inspected and investigated locally unless the violations include circumvention of the federal law.

Over-regulation always leads to unintended consequences, a fact that animal advocates must keep in mind. The stunning growth of pet imports suggests that American breeders cannot keep up with the marketplace demand for pets. If the current zeal for ever more regulations continues and conscientious breeders elect to give up breeding rather than welcome the federal government into their homes, the number of imports from totally uninspected foreign kennels will grow to meet that demand. Many of these animals may carry contagious diseases that can threaten our pets, native wildlife, and even our own health.

The AWA should not be expanded to include residential breeders. Instead, its current provisions should be strengthened and enforced. People who seek better handling of animals in today's commercial pet trade should work with USDA and other regulatory bodies and stakeholder groups to create an appropriate response for today's challenges.

NAIA will continue to oppose the use of numbers as a threshold for regulation and to support efforts to strengthen the original purposes of the AWA where necessary. We will issue statements and alerts as developments warrant.



Check the NAIA Trust website at www.naiatrust.org for information about policies, regulations & legislation affecting dog owners.

NAIA hosts dangerous dogs conference aimed at finding answers

Continued from page 6

search, stalk, and grab/bite; and livestock guardians exhibit little or no predatory sense (a good thing if they are expected to guard the sheep!).

Even within breeds, some lines of dogs are selected for particular attributes, Dr. Zawistowski said. Thus some breeders produce field dogs that have strong hunting, herding, or guarding instincts, while others concentrate on show dogs and still others breed for companion dogs that may or may not maintain the original breed behaviors.

Breeding for purpose is also a strategy used by gang members and other criminals who produce guard dogs and fighting dogs that are aggressive to humans. They are not interested in maintaining breed integrity or good temperaments; they select and breed aggressive dogs of any breed or mix and encourage fierceness through early handling and training of the puppies.

Temperament tests

Many dogs surrendered to shelters or picked up as strays have behaviors that are unacceptable for family life, leaving conscientious shelter personnel to determine which dogs are fit for placement in new homes. To help with this responsibility, **Amy Marder VMD**, director of behavioral services for the Animal Rescue League of Boston, developed a shelter assessment test as one tool in the shelter's kit bag.

"A valid test measures what it is intended to measure, is predictive of success in the home, and produces repeatable results with different testers or in repeat tests by the same evaluator," Dr. Marder told the conference audience.

The test depends on staff members trained to observe and record the dog's behavior in a variety of circumstances while caged, while loose in a room, and while being touched, restrained, and crated, and in play. Evaluators also watch for possessive behavior, reaction to pain and fear, response to cats and other dogs, behavior when left alone and response to commands with and without food rewards.

Dr. Marder cautioned the audience that the test is worthwhile but "should be done with a grain of salt." Staff observations, conversations with previous owners, and other information about the dog should also be used to make placement decisions, and shelters must follow-up to find out how well the placement is working.

The veterinarian's role

As Dr. Gloster mentioned in his presentation, veterinary practices lose clients when dogs are euthanized for aggression. Small animal veterinarian **Gary Clemons DVM** expanded on that brief mention by describing the veterinarian's role in preventing dog aggression by educating clients.



"If we can give people the tools to make the dog a good member of the family, they'll have the dog longer," he told the conference participants.

At Dr. Clemons' clinic, each new puppy visit lasts 30 minutes. During this time, he explains the elements of puppy behavior and socialization to the client, shows how to teach the puppy to 'sit,' and 'down' using treats, and emphasizes the importance of puppy socialization. He gives clients handouts on puppy training and behavior and offers a copy of Ian Dunbar's puppy training video for a \$10 refundable deposit.

During the visit, he gives parents advice on building a relationship between the puppy and the children in the family by teaching the kids to reinforce the treat-training for basic commands, having kids feed the puppy, and monitoring play between puppy and kids. He explains normal dog behavior and behavior changes as puppies reach social maturity; encourages owners to desensitize the puppy to the touches of children and strangers by frequent handling of feet, ears, head, and body; opposes tug-of-war games, rough-housing, and forceful corrections for unacceptable behavior; and advises clients to take puppies to training classes to meet and interact with other dogs.

He explained that the veterinarian's role goes beyond puppyhood so that clients take seriously the need to control dominance and short circuit aggressive tendencies throughout the dog's life. He tells clients that they should not excuse bad behavior or ignore potential aggression; that spaying an aggressive bitch can make matters worse by altering her hormone balance; and that some

Man and dog partnership survived terrorist bombing

When terrorists turned airliners into winged bombs on September 11, 2001, Michael Hingson and his guide dog Roselle were on the 78th floor of the World Trade Center tower struck first. Roselle guided Michael down 78 flights of stairs into the street and stayed with him as they ran away from the falling debris.

Since that fateful day, Michael has offered his services as a motivational speaker to emphasize the human-animal bond and to turn the elements of that bond into a life commitment to trust, cooperation, and courage.

He shared that message by telling his remarkable story to the participants in the NAIA conference to remind everyone that teamwork and focus yield results in any endeavor.

For more information about Michael Hingson and Roselle, see www.guidedogs.com/media/Hingson%20media%20kit.pdf

Continued on page 9

NAIA hosts dangerous dogs conference aimed at finding answers

Continued from page 8
aggression problems cannot be fixed.

Enter the pit bull

Any discussion of dangerous dogs ultimately gets around to the pit bull. Much maligned as a killer, the pit bull is a victim of a media-created "pit bull monster" according to **Jane Berkey**, president of the Animal Farm Foundation, a pit bull rescue and information center.

"A dangerous dog is only a symptom of the real problem: irresponsible owners who don't understand dog behavior and cruel and criminal owners who damage dogs and make them dangerous," Berkey said, and noted that breed specific legislation is an inappropriate response to what is an issue of responsible dog ownership.

"Breed specific legislation does not rest upon any reasonable basis," Berkey said. "While it addresses a legislature's immediate political emergency, it creates in the public a false sense of security and diverts needed resources from real solutions. BSL does not make communities safe. It does have a devastating effect upon innocent owners and dogs, and the agencies left to cope with the flood of cast offs."

Animal Farm Foundation is on the front lines with "It pays to spay" and an ambassador program to acquaint the public with well-behaved pit bulls like Dakota, a search and rescue dog who worked the Columbia shuttle disaster site; Tahoe, a search and rescue dog who doubles as a therapy dog; and Popsicle, a US Customs Service dog helping federal agents sniff out criminals.

Berkey said that the emphasis on spaying pet dogs and training pit bulls as breed emissaries will help overcome the prejudice against the dogs and that programs promoting responsible ownership will enhance community safety.

"Make sure your laws, policies and programs shine the spotlight on the true



Cincinnati, Ohio, bans pit bulls. **Andy Mahlman**, manager of the SPCA Cincinnati animal shelter, a facility that covers both the city and surrounding Hamilton County, explained the burden that breed bans and restrictions place on animal shelters.

"Breed specific laws create challenges for shelter managers," he said. "We can be overwhelmed by breed specific legislation."

villain, not the current victim," she said. "Make the pit bull the symbol of our united war against cruelty. Only when we educate their caretakers and protect our animals from cruel and criminal owners will we be taking the steps necessary toward making our communities safer."

Pit bulls in Ohio

Ohio is the only state with a codified restriction on the ownership of pit bulls. State law declares that dogs "commonly known as a pit bull dog" are vicious regardless of behavior and requires owners to confine the dog in a locked pen or yard and purchase \$100,000 liability insurance. Some cities go further; they ban the dogs outright or place additional restrictions on ownership.

Cincinnati, Ohio, bans pit bulls. **Andy Mahlman**, manager of the SPCA Cincinnati animal shelter, a facility that covers both the city and surrounding Hamilton County, explained the burden that breed bans and restrictions place on animal shelters.

"Breed specific laws create challenges for shelter managers," he said. "We can be overwhelmed by breed specific legislation."

Impounding dogs because of their appearance places a strain on kennel space, he said. SPCA Cincinnati handled 1300 pit bulls in 2003 and the trend is upward. (1025 in 2002; 888 in 2001). He told the audience that they rarely see a human-aggressive pit bull, but because they are generally aggressive to other dogs, they must be housed separately.

Pit bulls picked up in the county can go

back home if the owners understand the need to confine the dogs in compliance with state law. The shelter rarely places pit bulls in new homes; most of those impounded are killed if they cannot be safely reunited with their owners.

The first day of the conference ended with a dynamic presentation by **Pam Sears**, an assistant prosecutor who handled dog cases in Hamilton County.

Prosecutors have to balance the community's interest with the dog owner's interest in cases involving dangerous or vicious dogs, she told the audience.

"We prosecute people, not dogs," she said. "Often dogs categorized as vicious or dangerous are just acting like dogs."

Each case is handled on its own merits, she said, and suggested that placement of the dog in a new home or alternative sentencing that requires dog owners to attend education programs for responsible ownership are potential answers when a dog has behaved badly and the owners are not capable or willing to take steps to correct the problem.

Sears spoke briefly about the September 22, 2004, Ohio Supreme Court decision that declared a substantial portion of the state's vicious dog law to be unconstitutional. (see "Ohio lawmakers trying to restore sanity to state dog law" in this issue) She disagreed with the decision and said that it has caused turmoil among prosecutors as they attempt to figure out how dog wardens can legally deal with vicious dogs until new law is written and passed by the state legislature.

Her bottom line was that the community should be safe from dangerous dogs, but that alternatives to euthanasia should be considered if situations warrant.

Rescue responsibilities

November 7 began with a presentation by **Nancy Campbell**, long-time breeder, trainer, and rescuer of German Short-haired

Continued on page 11

Reuse, recycle, rescue

Good temperament is critical when placing rescue dogs in new homes

By Vicki DeGruy

What is rescue? It's saving the lives of pets that would otherwise be destroyed. But is that all? If it were, rescue would really be pretty easy. Since we can't care for all these saved lives by ourselves, we must find good homes for them. That's the hard part. In order to be successful in rescue, we need adopters. To get adopters, we need to provide them with good pets. If the dogs we're trying to place aren't good pets, no one will want them.

There's one thing people want most in a pet dog, and that's good temperament. They're willing to compromise on breed, size, sex, age, appearance, intelligence, and certain aspects of behavior and health, but not temperament. People want dogs that are friendly, reliable, trainable and above all, safe to handle and live with.

What do most people consider to be a good temperament in a family dog? A stable dog that doesn't startle or snap easily, is confident enough to handle the noise and bustle of a busy home, is protective yet smart enough to tell the difference between the average stranger and a genuine threat. He shouldn't have to tolerate abuse from children but his reaction should be to walk away, not growl or bite. He should be able to tolerate handling from strangers while he's on walks, at the vet, the groomer or boarding kennel. He needs to be loyal but adaptable enough to adjust to a stay in a kennel or with a friend while the family goes on vacation.

To an extent, a good temperament can be breed specific - what's considered good in your breed might not be good in mine. There are still a lot of generalizations we can make, though, that apply to almost every breed: a dog with a good temperament is happy and cheerful, he's trusting and has an optimistic outlook on life. He enjoys human companionship, he wants to be near people and he's eager to please. He looks to people for direction and can accept appropriate discipline. There's room for breed specific variation in all these characteristics but overall, they meet most breeds' stan-



dards for good temperament without compromising the breed's basic nature.

I think accurate temperament evaluation is the most important part of pre-adoption foster care. What is the dog really like? In our program, we don't put new dogs on our adoption listing for at least 30 days. During this time, they're critically observed, handled every day, groomed, taken to the vet, put under stress and experience corrections. We pet them while they're eating, we introduce them to other dogs, we teach them some basic manners (not to bolt out of doors, for example). We push their envelopes, especially the alpha dogs. What do they do when they're corrected or yelled at?

The standard by which we evaluate behavior is - how do they handle the kinds of things they will be exposed to every day in the average adoptive home? Are they safe for the average family? Imagine what the average family dog will encounter - kids that hug and pull on tails, the mailman, the vet, the neighbors, a walk on the street, toys and

food dishes - and test him with them. Does he react predictably and in a non-aggressive way? Be especially critical after the first two weeks have gone by because now the dog is more comfortable with you and will let his real personality show.

Bite potential comes up with every dog you rescue and needs to be determined in your temperament evaluation. Obviously, if the dog has teeth, he might find the opportunity to use them someday so when it comes down to it, every dog has bite potential. But some have more potential than others and that can usually be assessed in foster care. It's essential that you be objective in your evaluation and not make excuses for the dog's behavior. "Gee, he must've been scared once by a man with a beard" or "he'll be okay as long as kids don't run up behind him". These excuses won't hold up in court. If a dog threatens or appears likely to bite under the circumstances he can expect to meet in his day to day life, he should not be a candidate for adoption.

One of the biggest issues for rescue groups today is liability. Many people are afraid to rescue for fear of being sued over something a rescued dog does after it's been placed - and it's a legitimate concern.

The greatest liability risks for rescues are dogs that bite or show a strong potential for biting. It's also the risk that's the easiest to avoid. How? By not placing dogs that bite or accepting them into your rescue program.

The most important thing you can do to protect yourself, your breed, and the public is to never place a dog that has bitten someone. I can't stress this enough. No matter

Continued on page 13



The greatest liability risks for rescues are dogs that bite or show a strong potential for biting. It's also the risk that's the easiest to avoid. How? By not placing dogs that bite or accepting them into your rescue program.

The most important thing you can do to protect yourself, your breed, and the public is to never place a dog that has bitten someone.

NAIA hosts dangerous dogs conference aimed at finding answers

Continued from page 9

Pointers. Campbell spoke about the responsibilities of breeders to produce dogs of sound temperament and of rescuers to make hard decisions about dogs that have bad temperaments.

Breeders should ...

- work with a mentor;
- analyze a potential breeding dog for good temperament;
- temperament-test litters and place puppies accordingly;
- use a contract that requires the puppy to come back home if the owner doesn't want it or can no longer keep it;
- raise puppies in the house with lots of neonatal handling, exposure to household noises and activities, etc.
- encourage owners to train their dogs and participate in dog sports and activities.

Rescuers should ...

- realize they are not magicians and cannot fix every dog;
- listen to owners and drive them to the veterinary clinic for euthanasia if necessary; and
- do not take dangerous dogs or place them in new homes.

Campbell said that problems can be



Go to
www.NAIAonline.org
 for a large selection
 of articles, policies,
 letters, & other
 features.

Nancy Hill, Spokane, Washington, animal control director, defined the dangerous dog problem as a result of irresponsible owners, the popularity of powerful breeds, and inadequate laws to address dangerous and vicious dogs.

"Animal control is a band-aid," she said. "Education is important to prevention."

avoided if owners realize that dogs are a different species; are willing to train dogs and to manage difficult dogs so they don't become biters; teach children to treat dogs with respect and to use good manners and commands; and to remember that some aggressive incidents can be linked to health problems.

Defining dangerous dogs

Nancy Hill, the animal control director in Spokane, Washington, said that communities face difficulties in defining dangerous dogs and providing funding for programs that identify these dogs and remove them from irresponsible owners.

She linked the problem to three common misperceptions of dog owners:

- A dangerous dog is a vicious dog;
- My dog won't bite; and
- Only injuries to humans make a dog dangerous.

Owners often live in denial, she said; although some incidents are isolated, owners tend to claim extenuating circumstances and make excuses for their dog's behavior.

She defined the dangerous dog problem as a result of irresponsible owners, the popularity of powerful breeds, and inadequate laws to address dangerous and vicious dogs.

"Animal control is a band-aid," she said. "Education is important to prevention."

Her solutions? Pass a dangerous dog ordinance that is not breed specific, contains protective measures to keep potentially dangerous dogs from crossing the line, and includes an appeal process. Her model is the Revised Code of Washington, Section 16.08.070 and Spokane County Code Title 5. These laws define both dangerous and potentially dangerous dogs, provide for owners to appeal the dangerous dog

designation, and set registration requirements for dangerous dogs.

Permanent dog identification

Permanent identification of dogs with a microchip or tattoo is part of many dangerous dog laws, and many shelters are now using microchips in all dogs they place in new homes. Many breeders and rescuers chip all of their dogs and recommend microchips as a way to get lost dogs back to their owners. **Dr. Carmen Battaglia**, president of the American Kennel Club Companion Animal Recovery Program, described the CAR's dedication to getting dogs back home if they are lost and thus helping to reduce shelter deaths as well as decrease the amount of time the dog is on the loose. Chips do no good if shelters do not have the ability to read them, so, since its beginning in 1995, AKC-CAR has contributed over \$2 million toward the distribution of scanners to animal shelters, SPCAs, humane societies and animal control agencies. The key to recovery is the database and the 24/7 service. AKC-CAR has over 10 years of service experience and now recovers a pet every seven minutes.

Although microchips have reunited tens of thousands of dogs with their families, Dr. Battaglia opposed the growing demand for mandatory identification laws. "These laws are well-intentioned but most only polarize owners and authorities," he said. "They are not in our best interest because too often they are used to monitor zoning restrictions or as another means for taxing pet owners."

About 80-90 percent of pet stores and many breeders already microchip the puppies they sell, he said, and more breeders are

Continued on page 12

NAIA dangerous dogs conference aims to find answers

Continued from page 10

encouraged to do so. Many shelters and rescues also implant chips in the dogs they place in new homes, so the trend is growing without such laws.

AKC and dog laws

Stephanie Lane, director of the Canine Legislation Department., explained the registry's policy on canine legislation and spoke about recent trends in anti-dog policies and ordinances.

"AKC supports reasonable, non-discriminatory, enforceable laws, and works to protect the rights of dog owners by influencing laws before they are passed," she told the audience.

She said that there are more proposals to restrict or ban breeds, to establish state-wide dangerous dog registries, increase fines and penalties for owners, increase liability insurance requirements, and to repeal the pre-emptive anti-breed specific laws in some states. To thwart some of these efforts and to make sure that others are reasonable, AKC

works with state and local lawmakers and with insurance companies to write regulations, laws, and policies that target irresponsible ownership and promote education as the key to responsible ownership and safer communities.

Lane said that the Canine Good Citizen test is a major component of AKC's education effort. This 10-step test emphasizes responsible ownership and good pet manners. Recognized by veterinarians, landlords, and the insurance industry, the CGC is growing in popularity.

Conference wind-up

The conference wound up with panel discussions that included audience participation.

NAIA drew these conclusions from the gathering:

1. The problems caused by dangerous dogs in the community must be identified before they can be solved.
2. Responsible dog owners are part of any solution and should be recognized for

their contributions to the community instead of punished by breed specific legislation, high license fees, pet limits and other restrictions that are difficult to enforce, set neighbor against neighbor, and do nothing to make things better.

3. The media is an important part of every solution because reporters and editors can drive hysteria or can highlight problems and potential solutions, and recognize serious commitments by responsible owners to aid in finding resolutions that target only those who refuse to license their pets or to keep them confined.

4. Dog clubs, groomers, boarding kennel owners, dog trainers, rescuers, and others who promote responsible ownership must become more visible so that members are tapped to help when animal control problems plague neighborhoods.

5. When laws are proposed, responsible owners must stand up and make their views known, establish a relationship with lawmakers, offer alternatives if they object to the draft under discussion, and pledge support if the proposal recognizes that responsible owners can be part of the solution.

NAIA has drafted a model ordinance³ to help communities accentuate the positive in attempts to eliminate the negative in areas where citizens scoff at animal control laws. This ordinance has the potential to change attitudes by providing incentives to be responsible, plans to get dogs home, and appropriate punishment for those who place their neighbors in danger by failing to socialize, train, and confine their dogs.

Notes

1. The Ohio Legislature is considering HB 189, a bill that will delete the breed-specific portion of the law that defines pit bulls as vicious dogs and provide for due process for dog owners accused of violations of the vicious dog law. The bill as introduced is available at www.legislature.state.oh.us/bills.cfm?ID=126_HB_189.

2. Agencies ask NAIA to help fashion animal control policies, http://www.naiaonline.org/body/articles/archives/public_policy.htm

3. The model is available for downloading on the NAIA website at www.naiaonline.org/body/pdfs/PetFriendlyGuide.pdf

Lawmakers try to restore sanity

Continued from page 4

costs if any dogs are seized in violation of the leash law; and

- Gives the hearing officer or court the authority to require a vicious dog to be spayed or neutered if it is returned to the owner.

With assistance from NAIA, Ohio Valley Dog Owners Inc. has drafted a set of potential amendments to the bill and has been invited to submit those amendments to the sponsor for consideration. These amendments include:

- Permanent identification for dogs adjudicated as dangerous or vicious;
- A provision to remove the designation of dangerous from a dog if the owner proves he has taken steps to moderate the dog's behavior and the dog has had no further incidents for a specified period of time;
- A procedure for returning impoundment fees to owners whose dogs are exonerated of any charges; and
- An additional category of vicious dogs that includes dogs used for criminal purposes and dogs used to deliberately intimidate or threaten neighbors.

Hearings

HB 189 is under consideration in the House Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee. The bill has had two hearings, one for sponsor testimony (May 4) and one for proponent testimony (May 18). Hearing schedules can be found at http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/house_committee_schedule.cfm.

Contact the sponsor at

Representative Kathleen L. Walcher, 77 S. High Street, 13th Floor, Columbus, OH 43215-6111. Telephone: (614) 466-9628; Fax: (614) 644-9494; E-mail: district58@ohr.state.oh.us

Co-sponsor contact information is:

Representative Shawn Webster DVM, 77 S. High Street, 13th Floor, Columbus, OH 43215-6111. Telephone: (614) 644-5094; Fax: (614) 644-9494; E-mail: district53@ohr.state.oh.us

Committee contact information is:

Jim Aslanides (R), Chairman, 77 S. High Street, 12th Floor, Columbus, OH 43215-6111. Telephone: (614) 644-6014; Fax: (614) 644-9494; E-mail: district94@ohr.state.oh.us

Good temperament is critical for rescue dogs

Continued from page 10

how minor the bite or the incident. The law and your insurance company don't make a distinction between a big bite and a little one. If you want to be safe, neither should you. The law rarely takes into account mitigating circumstances. Insurance companies never do. Whether or not the dog was provoked may not make a difference in the final judgment.

It's not fair, that's for sure. Dogs have teeth and anybody with a lick of sense knows that they might be justified to use them once in a while. But the bottom line today is that our society, our legislators, and our insurance companies no longer understand canine behavior and they no longer tolerate dogs that bite. Period. If you place a dog with a bite history or one that displays a high potential for biting, you're putting yourself and other people at risk.

In your evaluations, it's important to trust your instincts as well as your knowledge. There are going to be times when a dog passes all your tests but for some reason, he still makes you uncomfortable. You don't quite trust him. Most of the time, our instincts are right. There's something wrong with that dog even though you can't explain what it is. You should listen to those instincts and not place the dog.

What to do with dogs of markedly poor temperament or those that bite? Euthanasia has unfortunately become a dirty word in rescue today. There's been so much emphasis on the "no kill" and "no dog is unadoptable" philosophies in recent years that many rescuers have become afraid to euthanize for fear of being considered inhumane or disreputable. Euthanizing dogs that are unfit for a quality life as good pets in our society should not be stigmatized, it is a responsible action that is done out of love and respect for both the animal and the world it would have to live in. Euthanasia should not be a easy-out solution for difficult dogs but it shouldn't be vilified when it is the most appropriate answer for a bad situation.

2005 is my 20th anniversary in rescue. I've learned a great deal in that time. I think the most important thing I've learned is that the long-term success of a rescue organization depends on the quality of temperament in the dogs it offers for adoption. The one thing people want most in a pet dog is a



2005 is my 20th anniversary in rescue. I've learned a great deal in that time. I think the most important thing I've learned is that the long-term success of a rescue organization depends on the quality of temperament in the dogs it offers for adoption.

good temperament. They'll compromise on just about everything else except that. Today's society demands a dog that's friendly, reliable, trainable and above all, safe to handle and live with. When this is what you provide, adopters find you. They come back for seconds and thirds, and they tell

their friends!

This will be my last rescue column for the NAIA News. I've enjoyed this opportunity to share my experience with you and have been gratified by the response it's received. Best wishes for the future!

Editor's note: NAIA has been most fortunate to have Vicki's columns and rescue expertise for the past several years. We will miss her level-headed approach to this important work and wish her the best in her life. Her contribution to dogs needing rescue and to those who are on the front lines of ethical rescue is cannot be measured. Thanks, Vicki!

The PeTA death connection

Two activists kill and dump dogs they 'rescued' from shelters

A man and a woman employed by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals have been arrested in North Carolina for killing dogs they received from two animal shelters. The two were using a van registered to PeTA in Norfolk, Virginia.¹

Following a month-long investigation, officers in Ahoskie, North Carolina, arrested Andrew Benjamin Cook, 24, of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Adria Joy Hinkle, 27, of Norfolk, Virginia, on 31 felony counts of animal cruelty and eight misdemeanor counts of illegal disposal of dead animals. The cruelty charges stem from discovery of 18 dog bodies found in a dumpster and 13 dead dogs in the van.

The police investigation was triggered by the discovery of dead animal bodies on several Wednesdays. On June 15, several law enforcement officers watched as Cook and Hinkle unloaded several dark bags into a dumpster behind a market. They stopped the van before it could pull away.

The animal officer for the Bertie County

Animal Shelter identified the bodies as dogs that were picked up at the shelter earlier that day.² The officer said the pair had been picking up animals at his shelter for the past two months on the pretext they were taking them to Norfolk, Virginia, to place them in good homes.

The investigation and arrests confirm what NAIA has known for years: PeTA's "sanctuary" exists to give the organization a veneer of respectability that is no more legitimate than a front business used by mobsters as a cover for corrupt activities.

PeTA is no stranger to killing animals it claims are better dead than held captive. From 1998-2003, PeTA killed more than 10,000 of the 13,000 animals brought to its sanctuary in Norfolk.³

A veterinarian speaks out

Ahoskie veterinarian Dr. Patrick Proctor said that he has spayed and neutered animals brought to him by PeTA

Continued on page 14

New regulations are necessary to protect human and animal health

The Commonwealth Of Massachusetts
Executive Office Of Environmental Affairs
Department of Agricultural Resources
251 Causeway Street, Suite 500, Boston, MA 02114
Contact: Brad Mitchell, 617-626-1771

May 26, 2005: The Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources (DAR) announced an emergency order today to strengthen the regulations pertaining to animals brought into the Commonwealth from other states. DAR has found that additional requirements are necessary to prevent rescue organizations, shelters and other groups from bringing animals into the state that pose risks to human and animal health. More than 200 rescue and adoption groups are currently relocating animals to Massachusetts for adoption and sale. Today's emergency order will address the weaknesses in the current import laws in order to minimize health risks in Massachusetts with the following four new requirements:

Record keeping –

Every rescue group and shelter will be required to keep and provide detailed records on the animal's place of origin, where it was housed prior to arriving in Massachusetts and ultimately on its new home. Rescue groups and shelters will also be required to keep detailed medical records on each animal to aid in epidemiology investigations and follow-up.

Isolation –

Every animal coming into Massachusetts for adoption must be isolated for 48 hours. This will serve two important purposes: 1) Any disease afflicting an animal will have the opportunity to manifest itself after the stress of transport, and 2) Imported animals will have enough time after transport to recover and exhibit either symptoms of disease or behavior consistent with a healthy animal.

Veterinary Examination –

Every animal must be given a health exam and issued a health certificate by a Massachusetts veterinarian at the end of the 48-hour isolation period.

Registration form –

Every rescue group and shelter will be required to be registered with the state of Massachusetts and be able to furnish proof of registration so that state enforcement agencies remain aware of all importing entities in the state and the precise nature of their operations.

"We are pleased that Massachusetts is a state in which humane relocation efforts

have been so successful in providing homes for stray animals from other states," said Douglas Gillespie, Commissioner of the Department of Agricultural Resources. "But, the time has come to be more vigilant in how we regulate this practice to prevent diseases and other health threats from reaching our residents, pets and livestock in Massachusetts." Some of the more serious issues that these new regulations seek to minimize include nonexistent or forged health records and certificates, introduction of diseases and parasites not previously found in Massachusetts and importation of animals with serious, contagious diseases such as rabies. "We have seen instances where families with young children were adopting sick dogs right off the back of an out of state transport truck, with few if any steps taken to protect the safety or health of the adopting family or their pets" added Commissioner Gillespie. "These rescue organizations do wonderful work; we just need to ensure that they are doing it right from an animal health and human health perspective" he concluded.

Two activists kill and dump dogs they 'rescued' from shelters

Continued from page 13

representatives for several years. The representatives asked him if he had any adoptable animals they could also take to Norfolk for placement in new homes. Over the years, he sent about 50 animals with them, including a mother cat and two kittens in the Wednesday pick-up. He identified one of the dead dogs found Wednesday as a six-month-old Labrador retriever cross puppy in apparently good condition except for the hypodermic needle hole in its front leg.

Proctor said that he is trying to get the word out about these killings and has called national media in an attempt to get them

interested in the story.

Questions have been raised about whether the two have the proper certification to euthanize animals by lethal injection; the Virginia Department of Agriculture, the agency responsible for training euthanasia technicians, is checking its files for the to ascertain whether they were qualified.⁴

Cook and Hinkle are out on bond. They were arraigned on Friday, June 17. Each faces 31 counts of felony animal cruelty, eight misdemeanor charges of illegally dumping dead animal bodies, and one misdemeanor charge of trespassing. Hinkle has been suspended by PeTA.

Notes

1. Media release from Ahooskie Police Department, June 16, 2005
2. "PETA possibly involved with dead dogs," by Cal Bryant, *Roanoke-Chowan News-Herald*, <http://www.roanoke-chowannewsheald.com/articles/2005/06/16/news/aneWS1.txt>
3. PeTAKills animals.com, a website of the Center for Consumer Freedom, <http://www.petakillsanimals.com/petaKillsAnimals.cfm>
4. WAVY-TV report, June 21, 2005, <http://www.wavy.com/Globa1/story.asp?S=3497648&nav=23iibExo>

Join NAIA



New members, renewing members, and donors receive an NAIA logo pin to signify their support for the well-being of animals and the people who care for them. (Additional pins are available for \$10 each)

Please mail or fax your information to us at:
 NAIA, PO BOX 66579 / Portland, OR 97290 Fax 503-761-1289

Membership Form / Annual Membership Dues & Annual Donation

(Use this form for new memberships, renewals, and donations to help NAIA help animal owners and fanciers protect traditional, ethical animal interests and maintain the human-animal bond.)

- [] Companion, \$35 [] Champion, \$100 [] Steward, \$150 [] Patron, \$250
 [] Hero, \$500 [] Super Hero \$1000 [] Additional donation: _____

Name of Person or Organization: _____

Contact Person: _____

Street Address: _____

City, State, Zipcode: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____ E-mail: _____

[] Visa [] Mastercard Card #: _____ Exp. _____

I can volunteer in the following ways: _____

You can also remember NAIA in your will. Check here [] or simply contact us at the address above to receive more information about bequests. NAIA's tax ID # is 93-1099912.

Congress looks at microchip standards

US microchips are manufactured to a different standard than chips in other countries, but a report to Congress recommends adoption of a universal standard so that all scanners can read all chips.

House Report 2744 supports microchip identification of pets and directs the US Department of Agriculture to write regulations to implement the 134 kHz International Standards Organization standard.

Microchip pet identification has been available for more than 20 years, but fewer than five percent of America's dogs and cats have this potentially lifesaving technology. Standardization will help more lost pets get reunited with their families.

For more information about a national standard for a 134.2 kHz ISO voluntary microchip system and a link to the report attached to the 2006 agriculture bill pending in Congress, visit the NAIA Trust website at www.naiatrust.org.

Banfield, The Pet Hospital®
 salutes the **National Animal Interest Alliance**
 for its efforts to improve the lives of Pets
 and their families

Banfield
 THE PET HOSPITAL SINCE 1982
 Treating Your Pet Like Family™

Call 1-800-768-8858 for the Banfield nearest you or logon to www.banfield.net



NAIA News
National Animal Interest Alliance
PO Box 66579
Portland, OR 97290-6579