



# Federation of Maine Dog Clubs

and Responsible Dog Owners



---

September – October 2010 Newsletter

---

*Official publication of the Federation of Maine Dog Clubs & Responsible Dog Owners*

[www.fedmedogclubs.org](http://www.fedmedogclubs.org)

---

## IN THIS ISSUE:

- MAINE - 50-State Report: Maine Shelters Receive Zero Dollars from HSUS.
- MISSOURI - American Kennel Club, Others, Oppose HSUS Ballot Initiative on “Puppy Mills”.
- FEDERAL – Is “PUPS” Bill Warm & Fuzzy?
- FMDCRDO - Announcements & Meeting Minutes.



## NOT YOUR LOCAL HUMANE SOCIETY: A 50-STATE REPORT

[http://humanewatch.org/images/uploads/2010-06\\_NOT\\_YOUR\\_LOCAL\\_HUMANE\\_SOCIETY.pdf](http://humanewatch.org/images/uploads/2010-06_NOT_YOUR_LOCAL_HUMANE_SOCIETY.pdf)

In a February 2010 poll conducted by Opinion Research Corporation, 71 percent of Americans agreed that the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) “is an umbrella group that represents thousands of local humane societies all across America.” And 59 percent believed that HSUS “contributes most of its money to local organizations that care for dogs and cats.”

Both of these statements are false. Despite producing a steady stream of television commercials and other fundraising materials that imply otherwise, HSUS is not affiliated with any of America’s more than 10,000 hands-on pet shelters. And in 2008, the most recent tax year for which nonprofit IRS filings are available, HSUS shared less than one-half of one percent of its budget with legitimate “humane societies” and other pet shelters.

This report documents HSUS’s grants to pet shelters in the 50 United States from 2006 to 2008. The data is drawn from HSUS’s tax filings with the IRS, documents which are in the public record.

During that three-year period, HSUS donated zero dollars to shelters in five states (Maine, Nebraska, Nevada, South Dakota, and Wyoming). And the organization’s total giving to pet shelters totaled less than \$50,000 in each of 39 other states.

All told, HSUS’s total spending in these 39 states made up just one-fifth of one percent (0.2%) of HSUS’s total budget during this time. In those three tax years, HSUS spent nearly \$280 million on salaries, lobbying, advertising, fundraising, and other programs. At the end of 2008, HSUS reported having over \$162 million in assets.

HSUS itself acknowledges that between 3 and 4 million dogs and cats are euthanized in American shelters every year—about half of all pets that enter their doors. But while HSUS can clearly afford to tackle the problem head-on, it appears to have other priorities.

The Humane Society of the United States did spend \$2.4 million on pet shelters in Louisiana between 2006 and 2008, mostly consisting of funds for constructing new facilities following Hurricane Katrina. HSUS could easily afford to follow this funding model in all 50 states and the District of Columbia; if it did, those expenditures would amount to roughly half of its annual budget—a noble goal.

However, HSUS—which is often erroneously referred to as our “national humane society”—routinely gives far less to the hands-on pet sheltering facilities that most Americans believe constitute its principal responsibility.

Continued...

## **HSUS Shelter Highlights**

The Humane Society of the United States didn't make any donations to Ohio pet shelters in 2007 and 2008, and gave just \$5,200 in 2006. This year, however, the organization is gearing up to spend millions of dollars in the Buckeye State on an anti-livestock farming ballot initiative.

From 2006 to 2008, HSUS made zero payments to pet shelters in Maine, Nebraska, Nevada, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

In 2008 HSUS made donations to pet shelter organizations in only 15 states—down from 34 states in 2007—even though its overall budget increased by more than \$8 million. HSUS routinely spends far more on state-level political fights than on pet shelters in those same states.

- HSUS spent 10 times more passing “Proposition 2” in California—a ballot initiative to create new livestock farming regulations—than on pet shelters there.
- In Massachusetts, the ratio was six-to-one (HSUS spent heavily on a ballot initiative to ban greyhound racing).
- In Colorado, a “humane farms” political committee got seven times as many HSUS dollars as the state’s pet shelters.
- In Michigan, HSUS spent 100 times as much money promoting a dove-hunting ban as it did on shelters.
- HSUS spent 300 times as much money sponsoring an Arizona “humane farms” ballot group as what it contributed to that state’s local shelters.

Despite the “United States” in HSUS’s name, it donated more to a veterinary hospital in India in just one year (\$22,150) than it gave in three years to shelters in 31 different states: Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

## **HSUS Shelter Giving, State by State**

To compile this list, we examined the schedules of outgoing grants provided by the Humane Society of the United States as part of its “Form 990” nonprofit federal tax returns.

Each grantee was examined to find out if it met the basic qualifications of:

- being a hands-on animal care center;
- being concerned with the daily care, adoption, and/or rehabilitation of dogs and

- cats; and
- being located in the United States of America.

HSUS grantees meeting these qualifications were deemed to be “hands-on pet shelters” for the purpose of this report, and are listed below. In every case where we could not make a clear determination, we gave HSUS the benefit of the doubt and counted the grantee as a pet shelter.

**United States Totals:**

2008 Grants: \$439,371

2007 Grants: \$2,988,292

2006 Grants: \$3,464,632

Total Grants to U.S. Pet Shelters: \$6,892,295 (out of \$277,009,635 in total spending)

**Maine:**

2006 HSUS Grants: None

2007 HSUS Grants: None

2008 HSUS Grants: None

Total HSUS Grants to Maine: \$0

Download the full 15-page report at:

[http://humanewatch.org/images/uploads/2010-06\\_NOT\\_YOUR\\_LOCAL\\_HUMANE\\_SOCIETY.pdf](http://humanewatch.org/images/uploads/2010-06_NOT_YOUR_LOCAL_HUMANE_SOCIETY.pdf)

## **AKC Joins Opposition to Missouri’s “Proposition B”**

By Jay Kitchener

A controversial ballot measure called "The Puppy Mill Cruelty Prevention Act" or “Proposition B” will go before Missouri voters on November 2.

A “Legislative Alert” from the American Kennel Club’s Government Relations Department states, “The AKC does not support this petition, and is working with the Missouri Federation of Animal Owners to address it.”

The Missouri Federation of Animal Owners, or “MoFed”, has created a Political Action Committee to challenge the ballot initiative.

The Missouri Veterinary Medical Association says "...the ballot being proposed for this November would completely shut down our states properly operated, inspected and licensed facilities that have over fifty breeding dogs. We see this proposal as unfair and misguided. These properly and humanely operated

facilities are providing families with pets under the guidance of extensive current regulations enforced by state government..."

The AKC continues, "...the way in which some of these terms are defined in the proposed Missouri ballot measure do absolutely nothing to improve the wellbeing of animals; instead, it would add excessive expenses to responsible breeders who strive to produce well-bred family pets at a reasonable cost.

"The proposal also seeks to limit the number of dogs an individual may own. This confuses the real issue of animal welfare, which focuses on the quality of care given to animals, not the number of animals an individual owns. Responsible breeders are not defined by the number of dogs kept, or whether they make a profit in selling dogs. Rather, responsible breeders are characterized by the quality of care and conditions that they provide their dogs and the quality (including health, temperament and breed type) of the puppies they produce.

"Cruelty and negligence can occur regardless of the number of dogs a person has."

The ballot initiative is sponsored by the animal rights groups Humane Society of United States (HSUS), American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), Humane Society of Missouri and Missouri Alliance for Animal Legislation.

For more information about this ballot initiative, including the full text of the bill, the AKC Legislative Alert, and suggestions for ways to help defeat this proposed legislation, please visit [www.akc.org](http://www.akc.org), [www.mofed.org](http://www.mofed.org) and [www.missourifac.com](http://www.missourifac.com)

## **Is Federal "PUPS" Bill Warm & Fuzzy?**

By Jay Kitchener

Senator Richard J. Durbin (Democrat of Illinois) and Representative Samuel S. Farr (Democrat of California) introduced companion bills in the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, titled the Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act (PUPS) on May 25, 2010.

The Illinois Federation of Dog Clubs and Owners wasted no time in issuing a position statement in opposition to these bills on June 15, 2010. The report can be read in its entirety at [www.ifdco.org](http://www.ifdco.org). The impressive statement details the background and history of this legislation and offers an analysis of the potential impact of this legislation.

Some of the concerns detailed by the Illinois Federation in their report include:

### **Co-ownership questions:**

"PUPS would open up a very onerous situation for many of the best purebred dog breeders of the American Kennel Club (AKC), United Kennel Club (UKC), and other major purebred dog registries, where co-ownership of valuable animals is not only accepted, but encouraged. These co-owned bitches do not

normally live in the home of the breeder, yet their offspring would count towards the 50 puppies required for licensing. Even worse, it is very possible that these breeders would, under PUPS, be made responsible for the care and conditions provided for co-owned bitches and their litters residing in distant states from the breeder. Without doubt, this would set up excessive liability for these breeders, and force a reassessment of the entire co-ownership concept, to the detriment of the breeders, the registries, and the dogs themselves.

**Definition of ‘breeding female dog’:**

“Also unsettling is how a ‘breeding female dog’ is defined to be such at four months of age, if intact. With rare exception, bitches four months of age or younger are not biologically capable of being bred, therefore, the use of this age is not scientifically supportable. Additionally, ‘breeding females’ would include puppies not intended to be bred until a more mature age; young bitches left intact until a better evaluation of their working talents could be made; elderly intact bitches well past a breedable age; bitches left intact for reasons of veterinary recommendation; or bitches left intact for show, working ability, or any other purposes, even if the bitch was not intended to be bred that year, or ever. Additionally, mandatory spay-neuter laws are increasingly being proposed, and passed across the United States, with a four-month age limit, illustrating the goal of Animal Rights activists to have all dogs spayed or neutered before any reasonable breedable age is achieved. Might the wording of PUPS be interpreted as extra coercion towards having co-owned bitches spayed rather than left intact?”

**Potential impact on the rescue and shelter community:**

“While not specifically aimed at dog rescues and shelters, there is no explicit exclusion made for breed rescues, private shelters, or public shelters from the regulations detailed in PUPS. It is very common for dog rescuers to take possession of bitches in whelp, or bitches with an unweaned litter of puppies, with the goal of adoption of the puppies and the dam once the puppies are weaned. Should such a rescue or shelter place more than 50 puppies a year from bitches over which they have possession, and should ‘adoption’, normally done for a fee, be interpreted as a ‘sale’ under the language of this bill, it would be very possible that such a rescue or shelter would construed as a ‘High Volume Retail Breeder’ under this bill. This would require these shelters and rescues to become licensed as ‘High Volume Retail Breeders’, and meet all AWA requirements regarding facilities and care of dogs. Additionally, purebred kennels occasionally need to be liquidated due to the sudden death or disability of their owners, requiring emergency placement of their dogs. Often, other recognized breeders, acting out of a sense of responsibility to their breed and concern for these dogs, will step in and take temporary possession these dogs and then seek suitable homes for them. Again, should they take ownership of bitches in whelp, or bitches with an unweaned litter, the puppies later sold may quite easily put them over the ‘more than 50 puppies sold or offered for sale’ stipulation in this bill, requiring licensing as a ‘High Volume Retail Breeder’. This might cause them financial and legal hardship if they were not previously required to be licensed under the AWA.

Continued...

**More than breeders who sell via the Internet will be impacted:**

“The bill does not make allowances for the many responsible breeders who make use of the Internet (or telephone, or newspaper) as initial first contact only, but who require a meeting in person with the potential purchaser typically at the home of breeder, prior to the finalization of the sale.

**Consequences of the bill for the home hobby breeder:**

“This bill poses enormous ramifications for a home hobby dog breeder that would now be defined under the Animal Welfare Act as a ‘High Volume Retail Breeder.’ In order to be licensed, they would have to be inspected ... to ensure that their facility (i.e., their home in most cases) meets the engineering standards required for a commercial USDA-licensed kennel. Unless such a breeder keeps their dogs kenneled in a separate portion of the home, and away from the "human" home proper, it would be difficult to meet the minimum engineering standards as directed. Several obvious conflicts arise when attempting to apply the specific kenneling standards contained in the AWA to the typical residential home where most dogs owned by hobby breeders live.”

The Illinois Federation of Dog Clubs and Owners concludes its report stating “this bill must be opposed in its entirety.”

Other groups opposing the PUPS bill include the North Carolina Responsible Animal Owners Alliance, the German Shepherd Dog Club of America, the Sportsmen’s and Animal Owners Voting Alliance, and the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council.

In a “Legislation Information Update” on July 22, 2010, the American Kennel Club said, “... the AKC also has a number of serious concerns with the bill as introduced. “

For more information on the PUPS bill, please go to: [www.ifdco.org](http://www.ifdco.org) [www.akc.org](http://www.akc.org) [www.gsdca.org](http://www.gsdca.org) [www.pijac.org](http://www.pijac.org) [www.ncraoa.com/alerts.html](http://www.ncraoa.com/alerts.html) and [www.saova.org/PUPS.html](http://www.saova.org/PUPS.html)



## Federation of Maine Dog Clubs & Responsible Dog Owners Welcomes National Parent Club

*October 10, 2010, Augusta, Maine:* The FMDCRDO welcomes the Newfoundland Dog Club of America, Inc. as its newest member club and its delegate Amy Culver Davis of Gouldsboro, ME. Please extend a warm welcome to Amy, and please visit the Newfoundland Dog Club of America on Facebook and at <http://www.ncanewfs.org/index.shtml>



*Welcome to the Newfoundland Club of America*  
**NCA**

## Federation of Maine Dog Clubs & Responsible Dog Owners Announces Third Annual “Lobby Day” in Augusta

*September 21, 2010, Augusta, Maine:* Please mark your calendars and save the date of Thursday, February 3, 2011 for FMDCRDO’s third annual Lobby Day in the Hall of Flags in the capitol building in Augusta. Lobby Day has become a very popular and much-anticipated tradition for legislators and staff in the state house. “We love having you guys here!” said an unidentified staff member in the office of the Clerk of the House. “You guys should get the law changed so you can bring your dogs” the staff person added. Lobby Day will take place from 8:00am-1:00pm and is open to all dog owners in Maine. Please watch our website for more information [www.fedmedogclubs.org](http://www.fedmedogclubs.org)



## **Federation of Maine Dog Clubs & Responsible Dog Owners on Facebook**

According to its website, "Facebook is a social utility that connects people with friends and others who work, study and live around them." It's estimated that over 400 million people use the free service worldwide. Dozens of state federations, hundreds of dog clubs and thousands of dog owners take advantage of the powerful online networking service to keep up-to-date on important issues. There is no cost to join or use Facebook. Please look for us and join us at Federation of Maine Dog Clubs & Responsible Dog Owners on [www.facebook.com](http://www.facebook.com)



## **Federation of Maine Dog Clubs & Responsible Dog Owners Meeting Minutes Tuesday, September 21, 2010 Augusta City Center, Augusta, Maine**

### **IN ATTENDANCE:**

Central Maine Brittany Club represented by delegates Ann Short & John Short.  
Down East Shetland Sheepdog of Greater Portland represented by delegate Jan Belair.  
Maine Collie Club represented by delegate Mary Mulhern.  
Maine Retriever Trial Club represented by delegate Sue Westlake.  
Mid-Coast Kennel Club represented by delegate Mary Mulhern.  
Penobscot Hunting Retriever Club represented by delegates Susan Robichaud and David Robichaud.  
Penobscot Valley Kennel Club represented by delegates Sharon St. John , Nancy Daniels , Robin Beckett & John Beckett.  
York County Kennel Club represented by delegates Ann Short & Jay Kitchener.

### **Guests:**

Lois Snowe-Mello, former Maine State Senator & candidate for Maine State Senate.  
John Bott, Policy Director, Maine Senate Republicans.

### **Call to Order:**

President Nancy Daniels called the meeting to order at 6:07pm.

**Approval of Minutes:** None

**President's Report:**

President Nancy Daniels and several FMDCRDO delegates attended the September 16 meeting of the governor's Animal Welfare Advisory Council in Augusta. President Daniels gave a report. Highlights of the president's report included that Norma Worley, Director of Maine's Animal Welfare Department, was not present at the AWAC meeting. Worley was reportedly in Chicago and two of her employees were in Missouri in spite of a ban on interstate travel by Maine state employees.

Meris Bickford, Esquire, resigned from the Animal Welfare Advisory Council at this meeting.

**Secretary's Report:**

Secretary Jay Kitchener attended the Symposium on Rational Animal Control on September 15 hosted by the Pennsylvania Federation of Dog Clubs in Philadelphia. Secretary Kitchener gave a verbal report.

**Treasurer's Report:**

Treasurer Sharon St. John submitted a written report. Sue Westlake, delegate representing the Maine Retriever Trial Club, motioned to accept the report. Ann Short, delegate representing the Central Maine Brittany Club, the York County Kennel Club and municipal kennel representative on the Animal Welfare Advisory Council, seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Treasurer Sharon St. John reported that filings for FMDCRDO to the Internal Revenue Service and the State of Maine have been completed.

Discussion turned to additional payment to Newell Augur, Esquire. Dave Robichaud, delegate representing the Penobscot Hunting Retriever Club, motioned to make an additional payment to Mr. Augur. Sue Westlake, delegate representing the Maine Retriever Trial Club, seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**Unfinished Business:**

All necessary forms have been filed and requisite fees paid to the state to complete the process of establishing a "doing business as" relationship with the National Animal Interest Alliance Trust.

Discussion about the federal Puppy Uniform Protection Act or "PUPS" bill resulted in delegate Ann Short, representing the Central Maine Brittany Club, the York County Kennel Club, and municipal kennel representative on the Animal Welfare Advisory Council, motioning for Secretary Kitchener to draft a letter to US Senators Olympia Snow and Susan Collins, and US Representatives Chellie Pingree and Michael Michaud, outlining FMDCRDO's opposition to this bill. Motion was seconded by \_\_\_\_\_. Motion carried.

Discussion returned to the September 16 Animal Welfare Advisory Council meeting. Of particular concern was proposed changes to the Maine's low-cost spay & neuter program. It was noted that the deadline for comments and requests for a public hearing is October 8, 2010.

**Adjournment:**

John Short, delegate representing the Central Maine Brittany Club, motioned to adjourn. Dave Robichaud, delegate representing the Maine Retriever Trial Club, seconded. There being no further business to discuss, President Daniels adjourned the meeting at 8:15pm.

**PRIOR NOTICE OF MEETING:**

**FMDCRDO WILL NEXT MEET ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2010 AT 6:00PM IN THE LECTURE HALL OF THE AUGUSTA CITY CENTER, AUGUSTA, MAINE.**

*Respectfully submitted by Secretary Jay Kitchener 10/15/10.*

This newsletter is published by the Federation of Maine Dog Clubs and Responsible Dog Owners. Opinions expressed in articles and editorials are not necessarily those of the Federation of Maine Dog Clubs and Responsible Dog Owners.

Inclusion in this publication does not constitute endorsement.

The editor reserves the right to accept or reject any material submitted for publication. Editor: Jay Kitchener, 207-646-8121, jay.kitchener@yahoo.com, PO Box 78, Ogunquit, ME 03907.

