



THE C.A.S.H. COURIER

THE COMMITTEE TO ABOLISH SPORT HUNTING
A DIVISION OF WILDLIFE WATCH, INC.

© 2019 BY WILDLIFE WATCH, INC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Summer/Fall 2019

MISSION STATEMENT:

The mission of C.A.S.H. - Committee to Abolish Sport Hunting - is to accomplish what its name says in the shortest possible time. Understanding that abolishing hunting entails a process, a series of steps taken and not a single action that would effect our goal overnight, a time frame cannot be established. We hope for building a succession of wins, and if not wins immediately then at least a succession of stirrings of consciousness. We hope to encourage those who are still silent to speak out, awakening community after community about the heavy hand of state and federal wildlife management agencies. We hope to alter whatever belief still exists that sport hunters are conservationists and champions of the environment to a realization that they are destroyers of wildlife and ecosystems in the narrow and broad sense. Where the natural feeling for wildlife doesn't exist, we strive to engender among citizens outrage that their own rights are violated by legal hunting and their quality-of-life diminished.

Luke A. Dommer was the founder of the Committee to Abolish Sport Hunting. He was its president from 1976 until his passing in August 1992. Mr. Dommer's research and publications served as the foundation for the anti-hunting movement. He remains, through this organization, an invaluable and dedicated warrior in the battle to save wild animals, the environment, and general public from the silent economy that encourages and preys on the passion of a few to kill the wildlife that belongs to all.

Wildlife Watch Inc.

a 501(c)3 Not-for-Profit Corporation.

Contributions are tax-deductible.

C.A.S.H. COURIER

PO Box 562 New Paltz, NY 12561

845-256-1400 - Phone

wildwatch@verizon.net

Anne Muller - Editor

Joe P. Morgan - Desktop Publishing

www.wildwatch.org

www.abolishsport hunting.org

Abolish Animal Cruelty — End Elk Hunting

by Jim Robertson, C.A.S.H. President



Each fall, elk, those colossal members of the deer family second only to moose in mass, go into rut--a fitting term for their mating season, indicative of the bulls' one-track mind at the time. Their obsessive behavior includes bugling and strutting while showing off to the weary cows, and when challenged by another well-antlered bull, posturing and occasionally sparring. **Although their showy racks of antlers appear to be lethal weapons, contestants are seldom hurt, and never intentionally.** The same two bulls locking horns during the rutting season were likely insepa-

rable pals throughout the previous spring and summer, and will be again once the breeding season is over. The elk rut is a rank-establishing ritual, proven, over many millennia, beneficial to the herd. It's a contest with simple rules: the biggest, oldest bulls, usually with the most impressive antlers, have two or three weeks to round-up as many cows as possible for their harem and breed with each of them as they go into estrus, while the younger bulls try to lure a few away and start a party of their own.

Autumn in elk country would not be complete without the stir-

Please see ELK HUNTING Page 3

Letter from the President

DEAR MEMBERS AND FELLOW ANTI-HUNTERS,

I know you like to hear what we've been up to here at C.A.S.H. (besides researching and recording the endless list of hunting accidents and hunting violations on our new website), so I'll begin by sharing the news of an interview C.A.S.H.'s own Anne Muller recently had with someone curious about the pros(?) and cons of sport hunting. Here's the link: <https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/curiosity/id1329316868>

And to go directly to the YouTube: <http://youtube.com/c/TravDeRose>

Among my duties as president is to monitor the comments made on our blogsite. Comments from C.A.S.H. blog readers are always pro-wildlife and often quite profound. For example, here is a recent comment, from Geoff:

...I'm very glad that you are now the President of CASH! ...[You]... seem to be the only published environmentalist not afraid to take on the sport hunters and tell them what lowlifes they actually are. Please keep up the great work, it is important to your readers and you are the most prominent wildlife enthusiast regularly doing it!

For more great comments or to leave your own, please visit the C.A.S.H. Blog: <https://committeetoabolishsport-hunting.wordpress.com>

One thing I'm proud to say about the Committee to

Abolish Sport Hunting, as opposed to your average environmental group or even those shady groups touting their (dubious and often self-serving) efforts in "conservation," is that *we* stand for the individual animal. It's easy to say you don't want to see a *species* to go extinct, but many groups promote, or turn a blind eye to, the hunting (ie: killing) of individual animals under the guise of raising funds for its species.

I've come across a lot of different attitudes while searching for like-minded folks out there. But while some groups, from the Sierra Club to the Safari Club, may be able to claim more members and financial backing than others, any group that supports

the taking of trophy heads, hides or horns to supposedly save its species is shooting itself in the foot, in my book.

It's not that I'm biased toward the group C.A.S.H. just because I'm its president. I've always believed we should advocate for the individual, while championing its species—whether or not said species is currently endangered. Who else really cares for the welfare of species like deer, who are not on the verge of going extinct soon, but whose plight is every bit as important as those who may well be. And really, what better way to ensure an individual animal's or a species' future than to abolish the sport of hunting.

Jim

Jim Robertson

President, the Committee to Abolish Sport Hunting



CO-EXISTING WITH GOD'S DOG*

Karen Coker had done her homework when she writes that **KILLING COYOTES IS COUNTERPRODUCTIVE!**

She is a journalist and wildlife protector, and heads the group: **Wild-Watch Maine**. <https://www.facebook.com/WildWatchMaine/>

She writes in the *Sun Journal*:

Killing coyotes to protect deer? It's a practice that has been imbedded in Maine's wildlife management policies for more than three decades, but it has led to grotesque abuses of this important carnivore and is as foolish as stringing beads on a cord with no knot on the end.

Read more here: <https://www.sunjournal.com/2019/07/07/karen-coker-coyote-control-doesnt-work/>



© Jim Robertson, All Rights Reserved

*Our title is inspired by Hope Ryden's book, **GOD'S DOG—A Celebration of the North American Coyote**. C.A.S.H. encourages you to read it, you can find it here: https://www.amazon.com/s?k=God%27s+Dog+a+celebration+of+the+north+american+coyote&i=stripbooks&ref=nb_sb_noss

ELK HUNTING

Continued from page 1

ring sound of solicitous bulls bugling-in the season of brightly colored leaves, shorter days and cooler nights. Nothing, save for the clamor of great flocks of Canada geese, trumpeter swans or sandhill cranes announcing their southward migration, is more symbolic of that time of year. And just as any pond or river along their flyway devoid of the distinctive din of wandering waterfowl seems exceedingly still and empty, any forest or field now bereft of the bugling of bull elk feels sadly deserted and lifeless.

Yet there are broad expanses of the continent, once familiar with these essential sounds of autumn, where only the blare of gunfire resounds. By the end of the Nineteenth century, a great wave of humanity blowing westward with the force of a category 5 hurricane—leveling nearly everything in its destructive path—had cut down the vast elk herds, leaving only remnants of their population in its wake. Today, a different kind of rite rings-in the coming of autumn over much of the land. **Following in the ignoble footsteps of those who hunted to extinction two subspecies, the Mirriam's and the Eastern elk, nimrods by the thousands run rampant on the woodlands and inundate the countryside, hoping to relive the gory glory days of the 1800s.**

While the awe-inspiring elk rut spectacle is going on, Elmers (*elkhunters*) polish their barrels or rosin up their bows (or whatever the heck archery hunters do), to gear up for their chosen form of thrill-kill—assuming elk have not already been driven locally to extinction from over-hunting in their neck of the woods. Traditionally, elk hunters will spend copious amounts of time and money drowning themselves in alcohol to get their blood up in preparation for the sacrificial event of trying to slay the mighty, majestic beasts.

To the detriment of the entire elk species, the individuals most highly prized by these trophy seekers are always the biggest bulls (with, of course, the most impressive ant-

lers). This sort of discriminatory culling runs contrary to natural selection and is effectively triggering a reversal of evolution by leaving only the “weak and scrawny” (as Newsweek magazine referred to them in a recent article on the subject) to pass on their genes. The phenomenon can be seen in any hunted species, but is especially evident among the “lordly game” (as President Theodore Roosevelt dubbed them), the antlered and horned animals. After more than a century of Teddy-type trophy hunters messing with natural selection, today's elk, big-horn sheep and others (whose heads you most often see disgracing the walls of empty-hearted halls) cannot boast the antler spread, horn curl—or quality of genes—of their ancestors.



Wildlife Photography ©Jim Robertson, All Rights Reserved

The mechanism that allowed for so many of North America's native species to be slaughtered with such abandon in centuries past was a common form of speciesism: species favoritism. Would-be ranchers wanted to do away with any wild grazers who might compete with their

cows and eliminate any predators who might naturally turn to their domestic calves or sheep in the absence of accustomed prey. Problem is, this ecologically short-sighted conduct resulted in severely diminished biodiversity (a fact that should be an embarrassment to inheritors of this abused land). Unfortunately, blundering behavior persists to this day. Instead of admitting to the mistakes of the past, the 5% who still hunt are paying homage to the ruinous ways of the 1800s—sometimes using bows or black powder muskets to make their “sport” more challenging.

The slaying of wildlife has now become a perverse pastime for people who call themselves sportsmen. But far from sporting, the game of stalking, shooting and skinning animals is driven by a selfish and sinister intent. The sport hunter's motive is comparable to that of a rebuked child who torments a puppy to gain a

Please see ELK HUNTING Page 4

ELK HUNTING

Continued from page 3

sense of power and control. No matter how hunters and trappers try to rationalize or justify their actions, their stated objectives—recreation, the need for sustenance or a civic duty to keep animal populations in check—are all red herrings. **There are less destructive ways to get your kicks, healthier and less costly sources of nourishment than cholesterol-laden rotting flesh, and nature—left to its own devices—doesn't need a manager. Nonetheless, "management" of wildlife "resources" is the *modus operandi* for state and federal agencies, which are virtually always staffed by sport hunters.**

Laws against cruelty to innocent victims are crafted by people who rely on their sympathies for the victims and their emotional attachments to the innocents. Those who can feel empathy and have compassion for the other creatures of this planet should be the ones making decisions concerning their welfare. But wildlife lawmakers habitually side with the nearest (and squeakiest) animal exploiters.

Since they're hunters themselves, state and federal wildlife "managers" are both delegates and lackeys for the hunting industry. They would have us believe the preposterous party line that hunting helps animals—they won't continue to live unless we kindheartedly kill them. This is particularly outrageous in light of how many species have been wiped off the face of the earth, or nearly so, exclusively by human hunting. The most infamous of these atrocities is the hunting of plains bison to near extinction in the 1800's. During that same period, over-zealous hunters completely killed off the once amazingly abundant passenger pigeon and Eskimo curlew (both killed en masse and sold by the cartload for pennies apiece).

The fact that shooting non-human animals is accepted as sport in this day and age puts our very society at risk. It's well-known that—as in the cases of mass murderer Richard Speck, serial killer Jeffery Dahmer and a host of others—animal cruelty often leads to crimes against humans. And unless one is starving or under attack, violently ending the

life of a healthy animal is cruelty.

No caring person should be expected to tolerate the mistreatment of others. So, what should you say to a hunter who tells you, "I respect your decision not to hunt, so you should respect my right to hunt."? How about something like, "There's a major difference between tolerating the actions of a bird watcher and those of a shotgun-toting bird-blaster." Or, "Customs and recreation are fine until one's hobby results in the suffering of others." Or even, "That's like an unrepentant slave owner asking an abolitionist to respect his right to keep people enslaved." Just as abolitionists wanted emancipation for the slaves and suffragettes wanted women to have the vote, anti-hunters want animals left alone.

Anyone with a sense of right and wrong will eventually find that intolerance is sometimes the only humane position to take. Intolerant is what Japanese whalers label anti-whaling groups or non-whaling nations when they question their "right" to harpoon and butcher whales or trap and slaughter dolphins. South Koreans who literally torture dogs to death and boil cats alive—in the belief that doing so makes them taste better and/or improves their medicinal value—call humane activists intolerant when they oppose those barbaric customs. And European or American producers of foie gras scream intolerance when animal advocates work to end the brutal and bizarre practice of shoving a pipe down the throats of geese and ducks and force feeding them until their liver swells or their stomach bursts—whichever comes first.

Members of a civilized society should not be afraid to take a stand against cruelty to non-human animals (who are fully capable of suffering) in the same way they oppose cruelty toward humans. Without a doubt, any effort to abolish sport hunting is ultimately taking a stand against animal cruelty.

The preceding includes excerpts from *Exposing the Big Game: Living Targets of a Dying Sport*, by **Jim Robertson**.



Wildlife Photography © Jim Robertson. All Rights Reserved

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION & MANAGEMENT FUNDING IN THE U.S.

by Mark E. Smith & Donald A. Molde

Nevadans for Responsible Wildlife Management. Reprinted with permission.

*The authors present a novel approach to help answer the question “Who really pays for wildlife in the U.S.?” Using public information about budgets of various conservation, wildlife advocacy, and land management agencies and non-profit organizations, published studies and educated assumptions regarding sources of Pittman-Robertson Act and Dingell-Johnson Act federal excise monies from the sale of sporting equipment, **the authors contend that approximately***

95% of federal, 88% of non-profit, and 94% of total funding for wildlife conservation and management come from the non-hunting public. The authors further contend that a proper understanding and accurate public perception of this funding question is a necessary next step in furthering the current debate as to whether and how much influence the general public should have at the wildlife policy-making level, particularly within state wildlife agencies.

October 2014 (revised June 2015)

[Emphasis and photos have been added by the editor of C.A.S.H.]

With increased awareness and interest of the general (non consumptive) public in controversial wildlife management issues such as fur trapping, predator control, trophy hunting, coyote killing contests and wolf reintroduction, **a debate is before us as to whether the general public is or should be afforded a proper voice in wildlife management decisions.** Sportsmen favor the current system, which places a heavy emphasis on their interests through favorable composition of wildlife commissions and a continued emphasis on ungulate management. Non-human predators (wolves, mountain lions, coyotes, ravens and others) are disfavored by wildlife managers at all levels as competition for sportsmen and are treated as second-class citizens of the animal kingdom. Sportsmen suggest this bias is justified because “*Sportsmen pay for wildlife,*” a refrain heard repeatedly when these matters are discussed. Agency personnel and policy foster this belief as well.

Do sportsmen *really* pay for wildlife? Is it a fact or an unfounded assertion or something in between? Are there ways of looking at financial and other information to test the merit of this claim? While wildlife is unequivocally a public asset under the Public Trust Doctrine (see, for example, SCOUS 1842 and Horner 2000), **a better understanding and definition of how wildlife management is financed in this country, particularly the portion attributable to the general public, would be of considerable help in deciding whether the general public’s interest is adequately represented in our current wildlife management system.**

Summary of Findings

While this question is not easy to answer and the infor-

mation may be murky, **we have devised a novel approach, using available public information and certain helpful assumptions to offer a perspective on this question, which, to our knowledge, has not been previously presented.** The results are expressed both in terms of annual budgets by organization (Table 1) and acreages under management (Table 2). **In summary, approximately 95% of federal, 88% of non-profit, and 94% of total funding for wildlife conservation and management come from the non-hunting public. This runs counter to the common position promoted by many hunter-centric organizations and even to what state wildlife agencies often cite** (e.g. Mayer, 2012). Another example of this is a motto of the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation: “*Hunting is Conservation.*” Obviously hunting *per se* is not conservation, but they claim that hunting funds conservation, nearly exclusively.



“The National Elk Refuge provides, preserves, restores, and manages winter habitat for the nationally significant Jackson Elk Herd.” FWS.
[Editor’s note: Most refuges allow hunting.]

The data in Table 1 shows that the financial contribution from hunters is a small portion of the total. Of the 8 largest federally funded wildlife programs listed in the top half of Table 1, a total of \$18.7 billion is spent annually on wildlife, land management and related programs (including hunter education). Approximately

Please see Wildlife Conservation Page 6

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

Continued from page 5

5.3% of the combined operating budgets (top half of Table 1) and 4.9% of the land acquisition costs (Table 2) are funded by hunters or through hunting-related activities. The 10 largest non-profit conservation organizations contribute \$2.5 billion annually to habitat and wildlife conservation. Of this, 12.3% comes from hunters and 87.7% from the non-hunting public (bottom half of Table 1).

Methodology

In Tables 1 & 2 values have been assigned for the portion of funding derived from hunters or hunting-related activities. The difference between “hunter” and “hunting related” as well as the allocation of Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Act funds are discussed in the section entitled Pittman-Robertson & Dingell-Johnson Acts. The allocations for the other items are discussed in the sections entitled General Tax Revenue and Duck Stamp Act.

State funding was not considered in this study, in part because most state wildlife agency funding flows

from the federal government (about 70% in Nevada’s case), and in part because it would be a task larger than our resources allowed. It is also generally true that the state funding (e.g. hunter license and tag sales) is rarely adequate to cover the direct costs of administering the related programs; therefore, state-level funding can reasonably be classified as hunting or sportsmen services rather than wildlife management. State-owned public lands are considered in terms of the acreage under management in Table 2. Also not considered is the portion that each agency or organization actually spends on conservation versus other activities. For example, most state wildlife agencies spent only a small portion of their total funding on conservation. Other organizations, such as the government funded National Wildlife Refuge System and the donor funded Nature Conservancy, spend the great majority of their funding on conservation. This differential was ignored in our analysis.

Table 1: Summary of Conservation Funding by Source (M = million US dollars)

Source	Total Annual Funding, \$	Activities Funded by Hunters		Activities Funded by Non-hunting Public, \$
		% of Total	\$	
National Wildlife Refuge System (operating budget, see Table 2 for land purchase funding)	\$276M	4.6%	\$13M	\$263M
Pittman-Robertson & Dingell-Johnson Acts Funds:	\$882M			
Funding based on hunting activities		14.5%	\$128M	
Funding based on population		4.6%	\$35M	\$714M
USDA Wildlife Services	\$89M	4.6%	\$4	\$85M
USDI Fish & Wildlife	\$2,795M	4.6%	\$129M	\$2,666M
US BLM	\$1,200M	4.6%	\$56M	\$1,145M
US Forest Service	\$9,779M	4.6%	\$453M	\$9,329M
National Park System	\$3,650M	4.6%	\$169M	\$3,482M
SUBTOTAL Federal Funding	\$18,671M	5.3%	\$987M	\$17,684M
Nature Conservancy	\$859M	4.6%	\$40M	\$819M
Land Trusts (all, except N.C)	\$535M	4.6%	\$25M	\$510M
Wildlife Conservation Society	\$230M	4.6%	\$11M	\$219M
World Wildlife Fund	\$204M	4.6%	\$9M	\$195M
Ducks Unlimited	\$147M	95%	\$140M	\$7M
The Conservation Fund	\$138M	4.6%	\$6M	\$132M
Natural Resources Defense Council	\$123M	4.6%	\$6M	\$117M
National Wildlife Federation	\$93M	15%	\$14M	\$79M
National Audubon Society	\$89M	4.6%	\$4M	\$85M
Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation	\$54M	95%	\$51M	\$3M
SUBTOTAL Non-profit Organizations	\$2,472M	12.3%	\$305M	\$2,167M
TOTAL Federal & Non-profits	\$21,143M	6.1%	\$1,292M	\$19,853M
				93.9%

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

Wildlife

In our analyses we included those agencies and organizations commonly considered by the public to have as their focus habitat and wildlife management or conservation (e.g. U.S. Department of the Interior Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS), National Wildlife Refuge System, Nature Conservancy, and Audubon). We also included agencies and organizations whose primary purpose is to conserve or manage the lands that host wildlife (the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), U.S. Bureau of Land Management (US BLM), the state equivalents, the various land trusts). The organizations that manage habitat, such as the US BLM and the many private land trusts, are included because wildlife requires habitat. The goals of these organizations include various combinations of habitat management and

conservation, biological diversity (necessary to ensure robust populations), food and water supply, watershed protection, migration corridor management, and other issues critical to wildlife conservation and management.

A potentially controversial choice was to include the U.S. Department of Agriculture Wildlife Services. Their core function is to control native carnivores such as wolves, bears, and coyotes, ostensibly to protect agriculture and improve hunter opportunity (Bruskotter, 2011). Arguably they accomplish neither since most livestock mortality is due to weather, birthing, and disease, while most wildlife mortality is due to lack of food, impacts to habitat, and disease. **While predator control is wildlife management it is not conservation. Nevertheless, we have included their budget in our funding analyses.**

Table 2: Summary of Land Under Direct Management (M = million acres)

Source	Land Under Management, acres	Land Purchases Funded by Hunters		Land Purchases Funded by Non-hunting Public
		%	acres	acres
National Wildlife Refuge System	150M			
Funding based on hunting activities		1.7%	2.6M	
Funding based on population		4.6%	6.8M	140.6M
US BLM	248M	4.6%	9.9M	236.5M
US Forest Service (note A)	193M	4.6%	7.7M	184.1M
National Park Service	84M	4.6%	3.4M	80.1M
State Lands (all states)	197M	4.6%	7.9M	187.9M
SUBTOTAL	872M	4.9%	42.8M	829.2M
State & Federal Funding				95.1%
Nature Conservancy	119M	4.6%	4.8M	113.5M
Land Trusts (all)	47M	4.6%	1.9M	44.8M
SUBTOTAL	166M	4.6%	7.7M	158.3M
Non-profit Organizations				95.4%
TOTALS	1,038M	4.9%	50.5M	987.5M
				95.1%

Note A. The USFS indirectly or cooperatively manages 600M acres.

Sources of funding & allocations

The sources of our funding and land acreage figures were, in most cases, the official websites for the named agencies or organizations. The total acreage under management by land trusts was obtained from the Land Trust Alliance (<http://www.landtrustalliance.org>). Pittman-Robertson Act and Dingell-Johnson Act revenue were obtained from the most recently published federal budgets for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms

and Explosives (ATF) and US Fish and Wildlife Services (FWS), the agencies responsible for collecting and administering these funds, respectively. See the section entitled Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts for a detailed discussion of how those revenues were allocated, as well as a brief discussion of the two Acts.

General Tax Revenue

Most of the federal programs relevant to wildlife

Continued on Page 10

SHOOTING RANGES...

BAD FOR THE HEALTH OF PEOPLE AND ANIMALS

By Elizabeth O’Nan

Lead by the National Rifle Association (NRA), shooting ranges are being located on public land and on the US Forest Service lands across our nation.

One of the often cited reasons to permit shooting ranges is that gun owners violate laws in order to practice shooting when they are not provided with publicly funded shooting ranges. The public should not be willing to indemnify sport hunters who will not obey the law. Rewarding bad behavior will not result in compliance. If enforcement agencies cannot or will not enforce the laws to prevent illegal shooting, they should not be allowed to spend more money to provide dangerous, toxic, and noisy shooting ranges, particularly not located on public lands.

Taxpayers should not be asked to pay for clean up or suffer lowered IQs and other health problems for a minority (less than 4%) of miscreant gun users. Additionally, there is no way to make any shooting range compliant with Americans Disabilities Act (ADA) when inevitable lead exposures will prevent those disabled by Toxicant Induced Loss of Tolerance from access. **ADA non-compliance potentially may result in the loss of all federal funding for the ADA non-compliant states.**

The primary reason the NRA and sports hunters are insisting on putting shooting ranges on public land is because they wish to shift liability for lead contamination and shootings to avoid liability. Most companies offering small business liability policies do not offer any insurance for shooting ranges of any type (for instance — <http://www.hiscox.com/small-business-insurance/professional-business-insurance/tradesman-insurance/>). There is no coverage available for indoor or outdoor shooting ranges. **Both indoor and outdoor ranges have serious health and environmental risks from lead.** Indoor facilities have expensive maintenance that if neglected results in massive contamination (as most operations with bag houses to collect pollution can testify). **This is why the NRA has gone into the insurance business- so that they can keep shooting ranges alive until they can shift the liability burden onto the taxpayers by locating shooting ranges on public property.** The NRA knows the threat/risk or they would not be kicking in \$25K for each shooting range on public property. The NRA can’t afford the insurance either.

Blogs on setting up private shooting ranges consistently report the profits are not there to pay the costs of operation, much less the liability insurance. This is an article about lead from shooting ranges. <http://projects.seattletimes.com/2014/loaded-with-lead/1/>

Another reason to ban shooting ranges, particularly on public property, is due to rulings that bar the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from regulation of lead on US Forest Service lands. Heavily supported by the NRA this rule will make it impossible to regulate or protect humans and wildlife from bullet-derived lead. Finding 6,600 lbs of lead resulting from “illegal target practice” on public land should prompt an end to guns on public land not codification of excessive lead levels from shooting ranges, which does not include lead contamination from legal hunting.



New EPA Lead Standard Fails to Protect Public Health

Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) condemns the inadequate effort by the EPA to establish new lead levels that are adequately protective of the public health. The Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee noted in an April 2008 study that the upper limits proposed by EPA would “cause cognitive and developmental problems in young children exposed to those emissions,” as stated by Dr. Michael McCally, MD, PhD, Executive Director of PSR. PSR program director, Dr. Kristen Welker-Hood, worked to coordinate a letter to EPA Administration Steven Johnson from more than 200 physicians, public health officials and scientists urging the adoption of the 0.02 micrograms per cubic meter standard in order to protect public health, as required by the Clean Air Act.

The problem is there is no good place to put a bad practice. Electronic shooting practice is the safest method. If we trust airplane test pilots to train with electronic equipment it should be good enough for gun owners. **Lifetime neurological damage or the loss of a loved one or abusive repetitious gun noise is too high a price for gun practice.**

Attacks on tourists and their pets by loose hunting dogs and accidental shootings are another reason to ban hunting on public lands. **No one should have to fear for their lives in order to use and enjoy public lands.**

Nothing done on public lands should poison the water, air or environment for adjoining private property owners or nearby communities. In short there is no good place to put locally undesirable land uses such as shooting ranges or hunting, much less on public property. The 4% of Sports hunters and the NRA do not own our public lands even if they have captured the enforcement agencies and our government officials with Wildlife Commissions and the USFS who have broken trust with the American people by not protecting our public lands.

It is blatant environmental injustice to locate shooting ranges on public property and on poorer, underserved communities. Studies have shown that because of where toxic industries locate neighbors have higher levels of cancer and other health problems.

Fight Public Shooting Ranges

Enforcement agencies have expected the public to accept shooting ranges on public land without disclosing essential information such as specifics about their environmental assessment or even traffic conflicts. Have they used proper bid procedures, or licensed engineers? Have

they provided information on health impacts, emergency plans for potential rampage incidents, or sound tests? The answer in many cases is NO. Also of importance, they have failed to make their meetings on gun ranges known to the public. They often do not list meetings with the other notifications on their website or publish meetings in public places.

It is important that we do not allow this injustice and abuse to continue, especially as we are experiencing a climate crisis that is exponentially increasing wildlife extinction. Ask your elected officials to ban shooting ranges.

Elizabeth O’Nan is the founder/director for Protect All Children’s Environment, est. 1987 for the chemically injured and disabled. She serves on the Executive Board of the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League (BREDL) and is the Chair of BREDL’s Forest Stewardship Committee.

EDITOR’S NOTE: Shooting ranges also pay into the FWS and state game agencies via the excise taxes on firearms and ammo.

BREAKING NEWS: EXCISE TAXES ON ASSULT RIFLES ARE USED TO PROMOTE MORE USE OF FIREARMS

By Anne Muller

THE TAX AND TRADE BUREAU (TTB) HAS CONFIRMED THAT EXCISE TAXES ON AR-15 AND AK-47 ASSAULT RIFLES GO DIRECTLY TO THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE (FWS).

Federal excise taxes on alcohol, tobacco, and firearms are the three major excise taxes collected by the Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB). While they are lumped together under one bureau, both the destination of the revenue and the spirit that motivates them are very different.

Federal excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco go to the General Fund. Those on firearms go to the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS).

The reasoning at the inception of the excise tax was based on research showing that the more expensive a product is, the lower the consumption will be. Therefore, the purpose of the excise tax was to be a deterrent.

The reason for encouraging a lower consumption on those products was considered a social benefit, as their use has severe social impacts. Alcohol has been implicated in car crashes and other crime; tobacco is harmful not

only to the health of those who smoke, but now we know it impacts the health of those around smokers, and adds to medical costs. Please visit: <https://truthinitiative.org/research-resources/tobacco-prevention-efforts/importance-tobacco-taxes> and https://sites.nationalacademies.org/Tobacco/regulation/TOBACCO_051290

The dangers of firearms are well-known.

So, the spirit of the excise taxes was to reduce consumption and to put programs in place to help those impacted, as in the case of using a portion of the tobacco excise tax for Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIPRA).

Would it not be obscene if alcohol and/or tobacco had bureaus whose purpose was to promote the use of those products *because their income is derived from the products?* Furthermore, wouldn’t it be obscene if, *because of their government status*, they had overhead benefits, networking and lobbying benefits to affect their self-serving goal, AND the ability to siphon General Funds?

More will be written about this in the next issue.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

Continued from page 7

management and conservation are funded from general tax revenue such as personal and corporate income taxes. The key exceptions to this are the tax transfers made to the states under three well known acts (and their amendments): the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act of 1937 (more commonly known as the Pittman-Robertson Act or PRA), the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act (Dingell-Johnson Act or DJA), and the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act (Duck Stamp Act). Each of these acts is discussed in more detail in subsequent sections.

Rather than attempt an allocation of general tax revenue funding to “hunter funding” and “non-hunting public funding” by some complex analysis of demographics, we chose the simpler, and possibly equally accurate, method of allocation based on the percent of the population who hunts. According to the US FWS (2013), there were 14,631,327 hunting licenses issued by all US states in 2013, down from 14,960,522 in 2012. There are two important bias in these statistics: hunters who purchased licenses in more than one state are counted for each state; and most states exempt youth from license requirements (e.g. Nevada hunters under the age of 12 years are not required to purchase a license, in some states the age is 16). We could not find any published analyses on either, so we have made no change to the data published by the FWS. It is likely that both figures are small and each acts to reduce the effect of the other.

According to the US Census Bureau (2013), the US population in July 2013 was 316,128,839. Dividing that into the number of hunting licenses sold in 2013 suggests that 4.6% of the population, and therefore the same percentage of general tax revenue is paid by hunters. That figure has been used in Tables 1 & 2. An important side note is that while the US population increases annually, the number of hunting licenses sold is on the decline.

Duck Stamp Act

Funding of wildlife land gets a lot of attention among sportsmen and other outdoor enthusiasts. One of the most common to come up in discussion is the Duck Stamp program and the land that it has successfully protected as refuges under the National Wildlife Refuge System. The federal government estimates that 1.9% of the 150,000,000 acres (or 2,850,000 acres) of land managed under this program was acquired with funds from programs including duck stamp sales (USFW, 2014; Lin,



Photo from USFS.com

2014). It has been estimated that collectors purchase 10% of duck stamps. Duck stamps allow free access to refuges that otherwise charge an entrance fee, and an unknown portion of the public purchases them for this purpose. To determine the total hunter-sourced portion of the National Wildlife Refuge System acreage, we combined 90% of the 1.9% with the hunter portion of general tax revenue (4.6%).

Considering the four main federal agencies, the combined state-owned lands, and the collective non profits falling in the category of land trusts, there are 1.038 billion acres of wildlife habitat under conservation management, of which about 4.9% were funded by hunter and 95.1% funded by the non-hunting public.

Non-profits Requiring Special Allocations

Three of the NGOs required special considerations for allocation of their funding sources: Ducks Unlimited, National Wildlife Federation, and the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation. The authors found no authoritative sources for revenue splits between hunters or hunting-related activities and the non-hunting public, though even a casual understanding of these organizations leads to the conclusion that they are more heavily hunter funded than the others. For Ducks Unlimited and the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation it was assumed that nearly all of their revenue was hunter sourced; 100% allocations were not used because it is rather easy to find non-hunting members of both societies, including at various times the authors. The National Wildlife Federation requires a somewhat deeper analysis. In 1980, then executive officer (Kimball, 1980) estimated that 25% of their membership was hunters. In the subsequent 24 years the demographics of

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

both hunting and the National Wildlife Federation have shifted with a general reduction in hunters as a percentage of the whole. Given this, the 1980 figure was reduced to 15% for the purposes of this study. While that figure is just an estimate, large variations in this single line item have a negligible effect on the overall allocations.



Photo by Tami Heilemann, Department of Interior

Secretary of Interior till 1/2019 with telling trophy on wall.

Pittman-Robertson & Dingell-Johnson Acts

The process of determining the portion of the Pittman-Robertson Act (PRA) & Dingell-Johnson Act (DJA) excise taxes generated by hunting-related activities is both complex and imprecise. **In the end, any such analysis can only be an estimate, since the revenue is not tracked in sufficient detail to allow a precise allocation.** Our approach was to both recognize and minimize the biases created by our assumptions in these analyses. The approach taken in this study is briefly summarized here.

Beginning in 1919, there has been an excise tax on firearms and ammunition (10 to 11% of the wholesale price). This tax was originally administered under the US Treasury, and the income went into the general fund. **In 1937, the Pittman-Robertson Act transferred this tax to administration by the FWS for the exclusive purposes of wildlife management, hunting management, and hunter education.** The Dingell-Johnson Act (1950), as amended by the Wallop and Breaux Act (1984), extended the excise tax to archery equipment, fishing supplies, recreational boat import duties, and marine fuel sales. PRA and DJA funding totaled \$522 million and \$360 million, respectively, for the 2013 fiscal year.

Our analyses consider funding allocations in two por-

tions: the first based on activity (hunting related versus non-hunting related), and the second on general population (hunters versus the non-hunting public). This section discusses the former; the latter uses the same allocation as for the other categories. We used this split approach for the PRA and DJA funds because firearms, ammunition, and archery equipment are purchased by both hunters and non-hunters and these are used for both hunting and non-hunting purposes. Therefore, putting the total revenue into either the “hunter” or “non-hunting public” categories would have created a strong bias.

The next step was to consider the nature of the purchases that generate the excise taxes collected. According to the ATF (Hogue, 2013), the PRA revenue is generated in the following proportions:

- 31% from handgun (pistols and revolvers) production
- 37% from long guns (rifles and shotguns) production
- 31% from ammunition production
- 1% from archery equipment production

Dingell-Johnson revenue is generated in the following proportions, according to US DF&W statistics (Michigan):

- 54% from motorboat fuel
- 15% from small engine fuel
- 16% from fishing equipment, tackle, trolling motors
- 9% from interest on trust fund deposits
- 6% from import duties on boats

Of these funds, we next made an estimate of the portion of the revenue generated from hunting. We used a variety of sources of information to produce these estimates, principally the following.

From ATF statistics on sales of firearms by type (ATF, 2011), we identified those types of firearms that are used principally for hunting. We used the following allocations: traditional rifles and shotgun sales were allocated to hunting; modern sporting rifles (including tactical shotguns) were allocated principally (but not exclusively) to non-hunting. The results was a combined allocation of 40% of long guns to hunting. Handgun sales were allocated 5% to hunting based on anecdotal evidence.

Statistics for ammunition sales published by industry sources (LuckyGunner, 2012 & 2013; Bushmann, 2014) were used to determine the approximate percentage of sales by caliber. Each caliber was then assigned to one of three categories: principally hunting, principally non-hunting, or split. Examples of ammunition classified herein as principally for hunting include .243 Winchester,

Please see Wildlife Conservation Page 12

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

Continued from page 11

.30-06 Springfield and .308 Winchester (traditional deer and elk calibers). Principally non-hunting ammunition include .380 acp, 9 mm parabellum (aka 9mm Luger), .45 acp, .338 Lapua and .50 BMG. Calibers considered to be used for both hunting and non-hunting include shotgun shells in all gauges, .223 Remington, 5.56x45mm, 7.62x39mm, and large bore magnum handgun calibers such as .44 Remington Magnum and .500 S&W Magnum. Based on the relative sales statistics, considerably less than 20% of ammunition sales appear to be hunting related, but 20% was used in our analysis; this higher figure was used because 2013 represented an anomaly in sales statistics, with sales more heavily weighted towards self-defense and tactical than a multi-year average would suggest.

Of the DJA revenue, the only category related to hunting is small engine fuel sales, some of which is likely used for waterfowl hunting. Our research did not find any data on allocation of these sales; we assumed 15% is derived from hunting-related activities.

Table 3 summarizes the allocations and presents the estimated total funding generated by hunting-related activities.

The estimate of 14.5% is consistent with the results published by other authors, a commonly cited range being 14% to 22% of the DJA funds alone (Lin, 2014), which equates to 8% to 13% of the combined PRA and DJA funds.

Another way to estimate the portion of PRA funds generated by hunting activity is to compare the number of guns used for hunting with total gun ownership. There are an estimated 270 to 310 million firearms in America (Krouse, 2012; GunPolicy; Crime Prevention Research Center, 2014). There are 14.6 million licensed hunters (FWS, 2013), though the number of licensed hunters who actually hunt is unknown. If we make an assumption that the average hunter owns 3 guns for hunting (e.g. two rifles and a shotgun), then 43.8 million guns are used for hunting, or 14.1 to 16.2% of the total. This would suggest that 8.8 to 10.1% of the combined PRA and DJA funds are hunting-sourced. If we increase the per-hunter ownership assumption to 5 guns, the portion of combined funding increase to 14.8 to 16.9%. Both ranges compare well with the 14.5% figure cited in Table 3.

Table 3: Allocation of Excise Tax Revenue Based on Activity (M = million US dollars)

Excise Tax Source	Total Tax Revenue, \$	Proportion Derived from Hunting Activities	
		%	\$
Handguns (revolvers, pistols)	164M	5	8M
Long guns (rifles, shotguns, MSR's)	194M	40	78M
Ammunition (all calibers)	163M	20	33M
Archery equipment and supplies	4M	33	1M
Fuel, motor boats	194M	0	0
Fuel, small engine	54M	15	8M
Fishing equipment	59M	0	0
Interest on reserves	32M	0	0
Import duties on boats	22M	0	0
TOTALS	\$882M	14.5%	\$128M

Possible Biases In Our Analyses of PRA & DJA Revenue

A large portion of the PRA funds are set aside by law for hunter-specific uses rather than conservation or wildlife management. For example one half of the taxes gener-

ated from handguns and archery equipment are set aside exclusively for hunter education, which is principally about firearms safety (i.e., Hunter Ed); this totaled 15.9% of the PRA revenue in fiscal 2013. While one may reasonably argue that this money is not wildlife conservation

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

funding, we have elected to ignore this issue. This creates a small bias in favor of the hunter-funding category.

Fiscal 2013 was a record-setting year for firearm and ammunition sales, based on worries in the gun community about new federal gun control legislation following the Sandy Hook shootings and the reelection of President Obama. This increased the PRA funding, both in terms of the total dollars and the PRA percentage of the combined PRA and DJA revenues. This, in turn, increased the apparent hunting allocation over a multi-year average. At the same time the types of guns and ammunition which saw the greatest sales increases in 2013 were not traditional hunting equipment but rather modern sporting rifles¹ or MSRs), tactical shotguns, tactical and self defense ammunition. For example, 9mm handgun ammunition sales increased to 21.4% of the total in 2013 from 14.2% in 2012 (Lucky-Gunner, 2012 & 2013). According to the National Shooting Sports Foundation survey, “82% of recent purchases were AR-platform rifles” (NSSF, 2013). The disproportionate increase in sales of pistols, tactical long guns, and the related ammunition decreased the apparent hunting contribution. The net affect was not estimated.

We applied 40% of long gun sales in 2013 to hunting sales, though the statistics suggest that this number should be lower. If, for example, the above NSSF quote is accurate and 82% of recent sales were AR platforms, and if AR platforms are principally not used for hunting as other surveys and anecdotal evidence suggest, the actual percentage allocated to hunting could be overstated by 10 percentage points or more.

Closing comments

Gill (1996) concluded that the narrowly based funding of state wildlife agencies has “blurred the essential distinction between public interest and special interest and inevitably eroded both scientific credibility and public trust.” We would argue that it is the perception not the reality that has blurred the distinction. For example, then director of the Nevada Department of Wildlife Ken Maver wrote to the legislative

sunset subcommittee “...the contribution to NDOW’s operating budgets from sportsmen is 79 percent of total funding” (Mayer, 2012). He was assuming that all of the federal excise tax transfers were hunter-sourced. This is a misrepresentation often used to manipulate public opinion and influence policy. This narrative “...logically encourages those who pay via licenses and permits for the privilege of using wildlife to expect greater benefits... Because [it’s believed that] hunters pay the bills, it is not surprising that they are given much attention and wield a great deal of influence...” (Jacobson et al, 2010).

Modern wildlife management has wandered far from the original path of the Public Trust Doctrine and the North American Wildlife Conservation Model from which it flows (SCOUS, 1842; Horner, 2000). Smith (1980) identified three criteria that need to be met for the Public Trust Doctrine to be effective:

The general public must be aware of their legal standing with respect to public ownership of wildlife;

This standing and the rights associated with it must be enforceable against the government so that the public can hold it accountable; and,

Interpretation of these rights must be adaptable to contemporary concerns, such as biodiversity and species extinction.

All three are impaired when the basis of public debate is a myth. It’s time that we call for honest dialog from our state and federal agencies and transparency in wildlife policy making.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our deepest gratitude to the many professionals who provided review, editing and critical input into the development of this paper. Especially noteworthy are Wendy Keefover of the Humane Society of the United States and Harley Shaw, retired, Arizona Game & Fish Department who provided invaluable review and editing support.

Mr. Smith and Dr. Molde provide an extensive reference list. For their complete paper, please contact C.A.S.H. at wildwatch@verizon.net and we will forward your email to the authors.



Greg Sheehan – Former Acting Director of the US-FWS. They tout his credentials this way: “He has worked on growing and sustaining big game populations, expanding fishing and hunting opportunities.”

[Editor’s note: He also enjoys killing birds.]

Photo from Department of Interior FWS

ASK UNCLE JOE



BY JOE MIELE

GOT A QUESTION FOR UNCLE JOE? YOU CAN E-MAIL IT TO UNLCEJOE@ABOLISHSPORHUNTING.ORG. WOULD YOU RATHER SNAIL MAIL YOUR QUESTION? SEND IT TO:

**ASK UNCLE JOE,
P.O. Box 13815, LAS CRUCES, NEW MEXICO 88013**

UNCLE JOE GETS A LOT OF MAIL SO DON'T BE OFFENDED IF HE CANNOT ANSWER YOUR QUESTION IN THE COURIER.

LETTERS ARE PRINTED AS RECEIVED. THEY ARE UNEDITED.

Dear Uncle Joe,

Greetings from northern New Mexico! My neighbor is upset that the state recently banned coyote killing contests. He's upset that ranchers won't be able to protect their animals, and he says this without realizing that animals on ranches aren't safe at all since they will all be shipped off to slaughter. I know your readers want to hear good news so I was hoping that you should tell them a little about it. My dad told me to write an article for you about it but I don't think I know enough to do that.

Mario,
Gallup, NM

Dear Mario:

As a fellow New Mexican and an obvious coyote advocate, I am as happy as you are that Governor Michelle Lujan Grisham signed SB 76 into law. This new law ends organized contests in which coyotes are killed for prizes or entertainment.

These contests were pretty sick - participants competed to kill the most, the largest, or even the smallest coyotes for entertainment and prizes, which often was a shotgun or a semi-automatic weapon of some sort. As you may know, up to 30 such contests were known to have taken place in New Mexico each year. Such indiscriminate killing serves no purpose other than to allow violent people to kill helpless animals for pleasure. Dave Parsons, a retired career wildlife biologist with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and a member of the Albuquerque-based Project Coyote science advisory board says there's no legitimate science that supports killing contests as sound wildlife management, regardless of what participants believe.

This law carries along the momentum that other states that have built. In 2014, California banned killing furbearer and nongame species for prizes, and Vermont banned coyote-killing contests in 2018. Even Arizona recently passed a limited hunting contest ban, but theirs seems easy to circumvent since loopholes exist that can be exploited. The rule only restricts "hunting contests," defined as competitions that charge a fee, require registration, and award prizes or money to successful participants. Given this definition all that needs to be done to make a killing contest legal is for the organizers to waive entrance fees or eliminate prizes.

So while Arizona has a bit more work to do, New Mexico, California, and Vermont have certainly moved in the right direction!

Sincerely,
Uncle Joe

Dear Uncle Joe

A friend forwarded me an article saying that California has banned fur. It didn't look like it was coming from a reliable source so I figured you and CASH would know if this was true. What's the story?

Antionette,
Colorado Springs, CO

Dear Antionette:

California hasn't banned fur, but they did ban fur trapping.

The Wildlife Protection Act of 2019 that was recently passed and signed into law prohibits the trapping of native animals including grey fox, coyote, beaver, badger and mink, along with the sale of their pelts (skin with fur attached).

Lawmakers argued that California's trapping industry was too small and costly to regulate. Only 133 California trapping licenses were purchased in 2017 according to the bill, and just over \$16,000 in revenue was generated for the state hunting/trapping/fishing agency, the Department of Fish and Wildlife. But despite 133 trapping licenses sold, only 68 trappers were active and the state was spending more to oversee the industry than was being returned to it. But the law also addresses fur dealers and fur agents as licenses for these practices will also no longer be issued. Goodbye and good riddance to the disgusting practice of recreational fur trapping, and not a day too soon.

As amazing as this is, there's another bill (AB 44) that if enacted, would ban the manufacture and sale of new fur products across the state. At that point fur will be as dead as the animals it is stolen from. Obviously, we encourage all our California supporters to contact their state Assembly members and Senators to encourage them to pass this bill into law. Contact information can be found at <http://www.legislature.ca.gov/>.

Sincerely,
Uncle Joe

Dear Uncle Joe:

You people are pests. You're annoying and ineffective and no one cares about your mission of ending the role science plays in managing wildlife. You're like a bee at the backyard barbecue that needs to be swatted. People are more important than animals and until you understand that don't bother answering me because I don't care about your opinions.

Vincent,
Chautauqua, NY

Dear Vincent,

I'm sorry, but are you my boss, my mom, or my wife? No? Well in that case I'm going to answer. Don't you know that you shouldn't be swatting bees? Without bees there's no food for any of us to eat. Seriously. According to the Earthwatch Institute, bees are the most important animal on the planet, and that includes, much to your dismay, humans.

Why are bees so much more important than people? It's because seventy-percent of the world's agriculture depends exclusively on bees. Obviously they are valuable because of their role as pollinators, but in addition, studies have shown that bees are the only living being who do not carry any type of pathogen. They don't spread any kind of disease to any other animal, and that's a big deal.

Shockingly, the population of bees has declined by almost 90 percent in the last few years, but it shouldn't come as a shock that human activity is the cause. The uncontrolled use of pesticides and deforestation (and lack of flowers) are the main reasons for their die-off. If this trend continues, we're in a world of trouble. Albert Einstein (you've heard of him, right?) said "If the bees disappear, humans would have 4 years to live." I have a hunch that I should take Einstein's words more seriously than yours.

If we're going to save the bees (and our own behinds in the process) we need to act quickly on some very simple things: 1 - Do not use any pesticides, fungicides or herbicides on plants or in your garden. 2 - Plant a garden with several different species of bee-friendly plants. A list of some examples can be found here: <http://beefriendly.ca/25-plants-for-bees-in-your-garden/> 3 - Don't maintain a lawn. Lawns are not good homes for insects because they don't have plants that bloom. 4 - Don't pick weeds. Plants like dandelions are excellent food sources for bees, especially in the spring when they may be the only blooming plants around. 5 - Educate yourself about bees (I can tell this might be difficult for you, but please give it a try). Bees aren't dangerous and they do not attack humans. All they really want to do is dance around in pollen and spread it from flower to flower. But if you're really afraid of being stung, just stay still and calm if a bee lands on you, and for dog's sake, get away from the hive. Learn to differentiate between bees and wasps. Wasps are carnivores who will be attracted to your gross Bologna sandwich, while bees are vegetarians.

Sincerely,
Uncle Joe

C.A.S.H. CATALOG

A Voice in the Wilderness

Videotape approximately 20 minutes.
\$12.00 and \$8 for members.

This video is an expose of wildlife management by **Luke Dommer**, founder of C.A.S.H. It was produced by **Focus on Animals**, CT. **Esther Mechler** of Focus has generously given C.A.S.H. the right to sell this videotape. Copies have been generously donated by **Nancy Gordon of HAVE**, an audio-visual company in Hudson, NY.



Luke Dommer

CASH HAT

Neon Orange, one size fits all. \$7.50



C.A.S.H. T-SHIRT,

X-LARGE,
BRIGHT ORANGE—\$12.00



Front of shirt

HOW YOU CAN HELP US DO MORE:

√ Become a member
√ Include WILDLIFE WATCH, INC. in your will (you may earmark bequests for C.A.S.H.). If you have general questions about leaving a bequest in your Will to Wildlife Watch, or making Wildlife Watch the beneficiary of life insurance or other assets, you can contact Frances Carlisle, Esq. at 212-213-0172. Frances Carlisle is a trusts and estates attorney with expertise in advising clients about bequests and other types of disposition to charitable organizations.

√ Donate shares of stock, avoid capital gains and get a tax deduction! Notify your broker or the company whose stock you hold. Ask them to transfer stock to Wildlife Watch, Inc. Federal Tax Identification Number: 13-3076705

A copy of our latest annual report may be obtained from Wildlife Watch, Inc., or from the Office of the Attorney General, Charities Bureau, 120 Broadway, New York, NY 10271.

PETER'S HUMOR? C.A.S.H. apologizes if you are not amused

By PETER MULLER, VP, C.A.S.H.

THE BEST OF PETE'S JOKES (Part 2)

An animal-rights activist was telling a new co-worker one of his dumb-hunter jokes. About half-way through the joke his new colleague stopped him; looked at him very intently and declared slowly and with exaggerated emphasis: "Do you know - that I am a hunter?"

The animal-rights activist apologized, "Oh, I'm very sorry, do you want me to start over and talk slower?"



A hunter, in a desperate effort to acquire some culture decided to attend the opera.

An usher came by and noticed him sprawled across three entire seats. He whispered to the hunter, "Sorry, sir, but you're only allowed one seat."

The hunter groaned but didn't budge.

The usher became more impatient. "Sir, if you don't get up from there, I'm going to have to call the manager." The hunter just groaned.

The usher marched briskly back up

the aisle. In a moment, he returned with the manager. Together the two of them tried repeatedly to move the hunter, but with no success.

Finally, they summoned the police. The cop surveyed the situation briefly then asked, "All right buddy, what's your name?"

"Sam," the hunter moaned.

"Where ya from, Sam?"

With pain in his voice Sam replied...
"The balcony."



What has 80 legs and 4 teeth?
A hunters' conference.



Q: How do you make a hunter laugh on Saturday?

A: Tell him a joke on Wednesday.



Q: How do hunters' brain cells die?

A: Alone.



Fans of Pete's Humor

www.ebaumsworld.com/pictures/view/557305/#

CONTACTS:

Jim Robertson, *President*

jim@abolishsporthunting.org

Joe Miele, *Uncle Joe column*

unclejoe@abolishsporthunting.org

Peter Muller, *Vice President, C.A.S.H.*

peter@abolishsporthunting.org

Anne Muller, *Editor, C.A.S.H. Courier*

anne@abolishsporthunting.org

As always, we are grateful to
The Mary T. and Frank L. Hoffman Family Foundation
for hosting the C.A.S.H. website!



Wildlife Watch, Inc.
C.A.S.H. Committee To Abolish Sport Hunting
 PO Box 562
 New Paltz, NY 12561
 Phone: (845) 256-1400 Fax: (845) 501-3175
www.wildwatch.org
www.all-creatures.org/cash
www.canadageese.org



Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
Paid
Newburgh, NY
Permit No. 473

Cut out along this dotted line if returning order form



PLEASE CLIP OUT AND MAIL IN THE ENCLOSED REMITTANCE ENVELOPE:

- ☺ YES, I WANT TO HELP THE COMMITTEE TO ABOLISH SPORT HUNTING END THE WAR ON WILDLIFE:
- ☺ I AM HAPPY TO BECOME A Basic Plus Member for \$50 _____
I will receive the C.A.S.H. hat, return address labels, and newsletter. Check if you do not want a hat. _____
- ☺ I am happy to become a Basic member for \$35 _____
I will receive the C.A.S.H. newsletter and return address labels.
- ☺ I am happy to contribute but cannot become a member now _____
- ☺ **I would like to make an additional contribution for Wildlife Watch** _____

C.A.S.H. accepts MasterCard or Visa:

Card # _____
 Amount _____ Exp. Date: _____
 Signature _____

All donations are tax-deductible.

My e-mail address is _____
 You can also pay through PayPal at www.abolishsporthunting.org link to "Donate" Thank You!

C.A.S.H. CATALOG ORDER BLANK

Description	Qty	\$ Each	\$ Total

Your Name: _____
 Street: _____
 City: _____
 State: _____ Zip: _____
 Day Phone: _____
 Eve Phone: _____
 Fax: _____
 E-Mail: _____
 Date: _____
 Special Instructions: _____

 Ship to address below (if different from above):

Subtotal: _____
 Shipping and Handling: \$5.00
 NYS residents must add appropriate sales tax: _____
 Additional contribution to help
 C.A.S.H. carry on its work: _____
 Total: _____
 You can now pay with:
 Mastercard/Visa # _____
 Expir. Date: _____
 Signature: _____

Please make checks payable to: C.A.S.H. or Committee to Abolish Sport Hunting or Wildlife Watch, Inc.