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IN THE MATTER OF ALLEGATIONS RELATING TO 
REPRESENTATIVE ED WHITFIELD

JULY 14, 2016.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. Dent, from the Committee on Ethics,

submitted the following

REPORT

In accordance with House Rule XI, clauses 3(a)(2) and 3(b), the Committee on Ethics (Committee) hereby submits the following Report to the House of Representatives:

I. INTRODUCTION

On July 12, 2016, the Committee considered the Report adopted by the Investigative Subcommittee (ISC) in this matter. This Report memorializes the Committee’s conclusions based on the ISC Report.

The Committee agrees with the findings and conclusions the ISC reached following its thorough thirteen-month investigation. Specifically, the Committee finds that Representative Ed Whitfield failed to prohibit lobbying contacts between his staff and his wife, Constance Harriman, and dispensed special privileges to Ms. Harriman, but that he did not violate the rule against improperly using his position for his own interest. The Committee also found, as the ISC did, that Representative Whitfield did not intend to violate the House Rules or other standards of conduct, or to benefit himself or his spouse by doing so. However, the Committee agreed with the ISC’s conclusion that Representative Whitfield did not take sufficient care to familiarize himself with the applicable rules and other standards of conduct, or to ensure that his office complied with them, and that the resulting violations were significant and numerous enough to warrant a reproval by the Committee.

1 The Committee thanks the Members of the ISC for their efforts and attention to this matter.
Accordingly, the Committee hereby adopts the ISC’s Report, which will serve as a reproof to Representative Whitfield. The ISC’s Report is transmitted as an appendix to this Report.

II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On June 10, 2014, the Office of Congressional Ethics (OCE) transmitted a Report and Findings (Referral) relating to Representative Whitfield to the Committee. OCE’s Referral recommended that the Committee further review allegations that Representative Whitfield failed to prohibit lobbying contacts between his staff and his wife (who was at the time a registered lobbyist), and that he dispensed special favors or privileges to either his wife or her employers, the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), or its lobbying arm, the Humane Society Legislative Fund (HSLF).2

The Committee agreed with OCE’s recommendation and did further review the allegations in its Referral. On November 10, 2014, the Committee published OCE’s Referral and a response from Representative Whitfield, and publicly announced that the Committee would investigate the matter under Committee Rule 18(a). Shortly after the commencement of the 114th Congress, on March 25, 2015, the Committee unanimously voted to establish an ISC to continue the Committee’s investigation of the allegations in OCE’s referral.

The ISC issued requests for information to Representative Whitfield, HSUS, and HSLF. In response to those requests, the ISC obtained and reviewed over 140,000 pages of documents. The ISC interviewed eleven witnesses, including current and former House staff, employees of HSUS and HSLF, a Member who was a witness to the allegations, Ms. Harriman, and Representative Whitfield. In addition, the ISC reviewed Representative Whitfield’s written submissions regarding the allegations in this matter.

On April 20, 2016, the ISC voted to adopt its Report, finding that Representative Whitfield had violated the House Rule concerning lobbying contacts between a Member’s spouse and his staff, as well as rules regarding the dispensation of special privileges. The ISC did not believe that a sanction requiring floor action by the House of Representatives was warranted in this case. However, the ISC did recommend that the Committee reprove Representative Whitfield, a sanction which the Committee is authorized by House Rules to issue on its own authority.3 As the Committee has noted previously, reproof by the Committee is “intended to be a clear public statement of rebuke of a Member’s conduct issued by a body of that Member’s peers acting . . . on behalf of the House of Representatives.”4

Pursuant to House Rule XI, clause 3(a)(2), which provides that the Committee may report to the House its findings and conclusions for final disposition of investigative matters after “notice and hearing,” the Committee provided Representative Whitfield with a copy of the ISC Report on April 29, 2016, and offered him the op-

---

2A referral from the OCE to the Committee may include a recommendation that the Committee further review an allegation or dismiss it and provide the Committee with certain types of information regarding the allegation, but not the names of any cooperative witnesses or any conclusions regarding the validity of the allegations or the guilt or innocence of the individual who is the subject of the review. See H. Res. 895 1(c)(2)(C).
3House Rule XI, clause 3(a)(2).
portunity to be heard by the full Committee. Representative Whitfield responded to the ISC’s Report through an extensive written submission and by appearing before the Committee.

Following Representative Whitfield’s appearance before the Committee, the ISC met again to discuss Representative Whitfield’s remarks and submission. After further consideration of those views and materials, the ISC unanimously agreed to make minor revisions to its Report, and transmitted the Report to the Committee. As described further below, the ISC still concluded that the violations were significant and numerous enough to warrant a reproval by the Committee, and the full Committee unanimously agreed with that recommendation.

**III. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

On July 12, 2016, the Committee voted unanimously to release this public Report finding that Representative Whitfield violated House Rules and other standards of conduct. Specifically, beginning in January 2011 and continuing until at least 2015, Representative Whitfield permitted Ms. Harriman, who was at that time registered as a lobbyist for HSLF, to contact his staff regarding federal legislation in which HSLF had an interest. This contact took many forms, from Ms. Harriman’s participation in the planning and strategy of arranging meetings between other Members and outside advocates for the Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (PAST Act), a bill that Representative Whitfield sponsored and HSLF supported, to discussing communications and parliamentary strategy for the PAST Act and other animal welfare bills, to directly advocating that Representative Whitfield vote for certain animal welfare bills or amendments, or that his staff alter the language of such bills. These contacts, the ISC concluded, illustrated Ms. Harriman’s unique level of access to, and influence on, Representative Whitfield’s staff.

With respect to the conduct described above, Representative Whitfield violated House Rule XXV, clause 7, which requires that Members “prohibit all staff employed by that Member . . . from making any lobbying contact . . . with that individual’s spouse, if that spouse is a lobbyist . . .” Representative Whitfield also violated the Code of Ethics for Government Service, Section 5, which states that Members shall “never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not . . .” Finally, this conduct also violated Clauses 1 and 2 of House Rule XXIII, which provide that a Member “shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House,” and “shall adhere to the spirit and the letter of the Rules of the House . . .”

The ISC noted that these violations were not caused by any corrupt or willful intent to violate House Rules or other standards of conduct. However, the ISC recognized that Representative Whitfield failed to establish clear guidelines and limits for his staff, which resulted in numerous lobbying contacts between his staff and Ms. Harriman over an extended period of time. The ISC further found that Ms. Harriman’s unique access to and influence on

---

3 ISC Report at 32–33.
4 Id.
Representative Whitfield's staff constituted a special privilege to her, which other lobbyists were not and would not have been granted. The ISC concluded that these violations did not require a House sanction, such as a reprimand or censure, largely because they were due to Representative Whitfield's negligence, rather any intent to violate the applicable rules and other standards of conduct. However, the ISC observed that, consistent with the Committee's prior precedents, even unintentional violations, if significant and sustained over time, can merit a reproval by the Committee. Based on the totality of the circumstances, the ISC concluded that a public reproval was appropriate in this case.

After reviewing the ISC's Report, Representative Whitfield acknowledged that his "oversights led to unintentional violations" of the House Rule regarding lobbying contacts between a Member's staff and a lobbyist spouse. However, Representative Whitfield asserts that his spouse did not have special access to his staff, and that there was thus no violation of the rule against providing a "special privilege" to any person. Representative Whitfield also contends that his actions did not fail to "reflect creditably on the House," and that a reproval is not appropriate, given his lack of intent to violate the rules and other circumstances.

The Committee has accepted the ISC's findings regarding the lack of any intent by Representative Whitfield to violate the rules. However, the Committee found that Representative Whitfield failed to take the proper care to avoid violations of the applicable rules. In particular, the Committee was troubled by Representative Whitfield's assertions that he was unaware of both the lobbying contacts rule and his spouse's registration as a lobbyist until another Member's staff raised questions about Ms. Harriman in October 2013, nearly three years after Ms. Harriman registered as a lobbyist. As the Committee has previously stated, "Members have both the duty and responsibility to be aware of relevant House Rules and to conform their actions accordingly." The Committee has thus refused to accept claims of mitigation that "would effectively result in the condonation of improper action based upon a defense of ignorance of House Rules," stating that "[s]uch an approach is clearly untenable on its face."

Likewise, and for the same reasons, the Committee believes that a Member bears some responsibility to be aware of significant changes in factual circumstances—such as a spouse's action to register as a lobbyist—that could implicate House Rules. The Committee also questioned Representative Whitfield's assertion that he "did not even know that his wife had become a registered lobbyist" until October 2013. In fact, Ms. Harriman sent a statement to Representative Whitfield's House BlackBerry device in December 2012, which referred to a Washington Post reporter's "inquiry regarding the lobbying work of Connie Harriman-Whitfield on behalf of her employer, Harriman-Whitfield, LLC."
of the Humane Society Legislative Fund (HSLF).” ¹⁵ The email to Representative Whitfield noted that Ms. Harriman was a registered lobbyist for HSLF, and was paid “for her lobbying work.” ¹⁶ Further, several of Representative Whitfield’s staff, including his chief of staff, testified that they knew Ms. Harriman was a registered lobbyist for the Humane Society well before October 2013.¹⁷ This raises questions about how Representative Whitfield’s staff were aware of Ms. Harriman’s change in status around the time it occurred, yet Representative Whitfield remained unaware.

Despite Representative Whitfield’s claim that he was unaware of the lobbying contacts rule until late 2013, and his admission that he did, in fact, violate the rule, Representative Whitfield argues that there was more than one reasonable interpretation of the rule, and that his actions were consistent with one such interpretation. Representative Whitfield has made this point previously, in written submissions and in extensive testimony before the ISC. The ISC considered Representative Whitfield’s interpretation of the rule, along with his characterization of the contacts between his staff and Ms. Harriman regarding legislation that HSLF supported or lobbied on, and found them to be without merit.¹⁸ The Committee agreed with the ISC’s thoughtful and detailed analysis, and notes that the ISC took care to highlight and address both exculpatory and inculpatory evidence in its Report. Given the Committee’s confidence in the ISC’s Report, the Committee will not issue an extended response to Representative Whitfield’s most recent submission. However, a few of Representative Whitfield’s legal and factual arguments merit brief discussion.

On the proper interpretation of the lobbying contacts rule, Representative Whitfield admits that he violated the rule, but asserts that it would have been reasonable for him to believe that Ms. Harriman’s communications with his staff were only “lobbying contacts” if she intended to influence the staff or Representative Whitfield, and that there was no public guidance from the House or Committee that would have led him to view the rule differently.¹⁹ Putting aside Representative Whitfield’s admission that he did not have any interpretation of the lobbying contacts rule during the period at issue here—because he was unaware the rule existed—the Committee disagrees with Representative Whitfield’s contention.²⁰ As the ISC explained, the definition of a “lobbying contact,” which is included in the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (LDA) contains no reference to, or requirement for, a lobbyist’s intent to

¹⁵ ISC Report at 27 (citing Ex. 56).
¹⁶ Id.
¹⁷ Id. at 5–6.
¹⁸ See, e.g., id. at 23–27.
¹⁹ In October 2013, Ms. Harriman contacted Committee staff after another Member’s staff objected to Ms. Harriman’s participation in legislative meetings arranged by Representative Whitfield’s staff. Representative Whitfield asserts that Ms. Harriman received “unclear responses” from Committee staff, and that Committee staff acknowledged that the issue was “complicated.” See Representative Whitfield Submission (May 31, 2016) at 9–10 (Appendix D). The ISC considered these assertions, and found that, at a minimum, Committee staff informed Ms. Harriman that she should not “talk about any bill with [Representative Whitfield’s] office that HSUS supports,” as Ms. Harriman’s own notes of the call state. See ISC Report, Ex. 32. Yet Ms. Harriman continued to have those conversations long after speaking with Committee staff.
²⁰ Representative Whitfield’s written response to the ISC report asserts that he was “unaware of the lobbying contacts rule.” The prohibition in House Rule XXV, clause 7, was created in the 110th Congress by the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007 (“HLOGA”), Pub. L. 110–81, § 302, 121 Stat. 735, 121 Stat. 735, 752 (Sept. 14, 2007), which passed the House on a vote of 411–8. It has been included in House Rules in each of the four successive Congresses.
influence anyone.21 As a matter of common sense and practice, lobbyists often work with Members and their staff on issues where the lobbyist and the Member or staff already agree; the point of those contacts is not to influence the Member or staff, but to work together to pass or modify legislation. These interactions fall squarely within the statutory definition of a lobbying contact. Further, as the ISC Report explained, the House has published guidance which makes clear that if a lobbyist’s client would view its lobbyist’s communication with a Member or staff as advancing the client’s interests in legislation, the communication is a lobbying contact.22 As the ISC detailed, Ms. Harriman’s client, HSLF, viewed her as acting on its behalf when she contacted Member offices—including Representative Whitfield’s office.23 Thus, based on the publicly available guidance issued by the House, Ms. Harriman’s contacts with Representative Whitfield’s staff regarding legislation that she and her client, HSLF, were registered to lobby on would be “lobbying contacts.”

Representative Whitfield acknowledges that by at least October 2013, he knew that his wife was a registered lobbyist and knew of the rule regarding lobbying contacts by a Member’s spouse who is a registered lobbyist, but asserts that he lacked guidance from the Committee about how to interpret the rule.24 Yet, as discussed at greater length in the ISC Report, the Committee’s Chief Counsel spoke to Ms. Harriman about the rule. In that conversation, the Chief Counsel offered to speak to Representative Whitfield directly and advised Ms. Harriman that the best way to obtain a formal opinion from the Committee would be for Representative Whitfield himself to request such an opinion. Representative Whitfield never made that request. Moreover, well after that time, Ms. Harriman continued to make similar contacts and requests to his office.

Representative Whitfield also attempts to characterize his spouse’s interactions with his staff regarding legislation that HSLF supported as mere “reminders” to take actions Representative Whitfield already intended to take, and suggests, as he did throughout the ISC’s investigation, that he and Ms. Harriman were completely aligned on all the issues that Ms. Harriman contacted his staff about. The ISC found that these claims were based on a mischaracterization or incomplete presentation of the facts,25 and the Committee agreed.

With respect to the ISC’s finding that Representative Whitfield granted Ms. Harriman a special privilege of access to his staff, Representative Whitfield argues that Ms. Harriman’s access to, and influence on, his staff did not change when Ms. Harriman registered as a lobbyist. This is precisely the point. Representative Whitfield’s
As the ISC explained, it is neither unusual nor inappropriate for a Member’s spouse to have a particularly close relationship with the Member’s staff. See ISC Report at 33. However, the appropriateness of this relationship changes where the spouse is a registered lobbyist, and is communicating with the Member’s staff concerning legislation the lobbyist is registered to lobby on. That was the circumstance here, and explains why the ISC and Committee did not view Ms. Harriman’s status as a Member’s spouse to be a mitigating factor.

When she registered to lobby for HSLF, and later joined HSLF as a paid lobbyist, her access to Representative Whitfield’s staff, and the staff’s treatment of her, should have changed accordingly. But by all accounts, nothing changed. To cite just one example, in May 2011, five months after Ms. Harriman registered as a lobbyist for HSLF, Ms. Harriman’s supervisor at HSLF told Ms. Harriman that an HSUS publication wanted quotes from Representative Whitfield, supporting a horse racing bill that HSUS wanted Congress to pass. The HSLF supervisor asked “Do you want me to just go through the office?”, to which Ms. Harriman responded “I do not need to tell YOU that going through a spouse is usually more efficient than going through the office! . . . I will get a couple of quotes from him.” Ms. Harriman’s supervisor responded 90 minutes later: “Oh, I know you’re the one to ask! I just think we ask A LOT! And, thank you, I already heard from [Representative Whitfield’s press secretary]—you work fast!” As the ISC’s Report detailed, HSLF and HSUS employees regularly followed this practice, using Ms. Harriman as a go-between to obtain prompt action from Representative Whitfield on a variety of requests. Based on these and other interactions between Ms. Harriman and Representative Whitfield’s office, the ISC found, and the Committee agreed, that Representative Whitfield granted Ms. Harriman a “special privilege” that was not available to other lobbyists—not through any decision he made, but due to a failure to alter the office’s policies as the House Rules required.

Representative Whitfield contends that his violations were not severe enough to implicate House Rule XXIII, clause 1, which provides that a Member “shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House.” But Representative Whitfield has acknowledged that his staff’s interactions with Ms. Harriman raised improper appearances, and that he would handle the change in Ms. Harriman’s status differently today, knowing what he does now. In the Committee’s view, given the number, duration, and significance of the violations the ISC found, Representative Whitfield’s actions were not consistent with House Rule XXIII, clause 1. The Committee also found that, although Representative Whitfield offered technical defenses to the allegations in this matter, his actions did not comport with the spirit of the lobbying contacts and “special privileges” rules.

Based on these findings, the Committee found that Representative Whitfield violated House Rule XXV, clause 7, the Code of Conduct, section 5, and House Rule XXIII, clauses 1 and 2. While the Committee agreed with the ISC’s assessment that these violations were not intentional, they only occurred because Representative

---

26 As the ISC explained, it is neither unusual nor inappropriate for a Member’s spouse to have a particularly close relationship with the Member’s staff. See ISC Report at 33. However, the appropriateness of this relationship changes where the spouse is a registered lobbyist, and is communicating with the Member’s staff concerning legislation the lobbyist is registered to lobby on. That was the circumstance here, and explains why the ISC and Committee did not view Ms. Harriman’s status as a Member’s spouse to be a mitigating factor.
27 ISC Report, Ex. 3.
28 Id.
29 Id.
30 See ISC Report at 3 & n.22.
31 Id. at 32.
32 See House Rule XXIII, clause 2.
Whitfield “failed to comprehend the importance of setting boundaries and limits on the interactions between Ms. Harriman and his staff,” and thus did not take the proper precautions to avoid either improper interactions or the appearance of impropriety. Therefore, consistent with prior precedent, the Committee has adopted the ISC’s Report in this matter, which shall serve as a reproval of Representative Whitfield. This recommendation is consistent with the Committee’s treatment of prior matters, in which the Committee issued a reproval even where a Member’s violations were unintentional. Following the publication of this Report, the Committee will take no further action in this matter, and considers it closed.

IV. STATEMENT UNDER RULE XIII, CLAUSE 3(c) OF THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Committee made no special oversight findings in this report. No budget statement is submitted. No funding is authorized by any measure in this report.

---

33 ISC Report at 29.
34 See Gingrey at 25 (finding violations of House Rules, and issuing a reproval, even though “the Committee credited Representative Gingrey’s assertion that he believed his actions were consistent with House Rules.”); Berkley at 10 (reproval was appropriate even though “the ISC found that Representative Berkley mistakenly believed the rules governing what assistance her office could provide to her husband’s practice required only that they treat him in the same manner by which they treated any other constituent.”); see also Stallings at 5–6 (Committee recommended a reprimand where the Member was unaware of the applicable House Rule and did not intend to violate it).
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REPORT OF THE INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE

I. INTRODUCTION

On March 25, 2015, the Committee on Ethics (Committee) unanimously voted to empanel an investigative subcommittee (ISC) to investigate allegations related to Representative Ed Whitfield. Those allegations were the subject of a referral from the Office of Congressional Ethics (OCE), which the Committee published on November 10, 2014, in accordance with House and Committee Rules. OCE’s referral recommended further review of allegations that Representative Whitfield had failed to prohibit lobbying contacts between his staff and his wife (who was at the time a registered lobbyist), and that he dispensed special favors or privileges to either his wife, or her employers, the Humane Society Legislative Fund (HSLF) and the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS). The ISC was also authorized to investigate whether these same allegations also constituted the impermissible use of Representative Whitfield’s official position for the beneficial interest of himself or his wife. The ISC has concluded its investigation into these allegations, and summarizes its conclusions in this Report. The ISC found that Representative Whitfield did impermissibly fail to prohibit lobbying contacts between his staff and his wife, and did dispense special privileges to his wife, but that he did not violate the rule against improperly using his position for his own interest. The ISC found that Representative Whitfield’s violations were unintentional, and not motivated by any corrupt intent or interest in benefiting himself or his spouse. However, the ISC concluded that the violations were significant and repeated, and the ISC thus recommends that this Report serve as a reproval of Representative Whitfield for the violations described herein.

Representative Whitfield has a long record of commitment to the cause of animal welfare. His wife, Ms. Harriman, has a similar record. In the past, Ms. Harriman volunteered her services as an organizer and advocate to Representative Whitfield’s legislative causes. In January 2011, Ms. Harriman went from being a volunteer on these issues to being a registered lobbyist for HSLF. This inflection point changed her status under House Rules, and should have resulted in a shift in how Representative Whitfield’s staff interacted with her. It did not. Ms. Harriman continued to enjoy the access and influence that she had as a spouse volunteering with
the office, but now could and did use that access and influence as a part of her professional duties. House Rule XXV, clause 7, requires Members to prohibit lobbying contacts between their staff and their spouse when the spouse is a registered lobbyist. The Code of Ethics for Government Service bars Members from dispensing special privileges to anyone, whether for financial gain or not. The conduct in this case amounted to a violation of both standards of conduct, as discussed fully below.

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On June 10, 2014, OCE transmitted a Report and Findings recommending further review of the allegations against Representative Whitfield. The Committee released OCE’s Report and Findings on November 10, 2014. Shortly after the commencement of the 114th Congress, on March 25, 2015, the Committee voted to establish this ISC, to investigate the allegations in OCE’s referral.

The ISC issued requests for information to Representative Whitfield, HSUS, and HSLF. In response to those requests, the ISC obtained and reviewed over 140,000 pages of documents. The ISC interviewed eleven witnesses, including current and former House staff, employees of HSUS and HSLF, a Member who was a witness to the allegations, Ms. Harriman, and Representative Whitfield.

III. HOUSE RULES, LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND OTHER STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

House Rule XXV, clause 7, states, in relevant part, “a Member...shall prohibit all staff employed by that Member...from making any lobbying contact (as defined in section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995) with that individual’s spouse if that spouse is a lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995...” A “lobbying contact,” as defined by the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (LDA), is “any oral or written communication (including an electronic communication) to a...covered legislative branch official that is made on behalf of a client with regard to...the formulation, modification, or adoption of Federal legislation (including legislative proposals)....”

House Rule XXIII, clause 3, states that a Member “may not receive compensation and may not permit compensation to accrue to the beneficial interest of such individual from any source, the receipt of which would occur by virtue of influence improperly exerted from the position of such individual in Congress.”

The Code of Ethics, section 5, provides that any person in government service should “never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not...” The House Ethics Manual notes that the Committee “has cautioned

1 See 2 U.S.C. § 1602(8).
all Members ‘to avoid situations in which even an inference might be drawn suggesting improper action.’

Finally, House Rule XXIII, clauses 1 and 2, provide that a Member “shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect credibly on the House,” and “shall adhere to the spirit and the letter of the Rules of the House....”

IV. FACTS

Representative Ed Whitfield is the Representative for the First District of Kentucky. He has held that position since 1995. He serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee. He married Ms. Harriman in 1990. Ms. Harriman has held a variety of positions in government and policymaking, from Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Director of the United States Export-Import Bank, Vice Chair of the Kentucky Horse Racing Authority, and Chair of the Kentucky Equine Drug Research Council. She started working for HSUS in 2007; in January 2011, she registered as a lobbyist for HSLF and, in October 2011, she transferred to the HSLF payroll. Ms. Harriman terminated her status as a lobbyist in 2015.

A. The Whitfields’ Historical Work on Animal Protection

Representative Whitfield has a longstanding record of support for policies intended to promote the welfare of animals. From his election through the middle of the 113th Congress, he has sponsored or cosponsored over 70 different bills pertaining to animal welfare, with subject matters ranging from bans on animal fighting as a spectator sport to the regulation of doping in horse racing.

Ms. Harriman has also worked on these issues throughout her career. While working for the Department of the Interior, she was involved in the creation of a worldwide ban on trading elephant ivory. In her positions overseeing equine matters in Kentucky, she also worked on issues related to doping of racehorses. In fact, this love of animals is, according to both Representative Whitfield and Ms. Harriman, a commonality that affects not only their professional lives, but their marriage—they have rescued dogs and horses throughout the years and brought them into their home.

Given their shared interest in animal welfare, it is not surprising that the two began to coordinate efforts on these issues. Ms. Harriman served as a volunteer organizer on a variety of legislative actions, and coordinated her efforts alongside Representative Whitfield and his staff.

---

4 Representative Whitfield Submission (July 31, 2014) at Appendix 1 (hereinafter “July 31, 2014 Submission”).
7 ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman.
8 Id.
9 Id.; see also ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield.
Most notably, Ms. Harriman put a great deal of effort into advocacy regarding the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act in 2006. While this bill was under consideration by the House, Ms. Harriman spent “countless hours organizing and attending meetings with other advocates of the legislation and Members to educate them about the bill and garner their support.”\(^{10}\) Press articles noted that Ms. Harriman’s volunteer efforts were “instrumental” in steering the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act to the House floor.\(^ {11}\) As discussed more fully below, both Representative Whitfield and Ms. Harriman carried the positive lessons of their efforts on the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act into future legislative endeavors.

When it came both to animal protection matters and issues outside that realm, staffers interviewed by the ISC described Ms. Harriman as actively involved in the day-to-day matters of the office: a former Scheduler testified that Ms. Harriman “calls a lot,” and that “she expected a lot . . . you always kind of said ‘yes’ to her because she’s the Congressman’s wife.”\(^ {12}\)

B. **Ms. Harriman Becomes a Lobbyist**

Ms. Harriman came to work for HSUS in 2007. She held a variety of roles in that organization, from assisting with fundraising to serving on the executive team. On January 1, 2011, Ms. Harriman first appeared on a lobbying registration form for HSLF, which listed her as an “individual who has acted or is expected to act as a lobbyist for the client [HSLF].” The LDA defines a “lobbyist” as “any individual who is employed or retained by a client for financial or other compensation for services that include more than one lobbying contact.” However, Ms. Harriman did not move to HSLF until October 24, 2011, when HSLF needed an experienced government affairs professional, and Ms. Harriman took the position.\(^ {13}\) Ms. Harriman’s supervisor at HSLF told OCE that Ms. Harriman did not lobby for that organization until October 2011,\(^ {14}\) which is the first time she is listed on a report of lobbying activities for HSLF. Ms. Harriman herself told the ISC that, between January 1, 2011, and October 24, 2011, she “didn’t operate as a lobbyist” and “that wasn’t really my job.”\(^ {15}\) However, she qualified those statements, adding that she “could have” performed lobbying functions for HSUS, and “might have spoken to a Member about one of our issues.”\(^ {16}\)

\(^{10}\) Representative Whitfield Submission (February 24, 2016) at 6-7 (hereinafter “February 24, 2016 Submission”).

\(^{11}\) Catharine Richert, Political Horse-Trading Leads to House Vote on Horse Protection Measure, CQ Today (September 18, 2006); Catharine Richert, Opponents of Horse Slaughter Measure Plan Numerous “Poison Pill” Amendments, CQ Today (September 6, 2006).

\(^{12}\) ISC Interview of Staffer A. When asked if Representative Whitfield’s office had any policy in place for dealing with requests from Ms. Harriman, the witness stated “Not set in stone. It was more or less you didn’t ever really say ‘no’ to her. You would, you know, if she needed things, then you would try and do that for her.” Id.

\(^{13}\) ISC Interview of HSLF Official.

\(^{14}\) See OCE Findings at 6, n.5.

\(^{15}\) ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman.

\(^{16}\) Id. The LDA’s lobbying registration requirement may shed some light on this issue. The statute provides: “No later than 45 days after a lobbyist first makes a lobbying contact or is employed or retained to make a lobbying contact, whichever is earlier, or on the first business day after such 45th day if the 45th day is not a business day, such lobbyist (or, as provided under paragraph (2), the organization employing such lobbyist), shall register with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.” 2 U.S.C. § 1603(a)(1).
HSLF understood that Ms. Harriman’s connection to the Republican Party, a constituency not traditionally aligned with the Humane Society, was an advantage it intended to use to its benefit. Ms. Harriman’s supervisor at HSLF listed on Ms. Harriman’s performance review one of Ms. Harriman’s job responsibilities as “Design strategies to educate and engage new Republican Members and senior Republican Members,” and graded Ms. Harriman as having exceeded expectations on that front. When questioned about this part of the performance evaluation, the HSLF official stated, “[Ms. Harriman] being a Republican, those decades of contacts and relationships that she had built up on the basis of her time in Washington would certainly afford her an opportunity for outreach to folks she felt comfortable reaching out to….”

Ms. Harriman agreed with the idea that she could, and should, leverage her connections to the Republican Party, for the benefit of HSLF. On February 17, 2012, Ms. Harriman sent an email to her HSLF and HSUS colleagues, noting that she would be attending an event hosted by the National Republican Congressional Committee (NRCC) and listing the Members who would also be present, asking for suggestions on topics to discuss. Similarly, when Ms. Harriman’s supervisor at HSLF asked her about getting quotes from Representative Whitfield regarding horse racing for a story on pending legislation that HSUS would subsequently publish in one of its magazines, Ms. Harriman responded, “I do not need to tell YOU that going through a spouse is usually more efficient than going through the office! . . . I will get a couple of quotes from him.”

Ms. Harriman’s supervisor responded 90 minutes later: “Oh, I know you’re the one to ask! I just think we ask A LOT! And, thank you, I already heard from [Representative Whitfield’s press secretary]—you work fast!” HSFL and HSUS employees regularly followed this practice, using Ms. Harriman as a go-between to obtain prompt action from Representative Whitfield on a variety of requests.

Employees on Representative Whitfield’s staff told the ISC that they were not initially aware that Ms. Harriman had registered as a lobbyist:

CHIEF OF STAFF: So [Ms. Harriman] didn’t tell us whenever she switched from Humane Society of the United States to Humane Society Legislative Fund. So, you know, we learned about it

17 Exhibit 1.
18 ISC: Interview of HSLF Official.
19 Exhibit 2. Her colleagues urged her to discuss the so-called “Egg Bill,” and noted that they would “love to get more Republicans on board as cosponsors.” Id. As 2012 continued, Ms. Whitfield continued efforts on the Egg Bill, some of which included interactions with Representative Whitfield’s office. See infra Part IV.B.2.
20 Exhibit 3.
21 Id.
22 See, e.g., Exhibit 4 (HSUS employee asked Ms. Harriman to discuss the possibility of amending the farm bill); Exhibit 5 (HSUS employee asked Ms. Harriman to have Representative Whitfield contact senior officials at USDA to discuss regulations on horse racing); Exhibit 6 (HSUS employee asked Ms. Harriman to have Representative Whitfield call a state district attorney to advocate for criminal charges against a horse sorer).
whenever the lobbying disclosure forms showed up on the internet.23

SCHEDULER: I don’t know if I knew for sure that she was an actual lobbyist for several months.24

And even Representative Whitfield admitted that he was not precisely aware of the change as it happened. In fact, he stated that he did not focus on Ms. Harriman’s lobbying registration until October of 2013, when another Member’s staff raised questions about Ms. Harriman’s status:

ISC STAFF: When Ms. Harriman registered as a lobbyist in January of 2011, did you discuss the change in her status with her?

REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD: No, I didn’t really. I honestly didn’t even focus on it. She had been with the Humane Society I guess for 4 or 5 years. And when she changed to becoming, quote, a registered lobbyist, I never even – we never discussed it really.

... 

ISC STAFF: Do you remember when you first learned that she had been registered as a lobbyist?

REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD: I don’t know that I ever focused on it whatsoever until one day, [my Chief of Staff], because of these meetings being set up, made some comment that, oh, [another Member’s] staffer raised an issue about why are you setting up these meetings. And he said he called House Ethics or House Admin or somebody, but he forgot to tell them that she was a registered lobbyist. I think that was the very first time that I really focused on it.

ISC STAFF: So that would have been when these meetings were getting set up in 2013.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD: Right.25

Representative Whitfield also acknowledged that “the first time you became aware of and read [the House Rule regarding lobbying contacts] was when the OCE investigation began,” around

23 ISC Interview of Staffer B.
24 ISC Interview of Staffer A.
25 ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield.
January 2014.\textsuperscript{26} He further explained that, at the time Ms. Harriman registered as a lobbyist in January 2011, "I am not sure that I was aware there was a specific rule" regarding lobbying contacts between a Member’s spouse and their House staff.\textsuperscript{27}

This lack of awareness of Ms. Harriman’s status and of House Rule XXV, clause 7, naturally, meant that there was no change in office policy or procedure when it came to interactions between the staff and Ms. Harriman after her registration. Not a single witness interviewed by the ISC could recall any change in Ms. Harriman’s interactions with the office in the period immediately following her registration, and Representative Whitfield admitted that “[w]hen efforts to pass the PAST Act ramped up in 2013,” he “simply continued to use [Ms. Harriman] the same way he always had – as a tremendously effective organizer and promoter of his animal-welfare legislative agenda;” he thus “integrated her into his office’s effort” on the bill.\textsuperscript{28} In his testimony before the ISC, Representative Whitfield stated that his office never instituted any policy or practice governing how staff communicates with Ms. Harriman.\textsuperscript{29}

Representative Whitfield acknowledged that Ms. Harriman was an employee of HLSF, but explained:

I viewed her more as a member of my staff than I did an employee of the Humane Society simply because historically, as I said, we have had three other major legislative endeavors [prior to her employment with the Humane Society] in which she played the same role. So from my perspective, I just didn’t – I wasn’t perceiving her as being an agent for the Humane Society.\textsuperscript{30}

Without any policy in place, Ms. Harriman was free to contact Representative Whitfield’s staff regarding a variety of matters that concerned the formulation, modification, and adoption of federal legislation in which HLSF had an interest. In fact, at least one staffer noted that contacts on substantive legislative issues were “still ongoing” at the time of her interview in August 2015, and believed that, without any limits on these sorts of contacts, “sometimes there are a bit of grey areas that some of the other staff get confused on....”\textsuperscript{31} This lack of a clear policy regarding contacts between Ms. Harriman and Representative Whitfield’s staff also contributed to a dynamic where Ms. Harriman had a unique level of access to the office as a spouse, relative to

\textsuperscript{26} Id.
\textsuperscript{27} Id.
\textsuperscript{28} February 24, 2016 Submission at 7 (emphasis added); see also ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield (“Q: So before the PAST Act – I am going to try to focus on that time back in 2011 when this change [Ms. Harriman’s lobbying registration] actually occurred. That wasn’t something you were focused on back then? A. No. Q. And so was there ever a change at that time in the office’s policy for how it would interact with Ms. Harriman? A. No, there wasn’t any change. I mean, from our perspective, I mean, I don’t think she has ever lobbied me... everything before and after [Ms. Harriman’s lobbying registration] was basically the same, as far as interaction with the office.”)
\textsuperscript{29} ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield.
\textsuperscript{30} Id.
\textsuperscript{31} ISC Interview of Staffer C.
other lobbyists, including other lobbyists at HSLF. 32 This Report attempts to discuss examples of these contacts and this dynamic, by focusing on a number of discrete legislative efforts when such contacts took place. 33

1. The Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act

On January 6, 2011, Representative Michael Grimm introduced H.R. 198, the Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act (VDTTA). 34 The VDTTA created a pilot program for evaluating whether veterans with PTSD could be helped therapeutically by training service dogs for other veterans with disabilities. 35 Representative Whitfield co-sponsored the VDTTA. 36 HSLF’s January 1, 2011 Lobbying Registration — which first identified Ms. Harriman as a lobbyist for HSLF — also listed the VDTTA as a lobbying issue for its registrants. 37 In Ms. Harriman’s 2011 performance evaluation, her supervisor wrote, “your work to lobby for House floor passage of the vets/dogs bill is a success story.” 38

One section of the VDTTA directed the administrators of the proposed pilot program to “ensure that in selecting assistance dogs for use in the program, dogs residing in animal shelters or foster homes are looked at as an option, if appropriate…” 39 When staff interviewed Ms. Harriman, she explained that this provision was a matter of some controversy:

[...]The Humane Society wanted to have shelter dogs used. And [Representative] Grimm did not really. He was doubtful about it. ... So the Humane Society was adamant about shelter dogs. They didn’t care about — I told them, I said, you know, I personally am in favor of no shelter dogs, and they were — they were not happy with that. 40

The day after the VDTTA was introduced, Ms. Harriman wrote Representative Whitfield’s then-Legislative Director, and the then-Chief of Staff, forwarding them HSUS’ press release in support of the VDTTA. 41 The then-Legislative Director responded, noting that Representative Whitfield’s office was working with Representative Grimm’s staff on the bill.

---

32 See, e.g., ISC Interview of HSLF Official (Q: “So even if you didn’t need [Ms. Harriman] to have access to Representative Whitfield’s staff, did you understand that if [Ms. Harriman] directly sent a request to a member of Representative Whitfield’s staff that that request might get more attention, a better response, a quicker response than if you, for instance, had sent that request?” A: “In principle, yes.”)
33 These examples are intended to be illustrative, rather than exhaustive. A search of the materials produced to the Committee revealed hundreds of contacts between Ms. Harriman and Representative Whitfield’s staff on a variety of issues.
36 July 31, 2014 Submission at Appendix 1.
37 Exhibit 7 at COE.WHITFIELD.DOC.146917.
38 Exhibit 1.
39 VDTTA § 2(6)(4).
40 ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman.
Ms. Harriman responded by asking the then-Legislative Director if he could “have [Representative Grimm’s staff] delete the two words ‘if appropriate’ after the mention of shelter dogs as an option?” She explained: “I understand why [Representative Grimm] removed ‘preferred’ before ‘option’ but the added two words create too big of an out.” The then-Legislative Director explained that such a change would need to occur at a committee markup. Ms. Harriman replied, “Yes, I was assuming the changes would be made in markup.”

2. The Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2012 and 2013

On January 23, 2012, Representative Kurt Schrader introduced H.R. 3798, the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2012. The following Congress, on April 25, 2013, Representative Schrader reintroduced substantially the same bill as the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2013 (collectively, the “Egg Bill”). The Egg Bill set new national standards for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens. HSLF’s 2012 and 2013 Lobbying Reports list the Egg Bill as a lobbying issue for its registrants, including Ms. Harriman.

Ms. Harriman, in her interview with the ISC, explained that this bill was a reaction to successful measures at the state level seeking to ensure hens would be kept in larger crates:

This is a bill that was the result of a very famous proposition that passed in California. It was called Prop 2 . . . . And what the Humane Society wanted to do was require all hens to be -- allowed to be in cages that were much, much larger than the ones they're typically in where they can’t turn around . . . . [T]he Humane Society then proceeded to try to get a bill that would be a Federal bill that would essentially make -- have the same requirements.

An HSUS FAQ on the Egg Bill reiterated this motivation for the bill, saying “[the egg industry should have the same right to uniform federal standards as other agriculture sectors.” A number of Humane Society emails indicated that the Egg Bill was a “very high priority,” perhaps even the “top legislative priority,” for HSUS.

But constituents in Representative Whitfield’s district explained to him that, even if they agreed with the standards for hens, they were concerned about setting a precedent that could be

42 Id. (emphasis added).
43 Id. At the time Ms. Harriman sent these emails, she was a registered lobbyist for HSLF, but HSLF did not list her as a lobbyist on the VDTTA specifically. Ms. Harriman was first listed as a lobbyist for HSLF on the VDTTA in March 2012. Exhibit 7 at COE.WHITFIELD:146944-6. Nonetheless, it does appear that Ms. Harriman, who did not personally support the legislative change she requested, communicated with Representative Whitfield’s staff about the formulation or modification of the VDTTA, on behalf of HSLF.
45 See 2012 Egg Bill, H.R. 3798, 112th Cong. § 2(b); 2013 Egg Bill, H.R. 1731, 113th Cong. § 2(b).
46 Exhibits 7 at COE.WHITFIELD:146944, 146974.
47 ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman.
48 Exhibit 9 at 1.
49 Exhibits 10 and 11.
applied to other agricultural sectors. Due to this concern, Representative Whitfield vacillated on supporting the Egg Bill, at first agreeing to sign on as a co-sponsor of the bill, and later deciding against it. Ms. Harriman testified that, despite her own support for the Egg Bill, and despite HSLF’s advocacy for it, she counseled her husband not to support the Egg Bill: “and so [Representative Whitfield] talked to some of his farmers, and they were opposed to it. And so when I heard about that, I said, ‘don’t go with this bill. Do not do it.’ . . . He said, ‘I’m going to sign on to it.’ And I said, ‘you shouldn’t.’”

And in fact, Ms. Harriman sent an email to Representative Whitfield’s then-Legislative Director on September 12, 2012, saying, “[Representative Whitfield] just decided to sign on to the Egg Bill. I advised against it . . .” But at almost the same time, she sent an email to her supervisor at HSLF, as well as other HSLF and HSUS employees, stating, “[Representative Whitfield] would like to be added to the Egg Bill. Talk about 11th hour!!!” Her co-workers responded in a way that suggested she had been instrumental in securing Representative Whitfield’s support, with one responding by saying, “I told you you were a rock star,” and another concurring: “That is really FABULOUS news, Connie!!! Thank you so much!!!”

The fact that Ms. Harriman’s Humane Society colleagues credited her with helping to get Representative Whitfield on board as a co-sponsor is not surprising, given that HSLF’s lobbying disclosure report for this time frame listed Ms. Harriman as someone who “acted as a lobbyist” for HSLF in the general area of animal issues, and that report identified the Egg Bill as one of HSLF’s “specific lobbying issues” in that area. Nor did Ms. Harriman correct her supervisor’s impression that she played a part in Representative Whitfield’s decision, or deflect any credit for doing so. Ultimately, however, Representative Whitfield did not co-sponsor the Egg Bill in 2012 or 2013.

3. The King Amendment

In May 2013, in response to the Egg Bill’s professed concern over a patchwork of state standards, Representative Steve King introduced an amendment to the farm bill, which would prevent states from applying their own standards for any agricultural product to those made in other states. The amendment was added to the farm bill by a voice vote in the Agriculture Committee, and its practical effect would have been not only to undercut the case for the Egg Bill, but also to prevent states like California, which had enacted minimum cage size standards on the state level, from applying their own standards to eggs imported from other states.

---

50 ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield; ISC Interview of Staffer B.
51 ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman.
52 Exhibit 12.
53 Exhibit 13.
54 Id.
55 Exhibit 7 at COE.WHITFIELD.DISC.146916, 146949, 146966, 146974.
Given that HSUS and HSLF favored the Egg Bill, it is understandable that they would oppose the Agriculture Committee’s addition of the King amendment to the farm bill. HSUS’ president wrote in an email to Ms. Harriman, “[Representative King’s] amendment is an assault on the historic power of states to protect health and welfare of their own citizens . . . . Historically, when Congress preempts state laws it is in order to replace them with a uniform national standard. This is the idea behind the [Egg Bill].”57 With his email to Ms. Harriman, the HSUS president attached an HSUS press release and an internal memorandum asserting that the King Amendment would cause various legal and regulatory problems.

On May 14, 2013, Ms. Harriman forwarded the HSUS president’s email, with the attachments, to Representative Whitfield’s Chief of Staff and a legislative aide, instructing them to fax the documents to the House Parliamentarian, and to “say the issue for consideration is whether the Energy & Commerce Committee,” which Representative Whitfield sat on, “has exclusive OR concurrent jurisdiction over the proposed King amendment to the proposed Farm Bill.”58 Ms. Harriman forwarded this instruction to Representative Whitfield’s staff back to the HSUS president, who responded, “excellent.”59 Ms. Harriman then forwarded her original email to Representative Whitfield’s Scheduler, and asked her to “Call me with any questions!!!”

4. The Peters and Holt Amendments

On February 27, 2012, Representative Jeff Miller introduced H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen’s Heritage Act of 2012.60 The Sportsmen’s Heritage Act was a large, multipurpose bill that addressed a variety of issues related to hunting, fishing, shooting sports, and conservation.61 When the Sportsmen’s Heritage Act went to the House floor for a vote, the House considered a number of amendments to the bill, including an amendment proposed by Representative Gary Peters to strike a provision that would allow the importation of polar bear trophies,62 and an amendment proposed by Representative Rush Holt to ban hunting in areas of the National Park System not already open for hunting.63 While HSLF did not include the Sportsmen’s Heritage Act in its lobbying disclosure filings for 2012, it did score lawmakers based on their votes on the main bill and the Peters and Holt Amendments.64 Members received points on the HSLF scorecard for voting for the Peters and Holt Amendments.

Shortly before the recorded vote on the House floor, Ms. Harriman emailed Representative Whitfield’s then-Legislative Director, stating, “please be sure Ed votes FOR the

57 Exhibit 14.
58 Id.
59 Id.
64 See Exhibit 15 at 30.
Peters amendment today (banning polar bear imports and hunting in Natl Parks.) Ed voted this way last time. The Legislative Director responded, “OK.”

As it turned out, however, Representative Whitfield’s position on these amendments was complicated, and he ended up voting against both of them. As he explained in his interview with the ISC:

> I am not proud of the vote that I made on the Peters amendment or the other one either, Holt. But I tell you, I capitulated to the pressure I was receiving from the sportsmen’s groups and the NRA in my district... So that is why I voted against it.

Representative Whitfield’s votes against the Peters and Holt Amendments were reflected in HSLF’s 2012 scorecard, which downgraded him from a score of 100 in 2011 to a 54 in 2012. When the HSLF scorecard was generated in 2012, one of Ms. Harriman’s coworkers confirmed Representative Whitfield’s score, and sent her the roll call for the Peters and Holt Amendments. Ms. Harriman forwarded this information to the then-Legislative Director, and said, “[Representative Whitfield] voted the wrong way on the first two!!”

When asked about this series of emails, Ms. Harriman stated that she “cannot imagine [Representative Whitfield] vot[ed] against the Peters amendment” and suggested that he may have done so by mistake. However, Representative Whitfield confirmed that he intentionally voted against the amendments. Representative Whitfield’s then-Legislative Director acknowledged that it appeared that Ms. Harriman was urging him to have Representative Whitfield vote one way, when Representative Whitfield intended to vote the opposite way. As the then-Legislative Director stated, “I know this looks bad.” For his part, Representative Whitfield explained that he may have led Ms. Harriman to believe that he would vote for the Peters and Holt amendments, but ultimately did not. Like his former Legislative Director, Representative Whitfield acknowledged the appearance issue:

> Q. But can you understand how, looking at it from the public’s perspective or an outsider’s –

---

63 Exhibit 16. Note that, while Ms. Harriman names only the Peters amendment, the subject matter she describes—both polar bear imports and hunting in national parks—appears to indicate that she is referring to both the Peters and Holt amendments.
64 Id.
65 ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield.
66 Compare Exhibit 15 at 15 with Exhibit 15 at 33. Representative Whitfield’s submissions to the ISC place a great emphasis on his decreased score from HSLF in 2012, asserting that it suggests a level of independence from Ms. Harriman’s lobbying efforts. See July 31, 2014 Submission at 13. It is worth noting, however, that the only items that changed from 2011 to 2012 that negatively affected his score were the votes related to the Sportmen’s Heritage Act and its amendments, which were precisely the votes for which Ms. Harriman chose to contact his staff and encourage him to adopt HSLF’s position. See Exhibit 16.
67 Exhibit 17.
68 ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman.
69 ISC Interview of Staffer B.
A. No, yeah, I can.
Q. – perspective, that this looks like she is lobbying your staff, if not you?
A. Let me just say to you, I can understand it very well. They [OCE] have 4 years of emails over there, and they have – this is the only one that I have seen that really looks like something.  

Representative Whitfield subsequently stated, regarding Ms. Harriman’s email on the Peters and Holt amendments, “In retrospect, your point on perception is a real point. I understand that. Reading this, you could say, yeah, she is definitely doing this [lobbying the office]. But knowing her personality, knowing our past history on these issues, in our mind, we certainly were not doing it.”

5. The Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act

On February 28, 2011, Representative Jim Gerlach introduced the PUPS Act, also known as the “Puppy Mill Bill,” which would strengthen regulations of certain dog breeders under the Animal Welfare Act. Representative Whitfield was a co-sponsor of the bill in prior Congresses, but due to an “oversight” by the then-Legislative Director, as of early December 2011, Representative Whitfield had not signed on to co-sponsor the bill in the 112th Congress. On December 2, 2011, the then-Legislative Director emailed Representative Whitfield’s Chief of Staff at the time: “Connie wants us on the Puppy Mill Bill. NRA won’t like it, but I think it is fine. We’ve been on it every year.” Based on the record, it appears that Representative Whitfield would have signed on as a co-sponsor of the bill when it was introduced, had his staff realized he had not already done so. Nonetheless, it seems clear that it was Ms. Harriman’s contact with the then-Legislative Director that prompted Representative Whitfield to sign on to the bill less than two weeks later, on December 14, 2011. At the time Ms. Harriman made this request, she was listed as a lobbyist for HSLF on the PUPS Act.

6. The PAST Act

On April 11, 2013, Representative Whitfield introduced H.R. 1518, the Prevent All Soring Tactics Act of 2013 (PAST Act). The PAST Act enhanced the existing system of inspections and criminal penalties designed to deter the unlawful practice of “soring” horses, which is defined as a “practice used to accentuate a horse’s gait” that is “accomplished by irritating or blistering a horse’s forelegs with chemical irritants . . . or mechanical devices.”

---

72 ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield.
73 Id.
74 See OCE Report and Findings, Exhibit 20 at 14-2940_0142.
75 See id.; Exhibit 18.
76 See Exhibit 19.
The practice, made illegal by the Horse Protection Act of 1970,\(^{80}\) persists despite that prohibition as a way to enhance the “big lick”, gait of Tennessee Walking Horses, which provides a competitive edge during horse shows.\(^{81}\)

OCE’s referral alleged that, as a part of the lobbying effort in support of the PAST Act, Representative Whitfield and his staff arranged “many meetings [with other congressional offices]... at the request of HSUS.”\(^{82}\) The ISC did not agree with this characterization of the meetings in question. Representative Whitfield, Ms. Harriman, and the staffers in Representative Whitfield’s office responsible for setting up the PAST Act meetings all agreed that it was Representative Whitfield’s decision to set up meetings between horse protection advocates and Member offices, and that Representative Whitfield’s staff did so based on this general direction.\(^{83}\)

Representative Whitfield appears to have settled on this strategy in part based on his understanding that House leadership would bring the PAST Act to the floor for a vote only if a majority of the House conference members signed on as co-sponsors.\(^{84}\) In response to this, Representative Whitfield turned to a strategy that had served him well years ago when he sought passage of a bill to prevent horse slaughter—in-person meetings between Members who might become co-sponsors and outside experts on the issue. He, therefore, identified grassroots advocates who would meet with other Members to educate them on the practice of soring and attempt to persuade them to co-sponsor the bill. These advocates had significant involvement in the Tennessee Walking Horse community, and one of the advocates, Grassroots Advocate A (who eventually joined Representative Whitfield’s staff as Congressional Aide), decided to oppose the practice after a lifetime of observing it first-hand.\(^{85}\) Grassroots Advocate A met with Representative Whitfield in August of 2013 and impressed Representative Whitfield with his story and command of the issue.\(^{86}\) Representative Whitfield, therefore, decided that these advocates should be the linchpin of his co-sponsorship strategy, and the meetings were set at his request. His Scheduler and Legislative Director at that time confirmed this, stating that their efforts on these meetings were an attempt to satisfy instructions from Representative Whitfield and not from anyone else.\(^{87}\)

However, even if the meetings were not set up for HSUS and HSLF, officials from both entities were involved in the execution of the strategy. The meeting between Grassroots Advocate A and Representative Whitfield in August 2013 appears to have been encouraged by

---

\(^{82}\) OCE Report and Findings ¶ 75.
\(^{83}\) ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield; ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman; ISC Interview of Staffer B; ISC Interview of Staffer A.
\(^{84}\) ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield.
\(^{85}\) ISC Interview of Grassroots Advocate A/Congressional Aide.
\(^{86}\) ISC Interview of Grassroots Advocate A/Congressional Aide; ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield.
\(^{87}\) ISC Interview of Staffer A; ISC Interview of Staffer B.
HSUS and HSLF officials. HSUS employees wrote to Representative Whitfield’s Scheduler to request that meetings be set up for specific Members. They received updates on the meetings that had already been scheduled, and were kept in the loop on scheduling conflicts as they arose. In testimony before the ISC, an HSLF employee stated that she attended some of the meetings alongside the grassroots advocates. Accordingly, while the overarching edict to Representative Whitfield’s staff to arrange these meetings came from Representative Whitfield and not the Humane Society, the details of those meetings were largely left to the rest of the “coalition,” including HSUS and HSLF.

Ms. Harriman assumed a major role in this “coalition,” as she had when Representative Whitfield deployed a similar strategy in support of a horse slaughter bill that he co-sponsored in 2006. The change in her status between the two bills, from volunteer advocate for the horse slaughter bill to paid lobbyist for the PAST Act, initially made no difference in her approach. For example, the Scheduler drafted a list of Republican Members on the Energy and Commerce Committee that “we have not yet met with,” and asked Ms. Harriman to “[p]lease let me know if you would like me to reach out to them about a meeting.” This message, like many of the communications between Representative Whitfield’s staff and Ms. Harriman, was sent only to Ms. Harriman, using her Humane Society email address. Likewise, the Chief of Staff kept Ms. Harriman engaged on scheduling meetings with a Senator. Ms. Harriman instructed the Scheduler to attempt to find housing for the grassroots advocates in Washington. She also instructed the Scheduler to keep a list of Members who refused to take meetings regarding the PAST Act. Upon seeing the list, Ms. Harriman complained to the Chief of Staff that “three [Members who had refused] are on the [Energy and Commerce Committee], and [one other Member] was on [Representative Whitfield’s] subcommittee.” She asked, “How is [Scheduler] pitching these meetings?” The Chief of Staff responded that the staff of those Members had refused the meetings when he spoke with them personally, and Ms. Harriman asked him if he had spoken directly to the Members, ostensibly to ensure that the meetings were receiving the appropriate amount of urgency. On a number of occasions, the Scheduler would set up a meeting for the grassroots advocates, and, after it was confirmed, let the other Members' staffs
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96 Exhibit 25. Ms. Harriman appears to have wielded this level of authority over the Scheduler on a variety of matters long before the PAST Act process began. On July 14, 2011, she asked the then-Scheduler by email, “any luck with any of my appointments?” Exhibit 26 (emphasis added). The Scheduler responded with a list of three meetings scheduled with Members on July 20, 2011. Id.
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know that Ms. Harriman would be attending as well.\textsuperscript{101} Ms. Harriman testified that she attended “maybe 15” of these meetings.\textsuperscript{102}

In addition to her involvement in the planning and logistics related to the PAST Act meetings, Ms. Harriman gave input to Representative Whitfield’s staff on a variety of other issues related to the PAST Act. For example, on September 26, 2013, Ms. Harriman wrote to the Chief of Staff, requesting that the office put out a statement clarifying the PAST Act in a way that accorded with previous public statements from HSUS, “the sooner the better.”\textsuperscript{103} And on October 31, 2013, Ms. Whitfield wrote to the Chief of Staff asking him whether he had discussed with staff for the Energy and Commerce Committee the possibility that the PAST Act might be considered in a committee hearing alongside another bill related to horse soring that did not have the support of the Humane Society or Representative Whitfield. Supporters of the PAST Act preferred a hearing solely focused on their bill.\textsuperscript{104} Ms. Harriman urged the Chief of Staff to “PLEASE stand firm” against the proposal for one hearing for both bills.\textsuperscript{105}

On October 21, 2013, Representative Whitfield’s Chief of Staff received a telephone call from Representative Renee Ellmers’ Legislative Director. This staffer told the Chief of Staff that her office was “concerned with the optics of [Representative Whitfield’s] office setting up [] meetings for [the grassroots advocates].”\textsuperscript{106} The Chief of Staff then called the staff of the Ethics Committee to seek advice on the practice of these meetings. According to the Chief of Staff, Committee staff initially indicated that there was no problem with Representative Whitfield’s office “setting up meetings on a bill that [he] sponsored,” or “requesting meetings for [her] registered lobbyist.”\textsuperscript{107} However, this advice was based on incomplete information; as the Chief of Staff explained in an email to Representative Whitfield, “[I did not inform [Committee staff]] that [Ms. Harriman] was attending these meetings as I suspected they would have expressed concerns since she’s married to you and a registered lobbyist.”\textsuperscript{108} It appears that, within half an hour, the Chief of Staff talked with Committee staff again, and it became clear that Ms. Harriman was attending some of the meetings on the PAST Act set up by Representative Whitfield’s staff. At this point, the Chief of Staff told Ms. Harriman that Committee staff “advised against you[] attending because we are setting them up and you are a registered

\textsuperscript{101} See, e.g., Exhibits 27 and 28.
\textsuperscript{102} ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman.
\textsuperscript{103} ISC Interview of Staff B.
\textsuperscript{104} ISC Interview of Staff B.
\textsuperscript{105} ISC Interview of Staff B.
\textsuperscript{106} ISC Interview of Staff B.
\textsuperscript{107} ISC Interview of Staff B.
\textsuperscript{108} ISC Interview of Staff B.
\textsuperscript{109} ISC Interview of Staff B.
\textsuperscript{110} ISC Interview of Staff B.
lobbyist.” The next morning, Committee staff reached out to the Chief of Staff again, and “advised us that we cannot set up these meetings all together for [the grassroots advocates].”

After the Chief of Staff described his conversation with Committee staff, Ms. Harriman immediately and actively inserted herself into the process of seeking advice from the Committee, saying, “I am happy to talk to the Ethics Committee myself…what is the name of the ethics person with whom you spoke? I would like to talk to the same person.” Ms. Harriman spoke to the same Committee staffer as the Chief of Staff, and reported that the staffer “failed to tell you that he asked me to call House Administration for a final ‘ruling.’ So the issue is NOT yet resolved.” Ms. Harriman told the ISC that when she contacted CHA staff, they approved the process of setting up the meetings. But the CHA staffer Ms. Harriman spoke to told the ISC that he advised her to also consult with the Committee.

It appears that the initial contacts between Representative Whitfield’s staff, Ms. Harriman, and Committee staff focused on whether the use of Representative Whitfield’s staff to set up meetings on the PAST Act, which Ms. Harriman planned to attend, was an improper use of official resources for an unofficial purpose (assisting the Humane Society). This issue fell within the jurisdiction of both the Committee and CHA, and thus Committee staff recommended that Representative Whitfield also seek guidance from CHA. However, as CHA staff recognized, the official resources issue was not the only concern with Ms. Harriman’s involvement in setting up meetings on the PAST Act. This is why the CHA staff told Representative Whitfield and Ms. Harriman, separately, that they should consult with the Committee.

Eventually, Ms. Harriman, not Representative Whitfield, spoke with the Committee’s then-Chief Counsel and Staff Director. This occurred in a phone call on or about October 23, 2013. According to the Committee’s records of that discussion, the Chief Counsel informed Ms. Harriman that having Representative Whitfield’s staff set up meetings that Ms. Harriman, a spouse and registered lobbyist, would attend raised complicated issues, and that it was not clear that the practice conformed with the rules. Specifically, the Chief Counsel discussed House Rule XXV, clause 7, regarding lobbying contacts between a Member’s staff and a spouse, and other relevant rules. The Chief Counsel impressed upon Ms. Harriman the need to avoid lobbying contacts with Representative Whitfield’s staff, and explained that a more specific answer would both require more work, and would need to be delivered to the office directly, as opposed to through Ms. Harriman. It appears this was the first time anyone from CHA or the
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113 ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman. This position was repeated by Representative Whitfield and his Chief of Staff, who also spoke with the CHA staff. See ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield; ISC Interview of Staffer B.
114 ISC Interview of CHA Staffer.
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Committee raised the prohibition on lobbying contacts as a potential problem in connection with Ms. Harriman’s interactions with Representative Whitfield’s staff.

At the end of the Chief Counsel’s call with Ms. Harriman, he offered to speak to Representative Whitfield directly, and advised Ms. Harriman that the best way to obtain a formal opinion from the Committee would be for Representative Whitfield to request an Advisory Opinion.  Representative Whitfield never made that request.

Ms. Harriman’s own notes of the conversation largely accord with the Committee’s records. Ms. Harriman wrote that lobbying contacts were defined as “oral, written, email communications…to influence…on behalf of a client.” She wrote that, therefore, she should not “talk about any bill with [Representative Whitfield’s] office that HSUS supports.” She wrote down that a formal advisory opinion would cover prospective behavior and took down the contact information for the Committee.

Her own notes, however, go on, in separate pages, to describe a part of the conversation that is not detailed in the Committee’s records. She wrote that the “safest way to attend [meetings is do not] tell [Representative Whitfield’s] office what [she] is doing. Idea is it would elevate the matters in their eyes if they know I had a meeting.” In a parenthetical, Ms. Harriman continued, “((Not applicable) here because they are already working hard on the bill and what I do [does not] matter to them.”

Based on the initial conversations between Representative Whitfield’s Chief of Staff and Committee staff, Representative Whitfield’s staff at least attempted to curb Ms. Harriman’s involvement in the PAST Act meetings. There is conflicting testimony on whether staff did so at Representative Whitfield’s direction, but the change in policy is undisputed. On October 22, 2013, the Chief of Staff announced that he had asked the Scheduler to “stop setting up the meetings” entirely. Later, this decision was softened to permit the Scheduler to continue to schedule meetings for the grassroots advocates, but simply not to involve Ms. Harriman.
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119 Id.
120 Id.
121 Id.
122 Id.
123 The Scheduler told the ISC that even after Committee staff advised Representative Whitfield’s staff that Ms. Harriman should not attend PAST Act meetings the staff set up, Representative Whitfield did not understand the concern, because the meetings were scheduled for Representative Whitfield, to advance his bill, not for Ms. Harriman or the Humane Society. But the Scheduler recalled the Chief of Staff saying that Representative Whitfield stated “well, Connie just can’t be involved anymore after this. And [the Chief of Staff] agreed and let me know that.” ISC Interview of Staffer A. However, Representative Whitfield told the ISC that his office policies regarding his staff’s interactions with Ms. Harriman were never changed. ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield.
124 See, e.g., Exhibit 21 (“I cannot set up meetings for [Ms. Harriman]”). The Scheduler also explained that, based on the advice from Ethics Committee staff, by approximately October 29, 2013, the Chief of Staff and Scheduler had determined that Ms. Harriman should no longer be involved in setting up meetings for grassroots advocates in support of the PAST Act. See ISC Interview of Staffer A.
According to the Chief of Staff, Ms. Harriman objected to this plan, calling the Chief of Staff “stupid.”

However, it appears that at this time, Ms. Harriman made it clear to her coworkers and others that she intended to change her actions in response to the advice from the Committee. An employee of HSUS recalled a conversation in the late fall of 2013 involving Ms. Harriman, in which it was discussed that Ms. Harriman should no longer have contact with Representative Whitfield’s staff. Similarly, Ms. Harriman’s supervisor at HSLF reported that Ms. Harriman told her that she would be scaling back her involvement with Representative Whitfield’s staff. Consistent with this testimony, the supervisor wrote an email on December 11, 2013 indicating that Ms. Harriman had “backed off asks/communications with Whitfield’s staff and [HSLF and HSUS staff] took [a] more prominent role.” When asked about this email, Ms. Harriman responded, “I don’t agree with what [the HSLF supervisor] said. I didn’t back off after communications with [Representative] Whitfield’s staff, which you can see with all your documents.” When asked how her supervisor may have gotten that impression, Ms. Harriman stated, “[N]o idea.”

On December 11, 2013, after Grassroots Advocate A had taken a job on Representative Whitfield’s staff as a Congressional Aide, Ms. Harriman wrote to him and to Representative Whitfield’s Scheduler, stating “I am not to contact you or [the Scheduler] directly in support of Ed’s bill.” Ms. Harriman told the ISC that she wrote this out of concern with the public perception of her contacts with Representative Whitfield’s staff, not because she believed any House rule prohibited such contacts.

Despite the concern about contacts between Ms. Harriman and Representative Whitfield’s staff, expressed by Ms. Harriman and others near the end of 2013, Ms. Harriman’s conduct does not appear to have substantially changed after her consultations with the Committee. For example, on October 31, 2013, Ms. Harriman emailed the Chief of Staff to ask him to “stand firm” on the PAST Act and another bill being considered together. On November 6, 2013, Ms. Harriman emailed Representative Whitfield’s Scheduler, instructing her not to schedule meetings on the PAST Act with three Members.

While Ms. Harriman engaged in contacts such as these with a number of different members of Representative Whitfield’s staff, she was most engaged with Congressional Aide,.
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126 ISC Interview of Staffer B.
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128 ISC Interview of HSLF Official.
129 See Exhibit 34 (noting that, as of December 11, 2013, Ms. Harriman’s supervisor was under the impression that Ms. Harriman had “backed off asks/communications with Whitfield’s staff and [the supervisor and HSUS Vice President] took [a] more prominent role.”).
130 ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman.
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134 ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman.
135 See supra p. 16 and n.106.
136 Exhibit 36.
who, prior to obtaining employment with Representative Whitfield, assisted the coalition as Grassroots Advocate A, attending the meetings in October 2013. After Grassroots Advocate A came to Washington to advocate for the PAST Act, he developed a personal friendship with the Whitfields, living in their home for a time and becoming close with both Representative Whitfield and Ms. Harriman.\textsuperscript{136} In December 2013, Grassroots Advocate A was hired as Congressional Aide, and took on a portfolio that included the PAST Act.\textsuperscript{137} Congressional Aide, both because of his prior advocacy on the bill and because of his close working and personal relationship with Ms. Harriman, discussed the PAST Act effort with Ms. Harriman on a near-constant basis throughout 2013 and 2014. Congressional Aide testified that during the period from December 2013 to August 2014, he and Ms. Harriman spoke about the PAST Act “probably on a daily basis . . . at least every few days.”\textsuperscript{138} Congressional Aide stated that those contacts were about how Ms. Harriman could work with him to work with other offices to obtain their support for the PAST Act.\textsuperscript{139} The conversations included Congressional Aide providing lists of potential co-sponsors to Ms. Harriman, and getting Ms. Harriman’s thoughts on “who [Congressional Aide] would be wasting your time with and who would [Congressional Aide] focus on.”\textsuperscript{140} Another member of Representative Whitfield’s staff stated that Ms. Harriman and Congressional Aide continued to discuss animal protection matters on a frequent basis until at least late 2015.\textsuperscript{141} That witness stated that “[b]ack when we were really involved with the bill [the PAST Act], [Congressional Aide] would call her a lot and ask thoughts, et cetera, and I always found it a little concerning.”\textsuperscript{142} The witness stated that these calls occurred multiple times a day and multiple times a week.\textsuperscript{143}

In addition to testimony and other evidence of Ms. Harriman’s general interactions with Congressional Aide regarding the PAST Act, the ISC reviewed documents concerning specific subjects they discussed. On December 9, 2013, Ms. Harriman provided Congressional Aide with advice on which Members to contact regarding co-sponsorship, and advised him that having Representative Whitfield call a Member’s cell phone directly might be helpful.\textsuperscript{144} On December 18, 2013, the Vice President of Equine Protection at the Humane Society emailed Congressional Aide, noting that Congressional Aide and Ms. Harriman were “strategizing regularly” on the PAST Act.\textsuperscript{145} On December 17, 2013, Ms. Harriman asked her colleagues at HSUS and HSLF if it would be permissible to have Congressional Aide “stand in” for her on a strategy call regarding the PAST Act; she justified this request by stating, “[b]ay and I communicate hourly on PAST and I was hoping to take Fri[day] off.”\textsuperscript{146} On December 19, 2013, Ms. Harriman told

\textsuperscript{136} ISC Interview of Grassroots Advocate A/Congressional Aide.
\textsuperscript{137} Id.
\textsuperscript{138} Id.
\textsuperscript{139} See id.
\textsuperscript{140} Id.
\textsuperscript{141} ISC Interview of Staffer C.
\textsuperscript{142} Id.
\textsuperscript{143} Id.
\textsuperscript{144} Id.
\textsuperscript{145} Exhibit 37.
\textsuperscript{146} Exhibit 38.

When asked about this statement, Ms. Harriman stated that she thought it was a joke. See ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman ("This email is Connie trying to be funny a little bit. He was living with Ed and me....")
Congressional Aide “don’t hold off” on convincing two Tennessee district attorneys to come to Washington and meet with Members in order to obtain their co-sponsorship of the PAST Act. On January 1, 2014, Ms. Harriman wrote to her colleagues at HSUS and HSLF, and stated that she and Congressional Aide “met all day yesterday re strategy [regarding the PAST Act].” On January 7, 2014, the President of Friends of Sound Horses (FOSH), an anti-soring organization, emailed Ms. Harriman and Congressional Aide to ask for advice on how to set up meetings with House and Senate Members regarding soring. Ms. Harriman then wrote to Congressional Aide, stating: “perhaps you (as Whitfield office) can let [a Senate and House office] know that FOSH is trying to contact them, the importance of FOSH etc. That way, [the FOSH President] is apt to receive the reception she deserves.”

On January 14, 2014, Ms. Harriman and Congressional Aide were both copied on a discussion between an HSUS employee and staffers for PAST Act sponsors in the Senate. The Senate staffers made clear that the cost of the PAST Act had raised questions, and those questions would need to be answered before the bill could move out of the Senate Committee considering it. In response to these concerns, Ms. Harriman asked Congressional Aide if Representative Whitfield could “back-channel a request to [the Congressional Budget Office]” to evaluate the cost of the PAST Act.

On January 24, 2014, Congressional Aide emailed Ms. Harriman’s supervisor at HSLF regarding efforts by Representative Whitfield’s office to set up meetings between two Tennessee district attorneys who supported the PAST Act and House Members. Congressional Aide wrote: “Have you had a chance to finalize the list of people we want the TN DA’s to meet with? I wanted to go ahead and try to get [Representative Whitfield’s Scheduler] started on scheduling.” Ms. Harriman, writing from her Humane Society email address, replied “I hope we are focusing on [Members who were] prosecutors and judges. [HSLF supervisor] and I made a list of them about a week ago.” Congressional Aide responded “I gave [Scheduler] the list and we are.”

Along similar lines, on January 28, 2014, Congressional Aide and HSUS Official had a heated discussion about whether or not PAST Act advocates should be accompanied by other interest group officials when meeting with House Members, or solely by those employed by HSUS. The Aide responded: “We have been corresponding with the Aide regarding the FOSH/HSUS relationship...They both stated that the FOSH/HSUS relationship is crucial to the success of the PAST Act.”

He and I talked a lot. That’s what our whole focus was on. So when I said he and I communicate hourly, I am exaggerating, but we talked about the PAST Act a lot around the house.” However, three staffers interviewed by the ISC, including Congressional Aide himself, indicated that Ms. Harriman and Congressional Aide spoke frequently, up to “multiple times a day,” about legislative issues during this time period. See ISC Interview of Staffer B; ISC Interview of Staffer C.
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HSUS and HSLF. Ms. Harriman, responding to this disagreement, advised Congressional Aide to set up meetings for a PAST Act advocate “without [third] parties in attendance.”

Even where Representative Whitfield’s staff attempted to avoid Ms. Harriman’s influence, her connection with Congressional Aide led to her continued involvement with the process of arranging meetings. On January 28, 2014, the Scheduler wrote to the Congressional Aide, and explained that, despite her willingness to schedule meetings for him in October 2013 when he was Grassroots Advocate A, her work schedule had made the continued effort of scheduling meetings for the PAST Act effort untenable, and so she would be unable to set up meetings for the Tennessee district attorneys. Congressional Aide wrote to the Chief of Staff asking for his advice; the Chief of Staff demurred, and asked if the district attorneys could set up their own meetings. The Congressional Aide offered to schedule the meetings himself, but noted that the Scheduler was much more effective at setting up meetings than he had been. The Chief of Staff responded that the practice of scheduling meetings for third parties was “out of the ordinary,” and offered to chat with the Congressional Aide. The Congressional Aide then forwarded this exchange to Ms. Harriman, who responded, “you need to tell [Chief of Staff] that these DAs have NOT been to DC before and that we are talking about passing [Representative Whitfield’s] bill not [Scheduler’s] feelings of effectiveness...You shouldn’t have immediately offered to [schedule the meetings]. That gave [Chief of Staff] an easy out.”

V. ANALYSIS

A. House Rule XXV, clause 7

House Rule XXV, clause 7, requires Members who are married to a registered lobbyist to prohibit lobbying contacts between their spouse and their staff. The rule is a relatively new one, enacted in 2007 as a part of the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act. As a result, the Committee has not publicly investigated allegations of violations of the rule. The Committee has, however, provided public guidance regarding the rule and its application. Upon reviewing the evidence in the record in light of this guidance, the ISC found that Representative Whitfield violated House Rule XXV, clause 7, by failing to establish clear guidelines and limits for his staff, which resulted in lobbying contacts between the staff and Ms. Harriman.

It is not in dispute that Ms. Harriman contacted Representative Whitfield’s staff frequently, during the period for which she was registered as a lobbyist for HSLF. The only outstanding question, therefore, is whether any of those contacts constituted lobbying contacts.  
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under the LDA. As stated previously, a lobbying contact is any communication that is (1) made on behalf of a client; and (2) made with regard to the formulation, modification, or adoption of federal legislation.\footnote{161}

As discussed above, the ISC discovered significant contacts made regarding animal protection legislation that was on HSLF’s agenda, and for which Ms. Harriman had been retained to lobby. There were, of course, other contacts between Ms. Harriman and Representative Whitfield’s staff that had nothing to do with animal protection legislation: schedulers reported that Ms. Whitfield often called to ask about Representative Whitfield’s schedule, or to work with staff on official travel matters.\footnote{162} Those contacts would not violate House Rule XXV, clause 7, because they did not involve legislation, and were not made on behalf of a client. But many or all of the contacts discussed in Part III, above, fit squarely within the definition of “lobbying contacts” for purposes of the rule.

Ms. Harriman, in her testimony before the ISC, maintained that she had not made any contact with Representative Whitfield’s staff regarding animal protection legislation on behalf of her employer HSLF, and contended instead that all of those contacts were made on her own behalf, motivated by her own personal support for the bills at issue.\footnote{163} Representative Whitfield argued, in a similar vein, that Ms. Harriman always had his own priorities at heart as opposed to those of HSLF, noting that she occasionally advised him to take positions contrary to those urged by her employer.\footnote{164} However, when Representative Whitfield was asked whether Ms. Harriman’s practice of sending his staff emails from her Humane Society email account “might create a problem of an appearance that she was acting on behalf of her employer instead of on her own view,” Representative Whitfield stated “You know, looking back on it, yeah, I think you are right. I think it does create that perception.”\footnote{165}

The ISC understands how the Whitfields might be confused about where Ms. Harriman’s personal role ended and her role as a lobbyist began, especially given her years of volunteer work on just these issues prior to being employed by HSLF. But that distinction – between a volunteer and a paid, registered lobbyist – is the precise distinction that the rule makes, and that Representative Whitfield should have made and enforced. There is no exception in the rule for lobbying contacts made by lobbyists who truly believe the righteousness of their cause, as

\footnote{161}See 2 U.S.C. § 1602(8).
\footnote{162}See e.g., ISC Interview of Staffer A; ISC Interview of Staffer C.
\footnote{163}See e.g., ISC Interview of Ms. Harriman. As a factual matter, it was not always the case that Ms. Harriman only advocated for legislative actions that she supported personally. For example, Ms. Harriman told the ISC that she did not support the use of dogs from animal shelters as companion animals for military veterans, but that she asked Representative Whitfield’s Chief of Staff to have a member of Representative Grimm’s staff change language in Representative Grimm’s veterans’ dogs bill, in a way that would increase the use of shelter dogs, because HSLF supported that change. Further, as a legal matter, it cannot be correct that if a client pays a lobbyist to lobby Congress, and the lobbyist communicates with a Member or their staff regarding actions in the client’s interests, that those communications are not “lobbying contacts” merely because the lobbyist and the Member or staffer share an interest or view. That standard would be completely unworkable, and would significantly undermine the Lobbying Disclosure Act and House Rule XXV, clause 7.
\footnote{164}February 24, 2016 Submission at 4-5.
\footnote{165}ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield.
opposed to “hired guns” who are simply contracted to achieve a result. On the contrary, the relevant factor for whether or not a contact is made on behalf of a client is the perspective of the client, not the lobbyist.\(^{160}\) And the circumstances of these contacts indicate that HSLF expected Ms. Whitfield’s contact with Representative Whitfield’s staff to be work she performed on behalf of HSLF, as opposed to her own private pursuits. Ms. Harriman routinely contacted Representative Whitfield’s staff from her HSLF email account and copied HSLF employees on her contact with the staff.\(^ {161}\) HSLF employees routinely asked for her assistance in contacting Representative Whitfield or his staff.\(^ {162}\) Ms. Harriman was paid over $88,000 annually to lobby for HSLF,\(^ {163}\) and received plaudits in her performance evaluations for “lobbying on the complete legislative agenda,”\(^ {164}\) which included bills she contacted Representative Whitfield’s staff about. It is unlikely that the client in this case, HSLF, viewed Ms. Harriman’s contact with Representative Whitfield’s staff as distinct in any way from her other work on Capitol Hill. And, while some evidence does indicate that Ms. Harriman took positions contrary to those of HSLF where Representative Whitfield’s own constituents saw a matter differently,\(^ {171}\) that does not change the nature of other contacts made in support of HSLF’s positions, which were numerous. Accordingly, the ISC found that where Ms. Harriman’s contacts concerned animal protection matters and were consistent priorities of, or directly aligned with, the legislative priorities of her employer, there was substantial reason to believe that such contacts were made on behalf of HSLF, and therefore were lobbying contacts. Such contacts must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Thus, the fact that Ms. Harriman on some occasions supported decisions by Representative Whitfield that were contrary to her employer’s interests does not mean that her contacts with Representative Whitfield’s staff, in other instances and regarding other legislation or actions related to the same legislation, were not “lobbying contacts.”

Representative Whitfield also argues that Ms. Harriman could not lobby him on bills he supported, such as the PAST Act, because his position, Ms. Harriman’s position, and the position of the HSLF were all “completely aligned.”\(^ {172}\) This argument fails for two reasons.

First, it is beside the point whether and to what extent the parties in this case had aligned or unaligned positions. There is no exception to the definition of lobbying contact for contacts

---

\(^{160}\) Cf. Office of the Clerk, *Lobbying Disclosure Act Guidance* (Dec. 15, 2014) (“Example 1: Lobbyist ‘A’, a former chief of staff in a congressional office, is now a partner in the law firm retained to lobby for Client ‘B.’ After waiting one year to comply with post-employment restrictions on lobbying, Lobbyist ‘A’ telephones the Member on whose staff she served. She asks about the status of legislation affecting Client ‘B’s’ interests. *Presumably* ‘B’ will expect the call to have been part of an effort to influence the Member, even though only routine matters were raised at that particular time.”) (emphasis added).

\(^{161}\) See, e.g., Exhibit 4 (HSUS employee asked Ms. Harriman to discuss the possibility of amending the farm bill); Exhibit 5 (HSUS employee asked Ms. Harriman to have Representative Whitfield contact senior officials at USDA to discuss regulations on horse cloning); Exhibit 6 (HSUS employee asked Ms. Harriman to have Representative Whitfield call a state district attorney to advocate for criminal charges against a horse dealer).\(^ {165}\)

\(^{162}\) Exhibit 48.

\(^{163}\) Exhibit 49.

\(^{171}\) But see Exhibit 1 at 5 (Ms. Harriman’s HSLF self-evaluation indicated, as a strength, an “unusual willingness to sacrifice political capital and my husband’s political fortunes for the sake of the HSLF and the HSUS”).

\(^{172}\) February 24, 2016 Submission at 3.
with an office that has a sympathetic ear. All that is required is that the contact be made on behalf of a client, and that it relate to the formulation, modification, or adoption of federal legislation. Indeed, lobbyists frequently work with Member offices already dedicated to their client’s cause, as opposed to simply attempting to persuade only those Members opposed to that point of view.

It is true that the LDA contains an exception to the definition of lobbying contacts when the contact involves “a request for a meeting, a request for the status of an action, or any other similar administrative request, if the request does not include an attempt to influence a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official . . . .”173 If Ms. Harriman’s contacts were limited to the mundane and ministerial acts described by this exception, then perhaps the question of whether those contacts included an attempt to influence might be a relevant question. But, as discussed above, a significant number of Ms. Harriman’s contacts with Representative Whitfield’s office went far beyond simply requesting a meeting; instead, they ranged from discussion of parliamentary procedure,174 to advice on communications strategies,175 to involving herself in determining the division of labor within the staff on work related to passage of a bill that HSLF supported.176 And even the meetings Ms. Harriman helped to coordinate were intended to influence the Members with whom the advocates met, so even if those contacts were not attempts to influence Representative Whitfield or his staff, they certainly would violate the spirit of the rule insofar as they included an attempt to influence other Members.177

Second, even if House Rule XXV, clause 7 permitted lobbying contacts between a Member’s staff and his lobbyist spouse where the Member’s opinion aligned with that of his spouse and her client, the record indicates that Representative Whitfield, Ms. Harriman, and HSLF were not always “completely aligned” when she contacted the office about a given issue. Most prominently, Ms. Harriman urged the Legislative Director to have Representative Whitfield vote for two animal protection amendments supported by HSLF, both of which he eventually voted against due to pressure from constituents and other interest groups.178 Ms. Harriman, upon learning of Representative Whitfield’s votes, emailed the Legislative Director again, stating that Representative Whitfield voted “the wrong way.”179 In addition to this incident, there were numerous occasions on which Ms. Harriman influenced Representative Whitfield’s staff in more subtle ways. She asked the then-Legislative Director to work with another Member’s staff in order to remove two words from the VDTTA, in accordance with

174 See e.g., Exhibits 14, 30, and 43.
175 See e.g., Exhibits 50 and 51.
176 See e.g., Exhibits 13 and 27.
177 Representative Whitfield’s Chief of Staff appears to have misunderstood this basic principle. According to Congressional Aide, the Chief of Staff told him, when he joined Representative Whitfield’s staff in December 2011, “Connie can’t lobby you to get on a bill, introduce a bill, change a bill, cosponsor a bill, but you guys can work together to help get other people to support the bill.” ISC Interview of Grassroots Advocate A/Congressional Aide.
178 Exhibit 16. ISC Interview of Representative Whitfield.
179 Exhibit 17.
HSLF’s preferences for the bill. She also asked Representative Whitfield’s staff to contact particular Members and keep track of particular responses as a part of the strategy to gain cosponsors for the PAST Act. In fact, the subtle inducement that Ms. Harriman routinely performed upon Representative Whitfield’s staff proves how unworkable Representative Whitfield’s test of “alignment” would be. It is impossible to know, in retrospect, what positions and actions an office might have taken in any event, had they not been contacted by a lobbyist about those positions and actions.

This problem with Representative Whitfield’s reading of the rule is illustrated by instances where contacts from Ms. Harriman prompted Representative Whitfield’s staff to take an action that, though consistent with Representative Whitfield’s views, the office might not have taken otherwise. One example, discussed previously, is Ms. Harriman’s prompting the staff to add Representative Whitfield as a co-sponsor of the PUPS Act in December 2011. It appears that Representative Whitfield, Ms. Harriman, and HSLF (which listed Ms. Harriman as a lobbyist on the bill) were of the same mind regarding the bill, yet due to an oversight by Representative Whitfield’s staff, he did not sign on to the bill until Ms. Harriman raised the issue. In another instance, in March 2012, Ms. Harriman suggested that Representative Whitfield’s Press Secretary draft a statement in support of the Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act, a bill Representative Whitfield had introduced. The then-Legislative Director replied that a Senator who had released a statement “is in a different position” than Representative Whitfield, and concluded, “I don’t think it makes as much sense for EW to do one, but I can ask our Press Secretary to work on one?” Ms. Harriman then listed several reasons for Representative Whitfield to issue a statement, and the then-Legislative Director replied, “OK, I’ll talk to [Press Secretary] and [Chief of Staff].” This exchange occurred on March 27, 2012. It appears that Representative Whitfield made a statement on the Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act the next day, March 28th. The President of HSUS then quoted the statement in a Humane Society blog post in support of the Act. During this period, the HSLF lobbying reports listed Ms. Harriman as a lobbyist on the Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act. In both of these instances, Ms. Harriman appears to have prompted Representative Whitfield’s staff to take actions that, while consistent with Representative Whitfield’s views, they might not have taken without Ms. Harriman’s intervention. Given that Ms. Harriman was a registered lobbyist on these bills, it is difficult to see how these contacts, which resulted in official actions favorable to her client, did not meet the definition of “lobbying contacts.”

The ISC accepts Representative Whitfield’s assertion that, when it came to the effort to support the PAST Act, he “simply continued to use his wife the same way he always had — as a
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tremendously effective organizer and promoter of his animal-welfare legislative agenda.” In many ways, that is precisely the problem. Once Ms. Harriman’s skills as an “effective organizer” and “promoter of [the] animal-welfare legislative agenda” landed her a job and a paycheck as a registered lobbyist, Representative Whitfield could no longer employ this same strategy without violating House Rule XXV, clause 7. His failure to change course, and institute boundaries and limits for Ms. Harriman that conformed to the edict of the rule, resulted in impermissible lobbying contacts between Ms. Harriman and his staff.

B. Code of Ethics § 5

The Code of Ethics was adopted by the House to assist federal employees, including officeholders, “in guiding and correcting any tendency toward cynicism of the high trust associated with public service.” It thus reaffirmed standards of conduct “to which all federal employees unquestionably should adhere.” In this spirit, Section 5 includes two prohibitions that are applicable to House Members: (1) “never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not;” and (2) “never accept for himself or his family, favors or benefits under circumstances which might be construed by reasonable persons as influencing the performance of his governmental duties.” It bears emphasis that, unlike House Rule XXIII, clause 3, where finding a violation requires proof of a connection between an official action and compensation to the acting Member, neither clause of Section 5 requires proof of such a connection.

While all Members are expected to know and “unquestionably . . . adhere” to these provisions, Representative Whitfield had particular reason to be aware of them: questions were raised about Ms. Harriman’s lobbying work and relationship to Representative Whitfield well before Representative Whitfield introduced the PAST Act. On November 21, 2012, Ms. Harriman received press inquiries from the Washington Post regarding “lawmakers who have family members that are registered to lobby Congress...”. And on December 17, 2012, Ms. Harriman forwarded to Representative Whitfield an email between an HSUS employee and a Washington Post reporter, responding to questions about Ms. Harriman’s lobbying activities, and their overlap with Representative Whitfield’s legislative agenda. A reporter from Politico raised similar questions in December 2013.

These questions should have alerted Representative Whitfield of the need to educate himself and his staff regarding the House Rules that could be implicated by Ms. Harriman’s interactions with his staff. Had he done so, he would have learned that the Committee has cautioned Members that they must “avoid situations in which even an inference might be drawn

---
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suggesting improper action.\textsuperscript{192} In this case, the ISC determined that Representative Whitfield did extend special privileges to Ms. Harriman, in that she had an unusual level of access to and influence over his staff, relative to other registered lobbyists, and that this unusual level of access created, if not impropriety itself, at least an appearance of impropriety.

In a recent case, the Committee found that Representative Phil Gingrey violated Section 5 of the Code of Ethics where he treated a single bank differently from other similarly situated entities, by arranging meetings between that bank’s officers, the Chair of the House Financial Services Committee, and high-ranking Treasury Department officials, and by attending some of those meetings himself.\textsuperscript{193} And in another case, the Committee found that Representative Shelley Berkley created the appearance that her duties were influenced by her husband’s financial interest, despite the fact that the Committee credited her testimony that she was not actually influenced.\textsuperscript{194}

In this case, the Committee found no evidence that any other similarly situated lobbyist received the same level of access to Representative Whitfield’s staff as Ms. Harriman. Representative Whitfield, through his counsel, asserted that other lobbyists and parties did have similar access to his staff, and pointed to the staff’s work related to a coal miner protection bill in 2012. In that instance, Representative Whitfield wanted to introduce legislation that would preserve the health benefits for Kentucky coal miners who lost their jobs as part of a corporate bankruptcy. In the course of drafting that bill and attempting to build support for it, Representative Whitfield’s staff interacted with interested parties and their lobbyists in a variety of ways, including posing questions about, and seeking reactions to, proposed legislative language as part of the process of drafting the bill, and acting on requests to reach out to a Senator to encourage his support of the bill. As a result of these interactions, Representative Whitfield’s staff ultimately incorporated language into the bill that outside parties suggested. Representative Whitfield has asserted that his staff did no more than this for Ms. Harriman or her employer, HSLF, and that he therefore did not grant either of them special access to his office.

The ISC found some merit in this argument, but concluded that Ms. Harriman had a greater level of access to Representative Whitfield’s staff than other parties involved in the office’s legislative efforts, including the coal miner bill. Indeed, both HSLF and Ms. Harriman herself acknowledged that Ms. Harriman’s ability to obtain information and action from Representative Whitfield’s staff was superior to what a lobbyist who was not a spouse could achieve. Other HSLF lobbyists acknowledged that, while their pre-existing relationship with Representative Whitfield was good, Ms. Harriman’s was clearly superior.\textsuperscript{195} Due to this

\textsuperscript{192} See House Comm. on Standards of Official Conduct, Investigation of Financial Transactions Participated In and Gifts of Transportation Accepted by Representative Fernand J. St Germain, H. Rept. 100-46, 100\textsuperscript{th} Cong. 1\textsuperscript{st} Sess. 3, 9, 43 (1987).

\textsuperscript{193} Comm. on Ethics, In the Matter of Allegations Related to Representative Phil Gingrey, H. Rept. 113-664, 113\textsuperscript{th} Cong. 2\textsuperscript{d} Sess. 14 (2014) (hereinafter Gingrey).

\textsuperscript{194} Comm. on Ethics, In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Shelley Berkley, H. Rept. 112-716, 112\textsuperscript{th} Cong. 2\textsuperscript{d} Sess. 49 (2012) (hereinafter Berkley).

\textsuperscript{195} Exhibit 3, ISC Interview of HSLF Official.
relationship, Ms. Harriman’s supervisor at HSLF understood that requests from Ms. Harriman would receive a “better response, a quicker response” than another HSLF lobbyist might obtain.196 And Ms. Harriman herself, in an email to her supervisor at HSLF, stated that when deciding who at HSLF should make an “ask” to Representative Whitfield’s staff, “I do not need to tell YOU that going through a spouse is usually more efficient than going through the office”!197

In addition, it was clear that Representative Whitfield’s staff viewed and responded to Ms. Harriman in a different manner than they interacted with the parties interested in the coal miner bill. With respect to that bill, the staff was generally asking for assistance and information, and appeared to be leading that process. Further, Representative Whitfield’s staff noted that they were aware that the opinions they were soliciting and receiving were biased, and based on the parties’ self-interest.198 and they firmly rejected a request to expand the scope of Representative Whitfield’s bill.199 In contrast, Representative Whitfield’s staff testified that they tried to always say “yes” to Ms. Harriman’s requests because she was their boss’s spouse.200 Likewise, when the Chief of Staff was asked whether there was a “different expectation for Mrs. Whitfield because she was married to the Congressman, in terms of how much you would listen or how you would take her statements,” he explained that he “was in a very difficult situation being in between [Representative Whitfield] and his wife. And so I tried to make the best of a very difficult situation.”201 He further explained that “I felt the need to respond. I couldn’t just ignore her, but that didn’t mean that she always got what she wanted either.”202

Representative Whitfield argues that his staff’s efforts to set up the PAST Act meetings, in particular, were not a special favor to the HSUS or HSLF. The ISC agrees. The ISC credited Representative Whitfield’s testimony that those meetings were arranged based on his understanding of House Leadership’s requirements for bringing the bill to the floor, and his own strategy for obtaining the requisite number of co-sponsors. However, just because the meetings themselves were not a special favor to HSUS or HSLF, that does not mean that the level of access and influence more generally provided to Ms. Harriman, on issues other than the meeting requests, was not a special privilege to her, or to her employer. The ISC does not believe that any other lobbyist could tell a junior staffer to object to his Chief of Staff’s decision regarding which member of Representative Whitfield’s staff should be scheduling meetings on a bill the lobbyist was lobbying on.203 Nor does the ISC believe that a lobbyist who was not a spouse would present the same “very difficult” situation for Representative Whitfield’s staff, who were expected to be responsive to Ms. Harriman’s requests and generally say “yes” to her if they
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could, while also complying with the House rules regarding lobbying contacts and special privileges.

Ultimately, the ISC concluded that Ms. Harriman, during the time she was a registered lobbyist for HSLF, did have a special level of access to, and influence over, Representative Whitfield’s staff. But even if she did not, the ISC found it clear that the public could reasonably perceive that Ms. Harriman, as a lobbyist for HSLF, received special privileges with respect to Representative Whitfield’s staff. Indeed, even Representative Whitfield, in a submission to the ISC, acknowledged that “to observers unfamiliar with the history of their partnership,” as most members of the public would be—“it could appear that Ms. Harriman, as an employee of HSLF, had an outsized role and exceptional access to Representative Whitfield and his staff.”204 This is precisely the inference against which the Committee’s guidance is designed to guard. As noted above, the Committee has long cautioned Members that when taking official actions, they must “avoid situations in which even an inference might be drawn suggesting improper action.”205 Even in cases where the Committee has credited testimony that a Member did not act out of self-interest, the Committee has nevertheless found a violation where an individual or entity is singled out for special treatment, and such special treatment creates an appearance of favoritism.206 Accordingly, even though Representative Whitfield did not, as he says, “leverage[,] [Ms. Harriman’s] experience and relationships and integrate[,] her into his office’s [legislative] effort” as a favor to the Humane Society,207 a member of the public could reasonably infer that such leverage and integration constituted a special privilege, which other lobbyists would not be granted. Accordingly, the ISC found that Representative Whitfield violated Section 5 of the Code of Ethics.

C. House Rule XXIII, clause 3

House Rule XXIII, clause 3 states that “a Member...may not receive compensation and may not permit compensation to accrue to the beneficial interest of such individual from any source, the receipt of which would occur by virtue of influence improperly exerted from the position of such individual in Congress.”

The nature of Members as proxies for their constituents in the federal government makes it impossible to require recusal on every issue in which a Member has a financial interest. The Committee, therefore, views conflicts of interest differently based on the nature of the personal financial interest relative to the scope of the action. If a Member seeks to act on a matter where he might benefit as a member of a large class, such action does not require recusal. Thus, “Members who happen to be farmers may nonetheless represent their constituents in

204 February 24, 2016 Submission at 7.
206 See Ginsberg at 25 (noting that the Member “took some care to limit the scope of his official actions”); Berkley at 55-56 (noting that “reasonable people would construe the benefit [the Member] received as her motivation, whether it was or not.”).
207 February 24, 2016 Submission at 7.
communicating views on farm policy to the Department of Agriculture.\textsuperscript{208} By contrast, where a Member’s actions would serve his own narrow financial interest, the Member should refrain from acting.\textsuperscript{209} The Committee’s guidance on this point advises Members to engage in “added circumspection” any time a Member is deciding whether to take official action “on a matter that may affect his or her personal financial interests.”\textsuperscript{210}

In previous cases, the Committee has considered whether a Member took an action that was so narrowly tailored to a single entity in which she had a financial interest that the action was “troublingly intertwined” with that interest,\textsuperscript{211} and whether the Member’s financial interest would “clearly be affected by the assistance sought.”\textsuperscript{212} The Committee recently found that no conflict of interest existed where the Member and his staff did not take any specific steps “to advocate for financial assistance or payments to an entity the Member had a financial interest in.”\textsuperscript{213}

The ISC found no violation of clause 3 in this case. Representative Whitfield took no action to direct federal monies or payments to HSLF or HSUS. Any actions he took on animal protection matters were not narrowly tailored to affect any financial interest, and did not clearly affect any such interest: Ms. Harriman is an accomplished government affairs professional with a background in policy and lobbying, and all evidence suggests that she earned her position by her own merit. Her compensation does not appear to have depended on her ability to obtain favorable actions from Representative Whitfield. Accordingly, Representative Whitfield did not take official actions to benefit his own financial interest in this matter.

D. House Rule XXIII, clauses 1 and 2

As stated in previous reports, the Committee observes two basic principles when applying the first two clauses of the Code of Conduct. First, Members must at all times act in a manner that reflects creditably upon the House. Second, the Committee has noted that the Code of Conduct and other standards of conduct governing the ethical behavior of the House community are not criminal statutes to be construed strictly, but rather—under clause 2 of House Rule XXIII—must be read to prohibit violations not only of the letter of the rules, but of the spirit of the rules. Ethical rules governing the conduct of Members were created to assure the public of “the importance of the precedents of decorum and consideration that have evolved in the House over the years.”\textsuperscript{214} The standard “provide[s] the House with the means to deal with infractions that rise to trouble it without burdening it with defining specific charges that would

\textsuperscript{208} Ethics Manual at 314.
\textsuperscript{209} See id.
\textsuperscript{210} Id. at 237.
\textsuperscript{211} Berkley at 49.
\textsuperscript{212} Comm. on Ethics, In the Matter of Representative Maxine Waters, H. Rept. 112-690, 112\textsuperscript{th} Cong. 2d Sess. 11 (2012) (hereinafter Waters).
\textsuperscript{213} Gingrey at 12.
\textsuperscript{214} House Comm. on Standards of Official Conduct, Report under the Authority of H. Res. 418, H. Rept. 90-1176, 90\textsuperscript{th} Cong. 2d Sess. 17 (1968).
be difficult to state with precision. The practical effect of Clause 2 is to allow the Committee to construe ethical rules broadly, and prohibit Members from doing indirectly what they would be barred from doing directly. The Ethics Manual states that “a narrow technical reading of a House Rule should not overcome its ‘spirit’ and the intent of the House in adopting that and other rules of conduct.”

Accordingly, the ISC analyzed the conduct at issue in this matter under these standards. Having considered the foregoing record and applied the relevant standards of conduct, the ISC found that Representative Whitfield violated House Rule XXV, clause 7, Section 5 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service, and Clauses 1 and 2 of the Code of Conduct, by not establishing clear boundaries and limits for the interaction of his staff with his spouse, Ms. Harriman, when she was registered as a lobbyist. Representative Whitfield himself, in testimony to the ISC, recognized the heart of the issue:

I would say this: that if I had the opportunity to go back and do this all over again, yeah, I would have made some changes, because she was a lobbyist with the Humane Society. And although I don’t think I did anything wrong — and I still don’t — I think from appearances and so forth, yeah, maybe I should have said, okay, now we have to be a little bit more distinct here.

The ISC credits Representative Whitfield’s testimony that this failure was not occasioned out of a corrupt or willful intent to violate House Rules. Instead, the ISC believes that the violations arose because Representative Whitfield did not take the requisite care when Ms. Harriman’s status changed. As a result, the ISC is not recommending that the Committee adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation. However, in previous cases, such oversights have, when they result in substantial, non-technical violations such as these, resulted in the issuance of a reprimand from the Committee to the subject Member. In accordance with that precedent, the ISC recommends that the Committee issue this Report as a reprimand in this case as well.

VI. CONCLUSION

Congressional spouses occupy a rarefied position in many personal offices, and with good reason. Members and staff work long and unpredictable hours in small and tight-knit groups, and balancing that workload with family commitments requires a significant amount of

214 Ethics Manual at 17 (citing House Select Comm. on Ethics, Advisory Opinion No. 4, H. Rept. 95-1837, 95th Cong. 2d Sess. app. 61 (1979)).
215 The ISC would be required to adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation if it concluded that a censure, reprimand, or other sanction imposed by the full House would be appropriate in this matter.
216 See, e.g., Gingrey at 25; Comm. on Ethics, In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Don Young, H. Rept. 113-487, 113th Cong. 2d Sess. (2014); Waters at 2. Additionally, the ISC notes that the issuance of a letter of reprimand, where warranted by the evidence, may have the additional effect of “plac[ing] other Members on notice... with the clear possibility that more severe action will be pursued [in the future].” Comm. on Standards of Official Conduct, In the Matter of Representative Jim Bates, H. Rept. 101-293, 101st Cong. 1st Sess. (1989).
coordination and support. The House enacted House Rule XXV, clause 7, because it was concerned that this symbiotic relationship might appear inappropriate when a spouse takes on the interest of an outside client as a registered lobbyist. The rule is a narrow caveat to the general understanding that a Member’s spouse will often need to interact with the Member’s staff to coordinate the Member’s official and personal obligations. But it is a strict and clear restriction as well. Representative Whitfield took no action to bring his office into compliance with that restriction when his wife, Ms. Harriman, became a lobbyist. It is true that her client largely shared Representative Whitfield’s own views about an issue that both he and his wife had long cared about. But the plain text of the rule takes no account of such considerations.

Moreover, the public might well wonder, upon reading the facts of this case, whether congressional spouses who are also lobbyists offer an “inside track” to any client who can hire them. Even if such an “inside track” turned out to be, on many occasions, irrelevant to the actions Representative Whitfield and his staff ultimately took, the level of insider access provided to Ms. Harriman while she was a lobbyist raised inferences of impropriety and suggested a special privilege.

The ISC notes that none of its findings should be read to indicate any degree of knowing, willful, or corrupt violation of the rules. Representative Whitfield and Ms. Harriman have stated that they never believed that Ms. Harriman’s contacts with Representative Whitfield’s staff were contrary to any House rule. Although the ISC accepted these sentiments as genuine, a Member’s mistaken belief in their compliance with the rules does not excuse a violation of those rules.219 The ISC found that Representative Whitfield failed to comprehend the importance of setting boundaries and limits on the interactions between Ms. Harriman and his staff. This failure was significant, if unintentional, and thus the ISC recommends that the Committee publish this Report, and that the Report serve as a reproval of Representative Whitfield.

219 See Gingrey at 25 (finding violations of House Rules even though “the Committee credited Representative Gingrey’s assertion that he believed his actions were consistent with House Rules.”); Berkley at 10 (“The ISC found that Representative Berkley mistakenly believed the rules governing what assistance her office could provide to her husband’s practice required only that they treat him in the same manner by which they treated any other constituent. This is incorrect.”).
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Last Name: Hartran
First Name: Constance
Date of Hire: 6/1/2007
Start date of current job: 7/1/2009
Company Job Title: Legislative Specialist
Organizational Unit: Humane Society Legislative Fund
Performance Review Status: U.S. Funded

Section A: Performance Standards for all Employees

Use this comments section to describe performance that is either different than the descriptions or more specific to the individual employee. Do not be limited to these categories or descriptions.

Communication

When rating employees, remember that the specific elements of communication includes speaking (clear, organized, easily understood), writing (clear, organized, easily understood), and listening (trustee information, clarifies with questions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication with Subordinates</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>3-Months Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Description</td>
<td>Provides effective, timely information to subordinates; solicits input on problems and suggestions for improvement; accepts feedback on performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Ratings</td>
<td>3-Months Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication with Superiors</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>3-Months Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Description</td>
<td>Provides effective, timely information and feedback to supervisor; solicits input on problems and suggestions for improvement; accepts feedback on performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Ratings</td>
<td>3-Months Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication with Other Departments</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>3-Months Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Description</td>
<td>Provides effective, timely information and feedback to other departments; solicits input on problems and suggestions for improvement; accepts feedback on performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Ratings</td>
<td>3-Months Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conducting Meetings</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>3-Months Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Description</td>
<td>Prepares agenda prior to meetings; adheres to and completes agenda; holds meetings when needed and as required; encourages participation and facilitates discussion appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Ratings</td>
<td>3-Months Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Development</th>
<th>Rating: Not Rated/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Description</td>
<td>Identifies own developmental needs with superior; establishes, actively pursues and reaches specific self-development goals; updates goals on an on-going basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Ratings</td>
<td>3-Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Directions</td>
<td>Rating: 3-Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Description</td>
<td>Effectively carries out instructions of superiors; acts on suggestions and feedback from superiors; meets deadlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Ratings</td>
<td>4-Above Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependability and Reliability</th>
<th>Rating: 3-Meets Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Description</td>
<td>Dependable and reliable in attendance and in completing jobs assigned; gets job done on time; dependable under pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Ratings</td>
<td>4-Above Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Rating: 4-Above Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Description</td>
<td>Tends initiative in completing job duties; shows self-direction once given assignments; degree of supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Ratings</td>
<td>4-Above Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>Rating: 3-Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Description</td>
<td>Effective utilization of time; manages distractions and doesn't allow them to interfere in getting the job done; well-organized; utilizes technical and human resources effectively; produces expected volume of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Ratings</td>
<td>3-Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work</td>
<td>Rating: 4-Above Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Description</td>
<td>Extent to which work is done correctly, neatness, thoroughness, completeness, attention to detail; concerned with getting the job done right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Ratings</td>
<td>4-Above Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Knowledge</td>
<td>Rating: 3-Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Description</td>
<td>Knowledgeable in all phases of job and in methods, techniques, and skills required in own area or related functions, i.e., shorthand, typing, word processing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Ratings</td>
<td>4-Above Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork and Cooperation</td>
<td>Rating: 3-Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Manager Description
Adapts to necessary changes in operations; willingness to work toward the department's goals and objectives; understands how his/her job contributes to the overall operation; maintains positive work relationships with supervisors, peers, staff personnel and constituents.

Manager Ratings
4 - Above Expectations

Manager overall comments
Consistent with the review content, I am hereby given your performance for the last quarter of 2011 on the basis of how these categories contributed to the overall mission of HR67. You have been a pleasure to work with and a great addition to the HR67 senior staff. Of particular note is your work with John Kingston to garner $50 million over two years for USDA Animal Care and to crack down on Class A Dealers/puppy mills - it was energetic and questionnable - but you've turned him into a real ally on that issue. In addition, your work to lobby for House floor passage of the veto/sog bill in a successful story.

It's terrific to have a "veteran" to bounce ideas off of, strategize on legislative and appropriations strategies and assess opportunities for furthering the HR67's overall mission.

Employee overall comments
When given assignments, I respond immediately and my performance often surpasses the scope of the request (e.g., not only did I auburn the Cancer Causes Focus Fund for the Dog Walk, I also auburn 13 crystal awards for the winners, and I secured $5,000 in funding for the event). In the absence of assignments, I advance the HR67 agenda at every turn (e.g., floor sponsor an veto/sog bill). Grant Brown as lead sponsor on H.R. Shaffer; arranging a meeting for Wayne and Mike with Senate Ap Committee to discuss egg bill.

I pride myself on taking initiative and harvesting opportunities throughout the Congressional landscape. Both require knowledge, instinct, flexibility and courage. Sometimes, I feel that our current structure and process discourages this approach. Nevertheless, I can see why people who value formal meetings, official approvals, and explicit reassurance would find my ad-hoc style threatening. Going forward, I hope for greater integration of the best!

Expense Reimbursements
Compliance with expense reporting policies, relating to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Validation Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeliness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Validation Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Timely approval of direct reports |
| Validation Rating |
| N/A - Not Applicable |

Section C: Performance Standards for Specific Job

| 500-60-91 |
| Rating | 4 - Above Expectations |

https://sunmassociety.alesmanagersonline.com/CompPlanner/LayoutScripts/Cplp_Mcp_... 2/200014
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Manager Description

Communicate with Congress and Congressional staff about the HSAF, including its mission, achievements and current legislative goals.

Manager Rating:

- Rating: 3-Meets Expectations

500-08-03

Manager Description

Design strategies to educate and engage new Republican members and senior Republican members.

Manager Rating:

- Rating: 3-Meets Expectations

500-09-03

Manager Description

Help organize and sponsor Congressional Animal Photo Contest.

Manager Rating:

- Rating: 3-Meets Expectations

500-08-04

Manager Description

Nurture Congressional developments through continuous contact with members and staff.

Manager Rating:

- Rating: 3-Meets Expectations

500-06-06

Manager Description

Deepen relationships with members and staff by attending Congressional events and trips.

Manager Rating:

- Rating: 3-Meets Expectations

500-06-06

Manager Description

Update Federal Affairs Department on Congressional developments and Congressional schedules.

Manager Rating:

- Rating: 3-Meets Expectations

500-06-07

Manager Description

Attend weekly meetings of Executive Senior Staff, Federal Affairs, and Federal Legislation Affairs, as needed.

Manager Rating:

- Rating: 3-Meets Expectations

500-09-08

Manager Description

Arrange meetings among senior HSAF personnel, Republican members, and their staff.

Manager Rating:

- Rating: 3-Meets Expectations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Manager Description</th>
<th>Manager Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-Month Expectations</td>
<td>Respond to media inquiries regarding HSUS legislation</td>
<td>3-Month Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Month Expectations</td>
<td>Provide facts and background for HSUS media releases, articles, and interviews</td>
<td>3-Month Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Month Expectations</td>
<td>Advance the goals of The HSUS by working with legislative and executive branches of the U.S., state governments, animal protection groups, and others by gathering and disseminating information, preparing documents, obtaining financing, and influencing decision-makers</td>
<td>1-Month Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Month Expectations</td>
<td>Work with members of The HSUS and HSUF Boards, and members of the HSUS Advisory Board, as required, to advance the mission of The HSUS</td>
<td>1-Month Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manager overall comments

Section 5: Overall Strengths and Accomplishments

Since Section 2 (Development Plan) focuses on need areas, please use this section to summarize the strengths and accomplishments of the employee being reviewed.

Manager overall comments

In addition to the comments above, your star ratings indicate having valuable congressional and regulatory contacts, knowledge of process, a deft touch in lobbying, responsiveness to colleagues regarding a wide berth of legislative opportunities and other projects. I also like your "pull down the hill"—as in, the Ag Appropriations program and additional funding. We need to advance our HSU agenda, while seizing opportunities to augment that agenda.

Employee overall comments

My strengths include an unshakeable passion for the organization’s mission; an unshakeable resolve to accomplish an objective no matter the people or time involved; unflagging willingness to help colleagues with their projects; and an unwavering willingness to sacrifice political capital and my husband’s political fortunes for the sake of the HSU and the HSUS.

My accomplishments include securing support from members of Congress for HSUS legislative gasp; securing support from federal and state officials, print and TV journalists, VIPs, and others for HSUS legislative and programmatic goals; expanding appreciation for HSUS’s mission and accomplishments among the US Congress, the US media, the US military and the foreign and US diplomatic communities.

https://humanesociety.talentmanagement.com/CompPlanner/LayoutScripts/Cplp_Mop... 2/20/2014
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Section B: Goals

Goal 1
Employee Comments

Educate and engage new Republican members of Congress.

Over a year ago, I proposed a strategy of meeting with the 87-member Republican Freshmen Class. I received neither encouragement nor support to execute this strategy. I understand that HFA, accompanied by various staff, has had some meetings with Republican members. I believe we could have met with the whole freshman class by now and advanced our cause in Congress as never before.

Manager Comments

Senate passage of the VETDogs Bill.

Comprised, I want to be sure you know that I met with approximately 40 members or senior staff of that freshman class in the fourth quarter of 2011. We made some good in roads which were reflected in getting those members on ANV of the scored bills in our HFA Statement. We could certainly do additional visits.

Goal 2
Employee Comments

Work to defuse our opposition on the Hill.

In most cases, I believe we spend a disproportionate amount of time trying to persuade people to support our causes. More time should be spent on educating and partnering with our opponents (e.g., the Farm Bureau, the NFA, Republican Committee Chairmen, etc.).

Manager Comments

Appropriations work on the Ag Appropriation bill for cracking down on puppy mills.

Let’s discuss strategies for coalition-building.

Goal 3
Manager Comments

Identify opportunities for greening HLF’s brand and fundraising for the organization.

Let’s discuss opportunities for doing so—make sure your job description encompasses these specific tasks. We’re planning a DC event this year and I want to ensure we can meet ethics and fundraising requirements to have a great event that makes sense for branding HLF. There may be opportunities for sponsorship and fundraising around the event.

Goal 4

Goal 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Custom Score Name</th>
<th>Review Custom Score Description</th>
<th>Review Custom Score Rating</th>
<th>etexture Custom Score Rating</th>
<th>etexture Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have read and discussed this evaluation with my supervisor and I understand its contents. My signature means that I have been advised of my performance status and does not necessarily imply that I agree with either the appraisal or its contents.

Employee Signature ________________________ Date __________

https://www.memberonly.talentmanageronline.com/CompPlanner/LayoutScripts/Comp_Map... 2/29/2014
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EXHIBIT 2
From: Connie Harman-Whitfield
To: [email]
Subject: [FW: Congressional Members I Will Be With at NRCC This Weekend]

Hi I was wondering if you could post a few facts. It would be great if you could post by today. I will be with the NRCC this weekend.

In case you want to glance through any materials, I've attached an FAQ (this might be the most useful if you only want to look at email, along with a fact sheet, economic voting points, and campaign poll results. Thank you, Connie.

From: Michael Belchenko
To: [email]
Subject: RE: Congressional Members I Will Be With at NRCC This Weekend

Craig, It would be great to talk to them about the egg bill, and how it’s supported by the egg industry, and how important it is to support egg farmers’ jobs and help their business success. Jeff Deseraine is one of the lead sponsors, and we would love to get more Republicans on board as co-sponsors. The only thing is on the bill is for an amendment. Gallozy, Allen’s, and Monsanto.

Mibs

From: Connie Harman-Whitfield
To: [email]
Subject: [FW: Congressional Members I Will Be With at NRCC This Weekend]

Any suggestions?

Dave Black
Van Wyk Buchanan
Ann Marie Battle
Bill Culberson
Jeff DeGeer
Hillman
Veggie First
Scott Garrett
Tim Ginter
Wally Singer
BILL HANSON
Tom Laber
Kevin McCarthy
Pat Meehan
Tom Perriello
Hall Rogers
Mike Rogers (MI)
Tom Rooney
Brenda Ruot-White
Ed Royce
Steve Stivers
Aaron Schuyler
Tom Sowers
Bill Shuster
Steve Silverman
Martin Sweeney
John Sullivan
Tom Walberg
Craig Walton
Lynn Winant
Ed Whitfield
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EXHIBIT 3
58

From: Sue Amsden DATE: 10:40 PM
To: Carrie Rasines DATE: 10:40 PM
Subject: Re: Quote Services Roy / Whitfield: Housing Bill

Oh, I know you're the one to ask. I just don't ask a lot! And, thank you. I already heard from subsidized—you work fast! See you soon.

---

From Carrie Rasines-Dilworth DATE: Tuesday, May 17, 2011 10:40 PM
To: Sue Amsden
Subject: Re: Quote Services Roy / Whitfield: Housing Bill

You are so thoughtful and nice to tell me. I do not need to tell YOU that going through a spouse is usually more efficient than going through the office.

I will get a quick quote from him.

He is in Ky. today. Louisiana tomorrow. then Ky. Thursday. What is the deadline?

Sent from my iPad

On May 17, 2011, at 11:47 AM, "Sue Amsden" said:

Hi Carrie. We're going to do a short story on the housing bill in the next issue of Human Rights and I thought it would be great to have a quick quote or two from Roy Whitfield. Do you want me to just go through the office? Just want to be sure you are aware of what we're planning...

Thanks.

Sue

---

From: Michael Sharpe DATE: Monday, May 16, 2011 10:34 PM
To: Sue Amsden
Subject: Housing Bill

Hello Sue,

Thanks again for your time this morning.

Quick question for you. I had wanted to reach out to either Roy Whitfield or you. I'd like to know the housing bill and perhaps get a quick quote or two to see which is the best story to Human Rights. Would you have a suggestion, between the two of them, for who to try first? Also, once we said that down, are you still with us reaching out directly to their office?

Thanks again!

Mike

---

Confidential Treatment Under the Non-disclosure Provisions of H.Res. 85 or the 110th Congress as Amended Pursuant to
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EXHIBIT 4
From: Corinna Karnowsky-Wilkinson

To: Mel Bracy

Subject: Can we get the Wireless House bill going? We can get that in the House bill.

VerDate Sep 11 2014 23:34 Jul 18, 2016 Jkt 020740 PO 00000 Frm 00068 Fmt 6659 Sfmt 6602 E:\HR\OC\HR687.XXX HR687
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Friday, June 02, 2017 5:36 PM

On Fri, May 26, 2017 6:39 PM, "Mel Bracy" <mbracy@acm.org> wrote:

Corinna, I know you're already up to your eyeballs trying to sort things around the FDA funding with Christina Hughes and Delia, so I don't want to really aggravate you. But you know that the USA - one change is that the FDA's PI has reinstated a plan to draft a month to try to get it to the House floor. How about we try to see if we can get a way on the House Appropriations Committee floor? And it would be nice to get it done in the middle of the month. (This bill is supposed to be markup up to House Ag on July 6, so this might work... after that?)

From: Mel Bracy

Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2017 3:44 PM

To: Corinna Karnowsky-Wilkinson

Subject: Can we get the Wireless House bill going? We need to get that in the House bill.

I'll have to speak with Chris. She said Cary said that they're done, but it's been hard to get Gigi (Final) to focus on it when they've got lots of other things to do, and they still need to figure out how to do the financials and how to handle the IP. We've been told we need to do this in the order of the bill, which means we can't get it done until the House gets their amendment to the bill.

From: Virginia Paoletti

Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2017 1:54 PM

To: Mel Bracy

Subject: Can we get the Wireless House bill going? We need to get that in the House bill.

Virginia Paoletti,

Director, COO

Heritage Global Properties

415 Pennsylvania Ave, NE

Washington, DC 20002

heritageglobalproperties.com@gmail.com

Twitter: @VirginiaPaoletti

Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/virginia.paoletti.56

LinkedIn: https://www.linkedin.com/in/virginia-paoletti-87714779

Twitter: @VirginiaPaoletti

Please let me know if you have any questions.

---

This email is from the COO of Heritage Global Properties, a real estate company. The email is addressed to Corinna Karnowsky-Wilkinson, and mentions the need to get the Wireless House bill in the House bill. The email also mentions issues with the financials and IP, and notes that the House needs to handle the amendment to the bill.
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EXHIBIT 5
From: Connie Harnett-Whitfield  <connie.harnett-whitfield@humansociety.org>
To: Whitfield <whitfield.house.gov> Copy: Hickenlooper <hickenlooper.house.gov>
Subject: FY2020 minimum wage raise - House version

Dear House, I wanted to provide context on this. I just talked to an APSERS staffor at USDA who said "let's hopeful" that the vote will be optimal. Here is the Under Secretary's Office (not sure yet). I would be glad if Congressmen Whitfield and another Attorney or a friend and help to push this through. (Know I mentioned doing this in the fall yesterday.)

Tasnia Lehmann
Director of Regulatory Affairs, Federal Affairs
Whitfield.HumanSociety.org - tasnia

The Humane Society of the United States
1995, 350, Washington, DC 20007

Join Our Email List: http://www.humanesociety.org/about/joinouremaillist.php
ActOn User Requests:
Facebook: http://www.facebook.com/humanesociety
Twitter: http://twitter.com/humanesociety

The Humane Society of the United States is proud to be a member of the ActOn User Request Network.
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EXHIBIT 6
As you may have heard, this is a very long case in which we had a significant investment. The attorney general is still making it to the grand jury. We are trying to do our best, but I think it might be a significant delay in the case and hope to have some news on that soon. The final case to be brought against the two state senators is now funding.

As General Whitefly is a regrettable, but I trust, the sponsor of the FAST Act, would be compelling.

Please let me know your thoughts, and thank you for your consideration.

Kath

--- Original message ---
From: Frederick Whitefield <frederick.whitefield@gmail.com>
To: [Redacted]@ presented by [Presented by] the House Speaker's Office on [House Speaker's Office]
Sent: August 16, 2012 10:50 AM
Subject: FYI - FAST Act

Kath,

Here is the article from the email you received. The test in the same but the notice is (right).

http://www.hinc.com/2012/08/16/tennessees-walking-horse-case-

Additional notes can be found on the House Speaker's Office test

* By [Presented by] the House Speaker's Office
* Posted August 16, 2012 10:50 AM

A House Speaker's Office summary reveals that the Tennessee Walking Horse Case in Tennessee has been ongoing since 2006.

On Thursday, a judge ruled that the case is not yet ready for a trial. The judge cited the complexity of the case in reaching his decision. The judge said he was confident that the trial would go to trial when the case is ready.

Dr. Bert Rich, a U.S. Department of Agriculture veterinarian, reviewed the bones and took samples of tissues and bone matter that might have been on the horse.

"We would have testified as we did for the first time that the horse was not what it was," Assistant District Attorney Glen Roop said after the hearing.

He never got the chance.

When defense attorney Karl Whitefield asked White whether any of the bone matter was used during the previous trials' testimony, White replied that he had been asked about bone matter.

Leahfield said the question, which had been asked earlier from the and what it was he had done.

Leahfield said he was asked about the bone matter. Whitefield then asked White for the bone matter and noted that the bone matter was used during the previous trials.

"This case is evidence enough for us to know the truth," Whitefield said. "It was not accurate or not too great. What is a reason to honest change."
EXHIBIT 7
LOBBYING REGISTRATION

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 4)

Date Filed:   X New Registrant   X New Client for Existing Registrant   X Amendments

1. Effective Date of Registration: 06/01/2011

2. House Identification

REGISTRANT

☑ Organization/Lobbying Firm   X Self-Employed Individual

3. Registrant Organization: Humane Society Legislative Fund

Address: 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310

City: Washington

State: DC

Zip: 20037

Country: USA

4. Principal place of business (if different than line 3)

City:  

State:  

Zip:  

Country:  

5. Contact name and telephone number

Contact Person: Sue Amendola

Telephone: (202) 874-  

E-mail: 

6. General description of registrant’s business or activities

Social welfare organization for the protection of animals

CLIENT

☑ A lobbying firm is required to file a separate registration for each client. Organizations employing in-house lobbyists should check the box labeled "Self" and proceed to line 7. ☑ Self

7. Client name: Humane Society Legislative Fund

Address: 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310

City: Washington

State: DC

Zip: 20037

Country: USA

8. Principal place of business (if different than line 7)

City:  

State:  

Zip:  

Country:  

9. General description of client’s business or activities

LOBBYISTS

10. Name of each individual who has acted or is expected to act as a lobbyist for the client identified on line 7. If any person listed in this section has served as a “covered executive branch official” or “covered legislative branch official” within twenty years of first acting as a lobbyist for the client, state the executive and/or legislative position(s) to which the person served.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Last Initials</th>
<th>Current Official Position(s) (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>H-W</td>
<td>Please see page 3 for list of positions held</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 1 of 3
| 11. General lobbying issue areas (Select all applicable codes): |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| ANI              | AGR              | CHM              | VET              | SCI              | FOO              | BUD              |
| 12. Specific lobbying issues (current and anticipated): |
| H.R. 847, S. 702, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, Puppy Mills |
| H.R. 199, Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act, Veterans and service dogs |
| H.R. 3492, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, Animal Fighting |
| H.R. 1313, Great Ape Protection and Chimpanzee Welfare Act, Chimps in research |

**AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS**

Is there an entity other than the client that contributed more than $5,000 to the lobbying activities of the registrant in a quarterly period and either actively participates in and/or in whole or in part, plans, supervises or controls the registrant's lobbying activities?

- [ ] No -> Go to line 14.
- [ ] Yes -> Complete the rest of this section for each entity matching the criteria above, then proceed to line 14.

**Internet Addresses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOREIGN ENTITIES**

Is there any foreign entity?

- [ ] No -> Sign and date the registration.
- [ ] Yes -> Complete the rest of this section for each entity matching the criteria above, then sign the registration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Principal place of business</th>
<th>Amount of contributions for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: ____________________________

Printed Name and Title: Frederick M. Whitfield, Executive Director

Date: 02/29/2012
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### ADDITIONAL LOBBYISTS

10. Supplemental. List any additional lobbyists for this client not listed on page 1, number 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Justice—Attorney Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Interior—Special Asst to Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asst Solicitor Energy &amp; Natural Resources, Asst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary Fish, Wildlife and Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Import-Export Bank—Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADDITIONAL LOBBYING ISSUES

11. Supplemental. General lobbying issue areas. Enter any additional codes for issues not listed on page 2, number 11.

### ADDITIONAL AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

13. Supplemental. List any other affiliated organization that meets the criteria specified and is not listed on page 2, number 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADDITIONAL FOREIGN ENTITIES

14. Supplemental. List any other foreign entity that meets the criteria specified and is not listed on page 2, number 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LOBBYING REPORT**

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Registrant Name</th>
<th>Organization Lobbying Form</th>
<th>Self-Employed Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Society Legislative Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Address</th>
<th>Check if different than previously reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address 1</td>
<td>2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>20037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a. Contact Name</th>
<th>b. Telephone Number</th>
<th>c. E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sara Amendt</td>
<td>(202) 676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403035599-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Senate ID#</th>
<th>41941000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. House ID#</th>
<th>41941000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TYPE OF REPORT**

- **8 Year:** 2011
- **Q1:** (41-1-391)
- **Q2:** (41-1-391)
- **Q3:** (11-1-391)
- **Q4:** (11-1-391)

- **5. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report:**
- **10. Check if this is a Termination Report:**
- **11. No Lobbying Issue Activity:**

**INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Lobbying INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Organizations EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**14. REPORTING** Check box to indicate expense accounting method.

- **Method A.** Reporting amounts using IRS definitions only
- **Method B.** Reporting amounts under section 6011(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code
- **Method C.** Reporting amounts under section 4412(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code

**Signature**

**Printed Name and Title**

| Sara Amendt, Executive Director |

**Date**

| 03/12/2012 |
15. General issue area code

16. Specific lobbying issues

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amannson, Executive Director
ADDENDUM for General Lobbying Issues Area: ANIMALS


H.R. 596, To amend the Marine Mammals Protection Act of 1972, relating to provisions that would allow the importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada.
15. General issue area code
   VET Veterans
   Use additional page(s) as needed.

16. Specific lobbying issues
   H.R. 198, Veterans' Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies
   [Check if None]
   [State or Congressional District]

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above
   [Check if None]

Printed Name and Title: Sara Annemoh, Executive Director

Page 4 of 7
15. General issue area code
R&D Budget/Appropriations

16. Specific lobbying issues

[HAMDT 39 to H.R.1, Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, Amendment reduces funding for the Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Management of Lands and Resources (Wild Horse and Burro Management Program) by $2 million and applies the amount to the spending reduction accounts]

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies
Check if None

House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above
Check if None

Printed Name and Title
Sara Anderson, Executive Director
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COE.WHITFIELDSC.146923
ADDENDUM for General Lobbying Issue Areas: BUD - Budget/Appropriations

H.R. 2554, FY 2012 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, agency prioritization and funding for alternatives to animal testing

S. 1909, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012, agency prioritization and funding for alternatives to animal testing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number</th>
<th>Client Name</th>
<th>Client's Address</th>
<th>Client's Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.**

20. Client's new address
   - City: [City]
   - Zip Code: [Zip Code]
   - Country: [Country]

21. Client's new principal place of business (if different than line 20)
   - City: [City]
   - Zip Code: [Zip Code]
   - Country: [Country]

22. New General description of client's business or activities
   - [Description]

**LOBBYIST UPDATE**

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client
   1. [Name]
   2. [Name]
   3. [Name]
   4. [Name]

**ISSUE UPDATE**

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains
   - [Issue]
   - [Issue]
   - [Issue]
   - [Issue]

**AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS**

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)
   - [Address]
   - [City]
   - [State/Province]
   - [Zip Code]
   - [Country]

**FOREIGN ENTITIES**

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client
   1. [Name]
   2. [Name]
   3. [Name]

27. Add the following foreign entities
   - [Name]
   - [City]
   - [State/Province]
   - [Country]
   - [City]
   - [State/Province]
   - [Country]

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that is no longer owned, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization
   1. [Name]
   2. [Name]
   3. [Name]
   4. [Name]

Printed Name and Title: [Name and Title]
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### LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 2) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. **Registrant Name**
   - [ ] Organization/Lobbying Firm
   - [ ] Self-Employed Individual
   - **Human Society Legislative Fund**

2. **Address**
   - [ ] Check if different than previously reported
   - **Address1**: 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310
   - **Address2**
   - **City**: Washington
   - **State**: DC
   - **Zip Code**: 20037
   - **Country**: USA

3. **Principal place of business (if different than line 2)**
   - **City**
   - **State**
   - **Zip Code**
   - **Country**

4. **Contact Name**
   - **Mr.**
   - **Ms.**
   - **S. Ammon Fox**
   - **Telephone Number**: (202) 676-6222
   - **E-mail**
   - **Senate ID#**: 400873559-12
   - **House ID#**: 41941000

5. **Type of Report**
   - **Year**: 2011
   - **Q1 (1/1-3/31)**
   - **Q2 (4/1-6/30)**
   - **Q3 (7/1-9/30)**
   - **Q4 (10/1-12/31)**
   - [ ] Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report
   - [ ] Check if this is a Termination Report
   - **Date of Termination**

6. **Income or Expenses - You Must Completeeither Line 12 or Line 13**

   **12. Lobbying**
   - **Income relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was**
     - Less than $5,000
     - $5,000 or more
   - **Expense relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was**
     - Less than $5,000
     - $5,000 or more
   - Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

   **13. Organizations**
   - **Expense relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was**
     - Less than $5,000
     - $5,000 or more
     - $10,000 or more
   - **Reporting Method**
     - [ ] Method A: Reporting amounts under section 6002(b) of the Internal Revenue Code
     - [ ] Method B: Reporting amounts under section 6031(h)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code
     - [ ] Method C: Reporting amounts under section 6041(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code

7. **Signature**
   - **Name**: S. Ammon Fox, Executive Director
   - **Date**: 03/12/2012

---

**Printed Name and Title**: S. Ammon Fox, Executive Director

---

**COE.WHITFIELDDISC.146926**
**LOBBYING ACTIVITY** Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code

- [ ] Animals

16. Specific lobbying issues

- H.R. 835 & S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders
- H.R. 1513 & S. 815, Great Ape Protection and Conservation Act, relating to the use of chimpanzees in research
- H.R. 514, To prohibit the importation of certain nonhuman primates
- S. 3324, Captive Primate Safety Act, to prohibit importation, exportation, etc. of certain primate species

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

- [ ] Check if None

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Co-Senior Officer Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Amundson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

- [ ] Check if None

Printed Name and Title

Sara Amundson, Executive Director
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ADDENDUM for General Lobbying Issues Areas:

AND: Animals

H.R. 2492 & S. 1547, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures

H.R. 990, To amend the Marine Mammals Protection Act of 1972, relating to provisions that would allow the importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada

Printed Name and Title: Sue Annabi, Executive Director
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code
   - VET Veterans

16. Specific lobbying issues
   - HR 149, Vettrain's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies
   - [Check if None]
   - [House of Representatives]

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above
   - [Check if None]

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amundson, Executive Director
Lobbying activity. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide additional information as requested. Add additional pages as needed.

15. General issue area code: BUD Budget/Appropriations

16. Specific lobbying issues:
- H.R. 2354, Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012, agency prioritization and funding for alternatives to animal testing
- S. 1599, Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012, agency

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies: Check if None

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>垄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>垄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>垄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>垄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>垄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>垄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>垄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above: Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amandi, Executive Director
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ADDITIONAL for General Lobbying Issue Areas: BUD - Budget/Appropriations

H. Amendment 1, H.R. 2112, FY 2015 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, Wildlife Services amendments to de-fund lethal predator management.

H. Amendment 260, H.R. 2112, FY 2015 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, Amendment to put a $125,000 cap on payments to agricultural personnel.

Printed Name and Title: New Amendments, Executive Director
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COE.WHITFIELDISC.146931
Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. New General description of client’s business or activities

Lobbyist Update

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Issue Update

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

Affiliated Organizations

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Foreign Entities

27. Add the following foreign entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Printed Name and Title:

[Signature]
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COR.WHITFIELDDISC.146932
LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 3) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. Registrant Name ☑ Organization Lobbying Fees ☐ Self-Employed Individual
   Human Society Legislative Fund

2. Address ☐ Check if different than previously reported
   Address1: 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310
   Address2: 

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)
   City:  District: Zip Code: Country:

4a. Contact Name  b. Telephone Number  c. E-mail  d. Fax  e. In-Kind Donor  f. Senate ID#  g. House ID#
   Larry Amundson (202) 670- 400873559-12 419410009

5. Client Name ☑ Self ☐ Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality
   Human Society Legislative Fund

6. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report ☐

7. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date

8. Type of Report ☑ Q1 (01-01-11) ☐ Q2 (04-01-11) ☐ Q3 (07-01-11) ☐ Q4 (10-01-11)

9. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date

10. Income or Expenses - You Must Complete Either Line 12 or Line 13

11. Lobbying

12. In-Kind Donor:
   Less than $1,000 ☐
   $1,000 or more ☐ $

   Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

   EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period (including:
   Less than $1,000 ☐
   $1,000 or more ☐ $10,000.00

   Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only
   ☑ Method A. Reporting amounts under sections 8031(3)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code
   ☐ Method B. Reporting amounts under section 149(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code
   ☐ Method C. Reporting amounts under section 149(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code

   Filing Date: 12/31/2011

Printed Name and Title: Larry Amundson, Executive Director

COE.WHITFIELDDISC.146933
15. General issue area code  ANIMALS  

16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 835 &amp; S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1513 &amp; S. 810, Great Apes Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimpanzees in research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1324, Captive Primate Safety Act, to prohibit importation, exportation, etc. of certain primates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies  

18. Name of each individual who served as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Pacch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interested foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above  

COE.WHITFIELDSC.146934
AMENDMENT for General Lobbying Issues: (AND - Animals)

H.R. 2492 & S. 1947, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures

H.R. 900, To amend the Marine Mammals Protection Act of 1972, relating to provisions that would allow the importation of polar bear trophies taken in polar bear hunts in Canada

S. 1066, To amend the Marine Mammals Protection Act of 1972, relating to provisions that would allow the importation of polar bear trophies taken in polar bear hunts in Canada

H. R. 2210, Sportsmanship in Hunting Act, to prohibit certain interstate conduct relating to exotic animals and certain computer-assisted remote hunting

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amidon, Executive Director
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15. General issue area code: VET - Veterans (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues:

H.R. 108, Vermont's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies: Check if None

House of Representatives

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Federal Official Positions (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above: Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amundson, Executive Director
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Amundson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above  
☐ Check if None

Printed Name and Title  Sara Amundson, Executive Director
ADDENDUM for General Lobbying Issue Area: BUD - Budget/Appropriations


Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer has, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Printed Name and Title

[Signatures]
LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. Registrant Name ☑ Organization Lobbying Firm ☐ Self-Employed Individual
   Revenue Society Legislative Fund

2. Address ☐ Check if different than previously reported
   Address1: 2100 1st Street, N.W., Suite 310
   Address2: 
   City: Washington State DC Zip Code: 20037 Country: USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than Line 2)
   City: 
   State: Zip Code: Country: USA

4a. Contact Name ☐ Ms. ☐ Mr. ☐ Self ☐ Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality
   Revenue Society Legislative Fund
   Ms. San Amadison ☐ Telephone Number ☐ Transmission Number ☐ E-mail
   (202) 676 ☐ 409472559-12

5. Senate ID#: 409472559-12

6. House ID#: 419410090

TYPE OF REPORT
8. Year 2011 ☐ Q1 (1/1-3/31) ☐ Q2 (4/1-6/30) ☐ Q3 (7/1-9/30) ☐ Q4 (10/1-12/31)

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report ☐

10. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date 

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST COMPLETE EITHER LINE 12 OR LINE 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:
☐ Less than $1,000
☐ $5,000 or more
☐ $10,000 or more

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrants by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:
☐ Less than $1,000
☐ $10,000 or more ☐ $10,000 or more

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all expenses incurred in support of lobbying activities.

14. REPORTING

☐ Method A. Reporting expenses using UDA definitions only
☐ Method B. Reporting amounts under section 833(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code
☐ Method C. Reporting amounts under section 163(j) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature ____________________________ Date 03/12/2012

Printed Name and Title San Amadison, Executive Director

Page 1 of 7

COE.WHITFIELDDISC.146940
LOBBYING ACTIVITY: Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code (Specify)(See page 13)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 353 & S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders

H.R. 1513 & S. 810, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimpanzees in research

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies □ Check if None

Place of Representation, State

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Government Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issue listed on line 16 above □ Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amuradjan, Executive Director
ADDENDUM for General Lobbying Issues Areas: ANI - Animals

H.R. 2492 & S. 1647, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting venues.
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code

| Vet | Veterans |

16. Specific lobbying issues

- H.R. 195, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy
- H.R. 195, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies: Check if None

House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name(s) of individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>General Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hartman-Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above: Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amendola, Executive Director

Page 4 of 5
# LOBBYING ACTIVITY

Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

## 15. General issue area code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUD</td>
<td>Budget/Appropriations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 16. Specific lobbying issue

- H.R. 2594, Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012, agency prioritization and funding for alternatives to animal testing
- S. 1390, Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012, agency

## 17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

- House of Representatives, Senate

## 18. Names of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Current Position (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed in line 16 above

- Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amendment, Executive Director

Page 5 of 5
ADDITIONS for General Lobbying Issues:


2. H.R. 3120. Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act 2012, related to increased for animal care, Horse Protection Act, and USDA Investigative and Enforcement Services and Veterinary Loan Forgiveness.

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amodeo, Executive Director

Page 6 of 7

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146945
Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Client new address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Richard</td>
<td>Paid</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer persists

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (City and state or country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (City and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership interest in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that is no longer owned, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printed Name and Title: Fred Frederick, Executive Director

Coe Whitfield Disc. 146946
## LOBBYING REPORT

**Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page**

1. **Registrant Name**
   - Organization Lobbying Firm
   - Self-Employed Individual
   - Human Rights Legislative Fund

2. **Address**
   - Check if different than previously reported
   - Address1: 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310
   - Address2: Washington, DC
   - Zip Code: 20037
   - Country: USA

3. **Principal place of business (if different than line 2)**
   - City: Washington
   - State: DC
   - Zip Code: 20037

4. **Contact Name**
   - Ms. Sara Amashou
   - Phone Number: (202) 676
   - E-mail: 
   - House Office
   - Zip Code: 4097559-112

5. **Client Name**
   - Self

6. **House Office**
   - House of Representatives
   - Zip Code: 419410000

7. **TYPE OF REPORT**
   - Year 2012
   - Q1: 11/5 - 3/31
   - Q2: 4/1 - 6/30
   - Q3: 7/1 - 9/30
   - Q4: 10/1 - 12/31

8. **Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report**

9. **Check if this is a Termination Report**

### INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST COMPLETE EITHER LINE 12 OR LINE 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line 12</th>
<th>Line 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong> relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:</td>
<td><strong>EXPENSE</strong> relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $1,000</td>
<td>Less than $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 or more</td>
<td>$1,000 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

10. **Reporting**
    - Check box in indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.
    - Method A: Reporting amounts using OMB definitions only
    - Method B: Reporting amounts under sections 6035 or 6036 of the Internal Revenue Code
    - Method C: Reporting amounts under section 6041 of the Internal Revenue Code

11. **Signature**
    - Sara Amashou, Executive Director
    - Date: 04/12/2012

12. **Printed Name and Title**
    - Sara Amashou, Executive Director

---

**CYES.WHITFIELDDISC.146947**
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional pages if needed.

15. General issue area code

- ANI Animals

(one page per)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 813 & S. 767, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders

H.R. 1157 & S. 310, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimpanzees in research

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

Check if None

18. Name of each individual who served as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>General Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Ammon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sara Ammon, Executive Director
ADDENDUM for General Lobbying Issues:

ANI - Animals

H.R. 2492 & S. 1947, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures.

S. 1281, Horse Transportation Safety Act, to prohibit transporting a horse in interstate commerce in a narrow vehicle (except a vehicle opened exclusively on rail or rail) containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another.


H.R. 1773 & S. 856, Interstate Horse Racing Improvement Act, would extend the Interstate Horse Racing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horse racing.
15. General issue area code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YET</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Specific lobbying issues

*H.R. 196, Veterans' Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy*

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

Check if None

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Officer Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Check if None

Printed Name and Title

Sara Amodeo, Executive Director
102

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

13. General issue area code (RUD = Budget Appropriations)

16. Specific lobbying issues
No bill yet, various appropriations strategies, including House Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations, related to alternatives to animal testing
No bill yet, various appropriations issues, including Animal Welfare Act funding, Horse Protection Act funding, Class B dealer, and

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies
House of Representatives, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>General Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Amundson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amundson, Executive Director
20. Client new address
   Address
   City ________________________ State __ Zip Code _____ County __________

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)
   City ________________________ State __ Zip Code _____ County __________

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBIYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printed Name and Title

Sara Amsden, Executive Director
**LOBBYING REPORT**

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. **Registrant Name**
   - House Society Legislative Fund
   - Check if Individual
   - Organization

2. **Address**
   - Address1: 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310
   - Address2:
   - City: Washington
   - State: DC
   - Zip Code: 20037
   - Country: USA

3. **Principal place of business (if different than line 2)**
   - City: Washington
   - State: DC
   - Zip Code: 20037
   - Country: USA

4a. **Contact Name**
   - House Society Legislative Fund

4b. **Telephone Number**
   - (202) 676

4c. **E-mail**

5. **State ID#**
   - 500873559-12

6. **House ID#**
   - 419410000

**TYPE OF REPORT**

8. **Year**
   - 2012

9. **Quarter**
   - Q1: 01/01/2012
   - Q2: 04/01/2012
   - Q3: 07/01/2012
   - Q4: 10/01/2012

10. **Check if this is a Termination Report**
    - No
    - Termination Date

**INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13**

12. **Lobbying**

   INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period:
   - Less than $5,000
   - $5,000 or more

   EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period:
   - Less than $5,000
   - $5,000 or more

   Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. **Organizations**

14. **Reporting**

   Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

   - Method A.
   - Method B.
   - Method C.

   Reporting amounts using UDA definitions only.

   Reporting amounts under section 6031(h)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

   Reporting amounts under section 6111(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

**Signature**

**Printed Name and Title**

Sara Amsund, Executive Director

**Date**

07/20/2012

**Page 1 of 6**

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146953
15. General issue area code

16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 853 &amp; S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1513 &amp; S. 810, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimpanzees in research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2960 &amp; S. 1176, American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, prohibiting sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

- Check if None

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>General Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logistic</td>
<td>Abamor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Amouron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>Nator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>Nator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>Nator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>Nator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>Nator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on Line 16 above

- Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amouron, Executive Director
ADDENDUM for General Lobbying Issues:

S. 1281, Horse Transportation Safety Act, to prohibit transporting a horse in an unsafe container in a motor vehicle (except a vehicle equipped exclusively on rail to rail) containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another.


H.R. 1723 & S. 685, Interstate Horse Racing Act, would amend the Interstate Horse Racing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horse racing.

H.R. 4058 & S. 2334, Causing Members of the Armed Services Act, relating to raising military working dogs.

H.R. 2482 & S. 1447, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, relating to increasing penalties for animal fighting.
**LOBBYING ACTIVITY:** Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code

16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>H.R. 198, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>General Interest Notes (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sen. Amos Hendon, Executive Director

Page 4 of 6
**Lobbying Activity**

Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each Code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code [ ] BUD Budget Appropriations (see next page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H 6091</td>
<td>Various appropriations strategies, including House Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations, related to alternatives to animal testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 9073</td>
<td>Approaches issues, including House and Senate Animal Welfare Act funding, Horse Protection Act funding, Class B dealers, and Horse Protection Act amendments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

- House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Amstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 18 above (Check if None)

- Check if None
Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address:
   Address
   City __________________________ State ______ Zip Code ______ Country ______

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20):
   City __________________________ State ______ Zip Code ______ Country ______

22. New General description of client's business or activities

**LOBBYSIST UPDATE**

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ISSUE UPDATE**

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains:

☐ [ ]

**AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS**

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOREIGN ENTITIES**

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printed Name and Title

Name: John Smith
Title: Executive Director

<signature>
Page 6 of 6
**lobbying report**

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 3) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. Registrant Name  ☑ Organization Lobbying Firm  ☐ Self-Employed Individual  
   Human Society Legislative Fund

2. Address  ☐ Check if different than previously reported
   Address1  2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310
   City  Washington  State  DC  Zip Code  20037  -  County  USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)
   City  
   State  
   Zip Code  -  County  

4a. Contact Name  ☑ Ms. Sara Anderson
   a. Telephone Number  (202) 676- 
   b. E-mail  
   c. International Number  
   d. Senate ID#  400872559-12

5. Client Name  ☑ Self  ☐ Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality  
   Human Society Legislative Fund  419410000

6. House ID#  

**Type of Report**

8. Year  2012  Q1 (1/1-3/31)  Q2 (4/1-6/30)  Q3 (7/1-9/30)  Q4 (10/1-12/31)

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report  

10. Check if this is a Termination Report  ☐ Termination Date  

**Income or Expenses** - You must complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying
   Income relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
   ☑ Less than $5,000  ☐ $5,000 or more  ☐ $  
   Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations
   Expense relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
   ☑ Less than $5,000  ☐ $5,000 or more  ☐ $ 10,000.00  
   Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

14. Reporting
   ☐ Method A. Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only
   ☐ Method B. Reporting amounts under section 6093(a)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code
   ☐ Method C. Reporting amounts under section 6093(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code

**Signature**

Date  10/19/2012

Printed Name and Title  Sara Anderson, Executive Director

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146959
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide additional information as needed.

15. General issue area code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANL</td>
<td>Animals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 635 & S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders
H.R. 1513 & S. 810, Great Apes Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimpanzees in research
H.R. 2566 & S. 1576, American Home Slaughter Protection Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of hogs for slaughter for human consumption

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

- House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Amendola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

- Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amendola, Executive Director

Page 2 of 4

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146960
S. 1251, Horse Transportation Safety Act, to prohibit transporting a horse in a manner commence in a motor vehicle (except a vehicle opened exclusively on rail or rail) containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another.


H.R. 4107 & S. 2334, Curative Members of the Armed Forces Act, relating to raising military working dogs.

H.R. 3402/S. 1943, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, relating to increasing penalties for animal fighting.

H.R. 6508, To amend the Horse Protection Act to, among other things, designate additional violations acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act.
15. General issue area code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Specific lobbying issue

H.R. 198, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

[Check box]

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

[Check box]

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amrhein, Executive Director

Page 4 of 6
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as required. Add additional pages as needed.

15. General issue area code

16. Specific lobbying issues

H 6091, various appropriations strategies, including House Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations, related to alternatives to animal testing.

H 7732, 2175, various appropriations issues, including House and Senate Animal Welfare Act funding, Horse Protection Act funding, Class B dealers, and Horse Agriculture Appropriations.

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

☑ Check if None

House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Harris-Wiltfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☑ Check if None

10. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amandos, Executive Director
Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address
   Address
   City ___________________________ State: Zip Code: Country ___________________________

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)
   City ___________________________ State: Zip Code: Country ___________________________

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE
23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE
24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS
25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliated Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FOREIGN ENTITIES
27. Add the following foreign entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that is no longer owned, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printed Name and Title: [Name and Title]
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LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Registrant Name</th>
<th>Organization/Lobbying Firm</th>
<th>Self Employed Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Society Legislative Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Address</th>
<th>Address2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 L St, N.W., Suite 310</td>
<td>DC 20037</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a. Contact Name</th>
<th>b. Telephone Number</th>
<th>c. Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5. State IDN     | 40073359-12        |          |

| 6. House IDN     | 412400000          |          |

**TYPE OF REPORT**

- **8. Year 2021**: Q1: (1/1 - 3/31) Q2: (4/1 - 6/30) Q3: (7/1 - 9/30) Q4: (10/1 - 12/31)

- **9. Check, if filing meets a previously filed version of this report**

- **10. Check if this is a Termination Report**

- **11. No Lobbying Issue Activity**

**INCOME OR EXPENSES** - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Method A: Reporting amount using LDA definitions only |
| Method B: Reporting amount under section 6033(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code |
| Method C: Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code |

**Signature**

Digitally Signed By: Sara Amassakoo, Executive Director

**Date**

01/18/2013

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146965
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue area in which the registrant engaged as lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code(s): ANIMAL ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

S.R. 335 & S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders; H.R. 1312 & S. 816, Commerical Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of animals in research; H.R. 2966 & S. 1176, American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc., of horses for slaughter for human consumption.

H.R. 2992 & S. 1347, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures; S. 1341, Horse Transportation Safety Act, to prohibit transporting a horse in interstate commerce in a motor vehicle (except a vehicle operated exclusively on rail or road) containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another; H.R. 3596, Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2012, 2012, would extend the Egg Products Inspection Act to cover housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions; H.R. 1733 & S. 860, Intrastate Horse Racing Improvement Act, would amend the Intrastate Horse Racing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horseracing; H.R. 4165 & S. 2154, Cause Members of the Armed Services Act, relating to retire military working dogs.

17. Name(s) of Congress and Federal agencies:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Check if None

COE.WHITFIELDDISC.146966
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue area in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as required. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

118. Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. Name(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. New General description of client’s business or activities

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________

_____________________________
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25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State/Province Zip Country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal place of business</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State/Province Zip Country</td>
<td>City State Country</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. Registrant Name Organization/Lobbying Firm Self-Employed Individual

Hume Society Legislative Fund

2. Address

Address 1 2300 L Street, N.W., Suite 310 Address 2
City Washington State DC Zip Code 20037 Country USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)

City State Zip Code County

4a. Contact Name

b. Telephone Number
c. E-mail

5. Senate ID# 400933350-12

6. House ID# 410410000

7. Client Name

Client is a state or local government or instrumentality

Hume Society Legislative Fund

TYPE OF REPORT

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report

10. Check if this is a Termination Report

11. No Lobbying Issue Activity

9. Year 2013 Q1 (01 - 03-31) Q2 (04 - 06-30) Q3 (07 - 09-30) Q4 (10 - 12-31)

10. Termination Date

11. No Lobbying Issue Activity

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period:

Less than $5,000

$5,000 or more $

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period:

Less than $5,000

$5,000 or more $ 70,000.00

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. 

See instructions for description of options.

Method A. Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

Method B. Reporting amounts under section 603(k)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code

Method C. Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature Digitally Signed By: Sara Amanderson, Executive Director

Date 04/10/2013

COB.WHITFIELDISC.146969
121

15. General issue or cause ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

S. 347 & S. 393, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeding; lobbying relating to the use of chimp in research and permanent retirement to sanctuary H.R. 1994 & S. 341, Safeguard American Food Exports Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of boars for slaughter for human consumption.

H.R. 3606 & S. 666, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting venues; Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to require housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions H.R. 1733 & S. 466, Interstate Hunting Improvement Act, would amend the Interstate Hunting Act of 1978 to prohibit the sale of performance-enhancing drugs to nonhuman. Lobbies relating to updating the Horse Protection Act

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coe</td>
<td>Lamarine-Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interested foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Check if None

COE.WHITFIELDDISC.146970
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue area in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code: VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

S.R. 183. Veterans' Dog Training Therapy Act to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies: Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above: Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client move address

Address
City ___________________________ State ______ Zip Code ________ Country ______

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City ___________________________ State ______ Zip Code ________ Country ______

22. New general description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

COE WHITFIELD DISC. 146971
25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOREIGN ENTITIES**

27. Add the following foreign entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal place of business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal place of business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. Registrant Name:  
   Organization/Lobbying Firm:  
   Self Employed Individual:  
   Humane Society Legislative Fund

2. Address
   Address: 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310
   City: Washington
   State: DC
   Zip Code: 20037
   County: USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)
   City: 
   State: 
   Zip Code: 
   Country: 

4. Contact Name
   a. Telephone Number:  
   b. Fax:  
   c. E-mail:  
   5. Scope of ID:  
      40057353912

6. Client Name:  
   - Self
   - Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality

7. Client Name: Humane Society Legislative Fund
   6. Scope of ID: 4150401000

TYPE OF REPORT
8. Year: 2015
   Q1 (Jan - Mar):  
   Q2 (Apr - Jun):  
   Q3 (Jul - Sep):  
   Q4 (Oct - Dec):  
   Q4 (Oct - Dec):  

9. Check if this filing reveals a previously filed version of this report
   Termination Date: 
   11. No Lobbying Issue Activity

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying
   INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
   Less than $5,000
   $5,000 or more $  
   Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income from the client (including all payments to the client by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).
   EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
   Less than $5,000
   $5,000 or more $ 10,000.00

13. Organizations
   14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method
   - Method A. Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only
   - Method B. Reporting amounts under section 6031(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code
   - Method C. Reporting amounts under section 162(c) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature: 
Digitally Signed By: Sara Ammons, Executive Director
Date: 07/19/2015

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146973
16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 347 & S. 355, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders. Lobbying related to the issue of clumping in research and permanent retirement to sanctuary.

H.R. 1094 & S. 541, Safeguard America’s Food Exports Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption.


H.R. 177 & S. 886, Interagency Horse Racing Improvements Act, would amend the Interagency Horse Racing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horse racing. Lobbying related to upgrading the Horse Protection Act H.R. 1518, Forever All Sirens Shelters Act, to strengthen penalties and make the sentencing of horses illegal. Lobbying relating to a proposed NMAPS rule that would protect birds and terrestrial animals on farms. wings R.R. 2924, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to title the King Amendment and add the King Amendment and add a new bill language to add horse slaughter bill language to H.R. 954, Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act, to add animal fighting bill language H.R. 3431, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of nonhuman welfare laws and defined the inspection of horse slaughter facilities. S. 1244, Agricultural, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of nonhuman welfare laws and defined the inspection of horse slaughter facilities. Lobbying to lift the cap on horse slaughter enforcement funding.

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE, Health & Human Services - Dept of (HHS), Labor - Dept of (DOL), Education - Dept of

18. Name of individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current/Official Position</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sen.</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrie</td>
<td>Harrison-Wyatt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of such foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

COE WHITFIELDDisc.146974
126

LOBBING ACTIVITY. Select or enter codes as necessary to reflect the general issue area in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional pages as needed.

15. General issue area codes: VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies. Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name    Last Name    Suffix    Current/Official Position (if applicable)   New

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above. Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client's new address

Address

City    State    Zip Code    County

21. Client's new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City    State    Zip Code    County

22. New general description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

First Name    Last Name    Suffix

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

COE, WHITFIELD DISC. 146975
25. Add the following affiliated organizations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146976
Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Firms Are Required to Complete This Page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>1. Registrant Name</th>
<th>Organization/Lobbying Firm</th>
<th>2. Address</th>
<th>3. Principal Place of Business (if different than line 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humane Society Legislative Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310</td>
<td>Washington DC Zip Code 20037 County USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a. Contact Name</th>
<th>4b. Telephone Number</th>
<th>4c. E-mail</th>
<th>5. Senate ID</th>
<th>6. House ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Principal Place of Business (if different than line 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Senate ID

400873539-12

6. House ID

415460000

TYPE OF REPORT


9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report

10. Check if this is a Termination Report

11. No Lobbying Issue Activity

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was

Less than $5,000 $1,000 or more $5,000 or more

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Less than $5,000 $5,000 or more $20,000.00

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

✓ Method A. Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

Method B. Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(3)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code

Method C. Reporting amounts under section 302(c) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature: Digitally Signed By: Sue Ann Aranow Date: 07/21/2014

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146977
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code ANI ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

| L.R. 847 & S. 395, Poppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act relating to commercial dog breeding | Lobbying relating to the use of sites in research and permanent retirement to sanctuary. H.R. 1094 & S. 541, Safeguard American Food Exports Act to prohibit sale, transport, etc., of horses for slaughter for human consumption. H.R. 1094 & S. 541, Safeguard American Food Exports Act to prohibit sale, transport, etc., of horses for slaughter for human consumption. H.R. 360 & S. 666, Animal Fighting Spectator Punishment Act to prohibit attendance at animal fighting venues. Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to require housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions. H.R. 1232 & S. 586, Tattersall Racing Improvement Act, would amend the Interstate Horseshoeing Act of 1975 to prohibit the sale of performance-enhancing drugs to horsemen. Lobbying related to upgrading the Horse Protection Act H.R. 1518, Prevent All Soring Tactics Act to strengthen penalties and make theitin of horses illegal. Lobbying relating to a proposed NFUFS rule that would preempt state and federal statutes on stallion breeding. Lobbying to kill the cap on compliance retirement funding H.R. 2042, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and add egg bill language H.R. 1497, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and add egg bill language, to add horse racing bill language, to add horse slaughter bill language S. 494, Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act, to add animal fighting bill language. |

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146978
16. Specific lobbying issues

[Cell content: LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue area in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 010 | Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and to define the inspection of horse slaughter facilities |}

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agency(ies) Checked if None

U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Content]</td>
<td>[Content]</td>
<td>[Content]</td>
<td>[Content]</td>
<td>[Content]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Check if None

COE.WHITFIELDSC.146979
LOBBYSING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue area in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code: VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

[Blank]

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

[Blank]

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

[Blank]

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

[Blank]

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where information has changed.

20. Client new address

[Blank]

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

[Blank]

22. New General description of client’s business or activities

[Blank]

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

[Blank]

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

[Blank]

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

COE.WHITFIELD.146980
25. Add the following affiliated organization(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Short Address</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(city and state or country)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal place of business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(city and state or country)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146981
LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Registrant Name</th>
<th>Organization/Lobbying Firm</th>
<th>Self Employed Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humane Society Legislative Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Address</th>
<th>Address2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 L. Street, N.W., Suite 310</td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Principal place of business (if different than Line 2)</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a. Contact Name</th>
<th>b Telephone Number</th>
<th>c. E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Senate ID#</th>
<th>400873559:12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Client Name</th>
<th>Check if client is a state or local government or instrumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. House ID#</th>
<th>4154100000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TYPE OF REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Year</th>
<th>Q1 (1/1 - 3/31)</th>
<th>Q2 (4/1 - 6/30)</th>
<th>Q3 (7/1 - 9/30)</th>
<th>Q4 (10/1 - 12/31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report

10. Check if this is a Termination Report

11. No Lobbying Issue Activity

**INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Lobbying</th>
<th>13. Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:</td>
<td>EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related expenses for the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method sees instructions for description of options.

- Method A. Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only
- Method B. Reporting amounts under section 503(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code
- Method C. Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature: Digitally Signed By: Sue Amundson
Date: 07/21/2014

C.O.E.WHITFIELDDISC.146982
16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 260 & S. 366, Animal Fighting Operator Prohibitions Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting venues H.R. 1514 & S. 1405 Prevent All Soring Tack Act, to strengthen penalties and make the soring of horses illegal H.R. 1094 & S. 541, Safeguard American Food Exports Act, to prohibit the sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption

H.R. 1751 & S. 829, Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to require housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions. S. 232, PREEMIE Act Reauthorization, to lift the cap on funding for nursing shortages

Lobbying relating to a proposed NAMS rule that would preempt state and territorial laws on shell-dinning farms in Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and maintain the existing fighting language.
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LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code(s) DUSD BUDGET/APPROPRIATIONS

16. Specific lobbying issues

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as lobbyist in this issue area

| First Name | Last Name | Suffix | Current Official Position (if applicable) | New
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amundon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morrisson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COE.WHITFIELDSC.146984
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LOBBIEYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrants engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies</th>
<th>Check if None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above (Check if None)

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. New General description of client’s business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

COE.WHITFIELDDISC.146985
23. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

1

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Principal place of business</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

1

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146986
**Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Registrant Name</strong></td>
<td>Humane Society Legislative Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Address</strong></td>
<td>700 L Street, N.W., Suite 310, Washington, DC 20001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4a. Contact Name</strong></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4b. Telephone Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4c. E-mail</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Lobbyist ID#</strong></td>
<td>60073359-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Client Name</strong></td>
<td>Humane Society Legislative Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Check if this report is a previously filed version of this report</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. No Lobbying Jurisdiction Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE OF REPORT**
- 8. Year 2022
- Q1 (1/1 - 3/31)
- Q2 (4/1 - 6/30)
- Q3 (7/1 - 9/30)
- Q4 (10/1 - 12/31)

**INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST COMPLETE EITHER LINE 12 OR LINE 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line 12</th>
<th>Line 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:</td>
<td>Expense relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

**14. REPORTING** Check box to indicate expense accounting method.
- Method A. Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only
- Method B. Reporting amounts under section 6032(h)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code
- Method C. Reporting amounts under section 162(g) of the Internal Revenue Code

**Signature**
Digitally Signed By: Sara Amanda, Executive Director
**Date** 04/24/2014

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146987
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15. General issue area code: ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.R. 306, S. 680, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures</th>
<th>H.R. 1573, S. 1400, Prevent All Soring Taints Act, to strengthen penalties and make the killing of horses illegal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying relating to a proposed NMFS rule that would prohibit cruel and fraudulent training of marine mammals for entertainment in the United States.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies: Check if None

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariah</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 18 above: Check if None

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146988
15. General issue area code AGRO AGRICULTURE

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 1731 & S. 828: Egg Products Inspections Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspections Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions. Lobbying related to a proposed USDA rule that would regulate the importation of puppies

Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and maintain the animal fighting language H.R. 3410, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of humane welfare laws and to ensure the inspection of horse slaughter facilities. S. 1244, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of humane welfare laws and to ensure the inspection of horse slaughter facilities.

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (If Applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>Harriett Whitheld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issue listed on line 16 above

COE.WHITFIELDDISC.146989
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LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as required. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code: FOOD INDUSTRY (SAFETY, LABELING, ETC.)

16. Specific lobbying issues

[1.] 1994 & S. 144, Safeguard American Food Exports Act to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of beef or slaughter for human consumption

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies: Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above: Check if None

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146990
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LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code: VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies: Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current/Former Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above: Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address

City ___________________________ State ______ Zip Code ______ Country ______

21. Client new principal place of business (if different from line 20)

City ___________________________ State ______ Zip Code ______ Country ______

22. New General description of client's business or activities

_LOBBYIST UPDATE_

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer persists:

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

COE.WHITFIELD.146991
25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

| 1   |               |      |                |     |         |

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Principal place of business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

| 1   |               |      |                |         |                                                        |                                               |                                |

**COE.WHITFIELDisc.146992**
### LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Registrant Name</th>
<th>Organization/Lobbying Firm</th>
<th>Self Employed Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humane Society Legislative Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Address</th>
<th>Address: 1200 L Street, N.W., Suite 310</th>
<th>Address2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>State: DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country: USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a. Contact Name</th>
<th>b. Telephone Number</th>
<th>c. E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Senate ID:</th>
<th>4008753159-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. House ID:</th>
<th>419410000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### TYPE OF REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Q1 (Jan - Mar)</th>
<th>Q2 (Apr - June)</th>
<th>Q3 (July - Sept)</th>
<th>Q4 (Oct - Dec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Check if this filing was a previous final version of this report

10. Check if this is a Termination Report

#### INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Lobbying</th>
<th>INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $5,000, of all lobbying related income from the clients (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Organizations</th>
<th>EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. REPORTING: Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

- Method A. Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only
- Method B. Reporting amounts under section 6033(h)(3)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code
- Method C. Reporting amounts under section 162(a) of the Internal Revenue Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Digitally Signed By: Sara Amundson, Executive Director</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>07/1/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

COE.WHITFIELDDISC.146993
15. General issue area code: ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

- H.R. 1099 & S. 541, Safeguard American Food Exports Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of foods for slaughter for human consumption
- H.R. 1518 & S. 1406: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act, to strengthen penalties and make the act of torturing horses illegal
- H.R. 4188, Humane Cosmetics Act, to end the use of animals in testing for cosmetics safety
- Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and the inspection of broiler slaughter facilities
- Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and the inspection of broiler slaughter facilities
- Lobbying to prioritize funding for alternatives to traditional animal tests
- Lobbying to prioritize research, development and integration of alternatives to traditional animal tests
- Lobbying to support enforcement of USDA's retail store rule
- Lobbying to support facilitation of USDA's export inspections

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Harmon</td>
<td>Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Check if None
146

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code
16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 181, Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name       Last Name       Suffix       Covered Official Position (if applicable)       New

Cowles          Marianne Whitley

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address

City _______________________________ State ______ Zip Code _______ County ________

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City _______________________________ State ______ Zip Code _______ County ________

22. Brief General description of client’s business or activities

______________________________

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

First Name       Last Name       Suffix

1 ________________________________ 2 ________________________________

______________________________

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issues that no longer pertain

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146995
25. Add the following affiliated organizations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146996
**LOBBYING REPORT**

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Registrant Name</th>
<th>Organization/Lobbying Firm</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Society Legislative Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Address</th>
<th>Address?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2100 L St., N.W., Suite 310</td>
<td>Address?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4. Contact Name | b. Telephone Number | c. E-mail | |
|-----------------|---------------------|------------|
| Human Society Legislative Fund | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Senate ID#</th>
<th>6. House ID#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400873559-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE OF REPORT**

8. Year: 2014  Q1 (1-3/31)  Q2 (4/1-6/30)  Q3 (7/1-9/30)  Q4 (10/1-12/31)

9. Check if this filing is a previously filed version of this report:

10. Check if this is a Termination Report:

11. No Lobbying Issue Activity

**INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST COMPLETE EITHER LINE 12 OR LINE 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Lobbying</th>
<th>13. Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was</td>
<td>EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Method A. Reporting expenses using LDA definitions only

Method B. Reporting expenses under section 6033(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code

Method C. Reporting expenses under section 162(o) of the Internal Revenue Code

**Signature**

Digitally Signed By: Sam Amorena, Executive Director

Date: 10/24/2014

COE.WHITFIELDISC.146997
15. General issue area code ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.R. 1519 &amp; S. 1459 Prevent Allioting Tactics Act, to strengthen penalties and make the keeping of horses illegal</td>
<td>D.R. 4HA. Human Use Cosmetics Act, to end the use of animals in testing for cosmetics safety Lobbying to support limitation and enforcement of USDA animal protection rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

- U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coe</td>
<td>Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

- Check if None
150

15. General issue area code: BUD BUDGET/APPROPRIATIONS

16. Specific lobbying issues

Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and define the inspection of horse slaughter facilities. Lobbying to prioritize funding for alternatives to traditional animal tests. Lobbying to prioritize research, development and implementation of alternatives to traditional animal tests.

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies: Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Amundson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Harriman Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above: Check if None

COE.WHITFIELD146999
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15. General issue area code VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

16.B. 185. Veterans Day Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

17.A. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name Last Name Suffix Occupied Official Position (if applicable) New

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address

City State Zip Code Country

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City State Zip Code Country

22. New General description of client's business or activities

________________________

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

COE WHITFIELD DISC 147000
### Affiliated Organizations

**Table: Affiliated Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### FOREIGN ENTITIES

**Table: FOREIGN ENTITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal place of business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage of client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Table: FOREIGN ENTITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Principal place of business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage of client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Table: FOREIGN ENTITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Principal place of business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage of client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

COE.WHITFIELDISC.147001
**Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Firms Are Required to Complete This Page**

### 1. Registrant Name
- **Organization:** Insurance Industry Action Network
- **Self-Employed Individual:**

### 2. Address
- **Address:** 575 L Street, Suite 300
- **City:** Washington DC
- **State:** DC
- **Zip Code:** 20001
- **Country:** USA

### 3. Principal Place of Business (if different than line 2)
- **City:**
- **State:**
- **Zip Code:**
- **Country:**

### 4a. Contact Name
- **Title:**
- **Telephone Number:**
- **E-mail:**

### 5. Service ID
- **Number:**

### 6. House ID
- **Number:**

### TYPE OF REPORT
- **8. Year:** 2016
- **Q1:** 1Q1-3Q1
- **Q2:** 4Q1-6Q5
- **Q3:** 7Q1-9Q3
- **Q4:** 10Q1-12Q3

### 9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report

### 10. Check if this is a Termination Report

### 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity

### INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

#### 12. Lobbying
- **INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:**
  - **Less than $5,000:**
  - **$5,000 or more:**
- **Total:**

#### 13. Organizations
- **EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:**
  - **Less than $5,000:**
  - **$5,000 or more:**

#### 14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.
- **Method A:** Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only
- **Method B:** Reporting amounts under section 403(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code
- **Method C:** Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

**Signature**

**Digitally Signed By:** Sara Amoush

**Date:** 1/28/2015 2:58:01 PM

---

COE Whitfield Disc. 147002
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as required. Add additional pages as needed.

15. General issue area code: AN1

16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1148 &amp; S. 1406</td>
<td>Prevent All Seeing Tactics Act to strengthen penalties and make the using of torture illegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 449</td>
<td>Humane Cosmetics Act, to end the use of animals in testing for cosmetics safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 56 &amp; S. 666</td>
<td>Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to strengthen penalties for attending or bringing a child to an animal fight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1004 &amp; S. 541</td>
<td>Safeguard American Food Exports Act, to protect horses and consumers by prohibiting the transport and export of U.S. horses to slaughter for human consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1730 &amp; S. 820</td>
<td>Egg Products Inspections Act Amendments, to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of laying hens, placed is over a period of 15-16 years, which would significantly improve animal welfare while providing a viable future for egg farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2636 &amp; S. 1451</td>
<td>Captive Primate Safety Act, to prohibit the importation into the United States for the exotic pet trade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agency: Check if None

18. S. Senate, U.S. House of Representatives

19. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Whitfield</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issue listed on line 16 above: Check if None
155

1. LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code: BUD

16. Specific lobbying issues

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies: Check if None

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above: Check if None

Information Update Page. Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

22. New General description of client’s business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

COE.WHITFIELDISC.147004
AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal place of business</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COE.WHITFIELDISC.147005
LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. Registrant Name: Humane Society Legislative Fund

2. Address:

   Address: 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310
   City: Washington
   State: DC
   Zip Code: 20037
   Country: USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2):

   City: 
   State: 
   Zip Code: 
   Country: 

4a. Contact Name: 

   b. Telephone Number: 
   c. (Email): 

5. Senate ID#: 49373533-12

6. House ID#: 4123410609

TYPE OF REPORT

8. Year 2015, Q1 (1/1 - 3/31) Q2 (4/1 - 6/30) Q3 (7/1 - 9/30) Q4 (10/1 - 12/31)

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report

10. Check if this is a Termination Report

11. No Lobbying Income Activity

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

   INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
   Less than $5,000
   $5,000 or more $ 

   Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income for the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

   EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
   Less than $5,000
   $5,000 or more $ 10,000

   14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

   Method A: Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

   Method B: Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code

   Method C: Reporting amounts under section 6621(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature: Digitally Signed By: Sara Amundson

Date: 4/02/2015 4:25:38 PM

COE.WHITFIELDDISC.147006
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LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue areas code AN1

16. Specific lobbying issues

- Prevent All-Swine Tactics Act, to strengthen penalties and make the killing of hogs illegal
- Pianalto Canine Act, to end the use of animals in testing for cosmetic safety
- APPEA, to require federally funded research using farm animals to comply with the Animal Welfare Act
- PAPWS Act, to protect pets in domestic violence cases and ensure that shelters can accommodate pets
- Pets on Trains Act, to allow passengers to transport domesticated cats or dogs on certain Amtrak trains
- Western Great Lakes Wolf Management Act of 2015 to prohibit treatment of gray wolves in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan as endangered species
- H.R. 884 to delist wolves under the Endangered Species Act
- Sportmen's Act of 2015 which contains special provisions for trophy hunters and commercial trappers

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

- U.S. SENATE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above  ** Check if None
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional pages as needed.

15. General issue area code BUD
16. Specific lobbying issues
Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act and reauthorization to ensure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defend the inspection of humane slaughter facilities. To ensure language prioritizing themselves to animal rape resulting in the omission.

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies  Check if None
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above  Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.
20. Client new address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issues that no longer pertain

COE.WHITFIELDISC.147008
AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(city and state or country)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(city and state or country)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(city and state or country)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(city and state or country)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal place of business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal place of business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COE.WHITFIELDISC.147009
### LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Firms Are Required to Complete This Page

#### 1. Registrant Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self Employed Individual</th>
<th>Organized/lobbying Firm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 2. Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 3. Principal Place of Business (If different than line 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 4a. Contact Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone Number</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5. Senate ID: 69275559-12

#### 6. House ID: 4124010980

### TYPE OF REPORT

**B. Year:** 2015

- Q1 (1/1 - 3/31)
- Q2 (4/1 - 6/30)
- Q3 (7/1 - 9/30)
- Q4 (10/1 - 12/31)

#### 9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report

#### 10. Check if this is a Termination Report

#### 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity

### INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

#### 12. Lobbying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income for the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

#### 13. Organizations

| EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method:

- Method A. Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only
- Method B. Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code
- Method C. Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

---

**Signature**

[Digitally Signed By: Sara Ann Chadwick]

**Date:** 7/29/2015 4:17:07 PM

---

COE.WHITFIELDISC.147010
162

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue areas code ANI

16. Specific lobbying issues

- Prevent All-Sewing Tackles Act, to strengthen penalties and make the testing of horses illegal
- Frank R. Laubach Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act (HRCA reforms, § 697), to require the use of existing validated alternatives to animal testing where available, ensure that research and development of new methods is prioritized, and create a list of procedures prior to any new testing.
- Humane Cosmetics Act, to end the use of animal testing for cosmetics safety
- AWARE, to require federal funds to be used only if animals are used to comply with the Animal Welfare Act
- PACT Act, to strengthen the animal cruelty prohibitions and prohibit the same extreme acts of animal cruelty when they occur in interstate or foreign commerce
- PAYS Act, to protect pets in domestic violence cases and ensure that shelters can accommodate pets
- Safe to Train Act, to allow firefighters to transport deceased or injured dogs on certified Amtrak trains.
- SAFE Act, to ban horse slaughter in the United States and end the current export of horses abroad for horse meat consumption
- Western Great Lakes Wolf Management Act of 2015 to prohibit the intentional killing of gray wolves in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan as endangered species
- H.R. 864 to delist wolves under the Endangered Species Act
- Sportmen Act of 2015 which contains special provisions for trophy hunters and commercial trappers

17. Name(s) of Congress and Federal agencies Check if None

U.S. SENATE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issue listed on line 16 above Check if None

COE.WHITFIELDISKC.147011
163

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional pages as needed.

15. General issue areas code BUD

16. Specific lobbying issues

Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016
To secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defend the inspection of fruit slaughter facilities.

Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016
The Oglala amendment, which attempted to strike a harmful rider prohibiting the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from implementing new rules to address the problem of ivory sales in the United States. The Virginia amendment, which attempted to strike sections of the bill seeking to substantially weaken the Endangered Species Act for wolves and other species. And to prioritize funding for the Environmental Protection Agency Computational Toxicology Program.

Liber Health and Human Services and Education Act, 2016.
To secure increased funding over fiscal year 2015 for the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, which is funding research into nonanimal computational toxicological and organ-on-a-chip methods.

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Names of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above Check if None

________________________

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client's new address

Address

City

State

Zip Code

County

21. Client's new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City

State

Zip Code

County

22. New General description of client's business or activities

________________________

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COE.WHITFIELD.DSC.147012
## ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organizations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internet Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying services</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

COE.WHITFIELDISC.147013
LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. Registrant Name: Humane Society Legislative Fund
   Organization/Lobbying Firm: Self-Employed Individual

2. Address:
   Address: 2001 L Street, N.W., Suite 310
   City: Washington
   State: DC
   Zip Code: 20037
   County: USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2):

4. Contact Name
   a. Telephone Number
   b. Fax
   c. Email
   d. Senate ID No.
   e. House ID No.

5. Client Name: Humane Society Legislative Fund
   Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality:
   Senate ID No.: 490073859-17
   House ID No.: 4150410000

6. Type of Report:
   Type: 2015
   Q1 (1/1-3/31) Q2 (4/1-6/30) Q3 (7/1-9/30) Q4 (10/1-12/31)

7. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report:
   10. Check if this is a Termination Report:
   Termination Date:

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST COMPLETE EITHER LINE 12 OR LINE 13

12. Lobbying
   INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:
   Less than $5,000
   $5,000 or more
   Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income for the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizational
   EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period:
   Less than $5,000
   $5,000 or more
   $30,000 or more

14. REPORTING:
   Check box to indicate expense accounting method:
   Method A: Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only
   Method B: Reporting amounts under section 6032(e)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code
   Method C: Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature: Digitally Signed By: Sara Amends
Date: 10/30/2015 4:30:58 PM

COE.WHITFIELDISC.147014
166

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code ANI

16. Specific lobbying issues

- Prevent All Soring Tactics Act, to strengthen penalties and make the soring of horses illegal
- Frank R. Launenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act (TSCA Reform, S. 697), to require the use of existing validated alternatives to animal testing where available, ensure that research and development of new methods is prioritized and create a list of procedures prior to any new testing
- Humane Cosmetics Act, to end the use of animals in testing for cosmetics safety
- AWAKE, to require federally funded research using farm animals to comply with the Animal Welfare Act
- FACT Act, to strengthen the animal crush video law and prohibit those same extreme acts of animal cruelty when they occur in interstate or foreign commerce
- PAWS Act, to protect pets in domestic violence cases and ensure that shelters can accommodate pets
- Pets on Trains Act, to allow passengers to transport domesticated cats or dogs on certain Amtrak trains
- SAFE Act, to ban horse slaughter in the United States and end the current export of horses abroad for slaughter for human consumption
- Western Great Lakes Wolf Management Act of 2013 to prohibit treatment of gray wolves in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan as endangered species
- H.R. 884 to delist wolves under the Endangered Species Act

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

U.S. SENATE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above: [ ] Check if None

COE. WHITFIELD. DISC. 147015
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select this page only as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code (BDU)

16. Specific lobbying issues

| Agricultural, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016 | 
| To secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and to fund the inspection of horse slaughter facilities and to expedite the captive primate manufacturing protection rule. | 

| Labor Health and Human Services and Education Act, 2016 | 
| To secure increased funding over fiscal year 2015 for the National Cancer Institute’s Translational Science, which is funding research into stem cell therapies. | 

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

Check if None

| U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | 
|  | 

18. Name of each individual who served as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Check if None

| Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed. | 
|  | 

20. Client new address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City _________________________ State ______ Zip Code ________ Country ______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City _________________________ State ______ Zip Code ________ Country ______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. New General description of client’s business or activities

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| LOBBYIST UPDATE |

2. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ISSUE UPDATE |

COE.WHITFIELDISC.147016 |
24. General lobbying issue that no longer pursued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS**

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internet Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

| 1 | 2 | 3 |

**FOREIGN ENTITIES**

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of Contribution for Lobbying Activities</th>
<th>Ownership Percentage in Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client, or affiliated organization

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

COE.WHITFIELDISC.147017
LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. Registrant Name: Human Society Legislative Fund

2. Address
   Address: 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310
   City: Washington
   State: DC
   Zip Code: 20037
   Country: USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)
   City: State: Zip Code: Country:

4a. Contact Name: Frederick
   b. Telephone Number: 202-624-1770
   c. E-mail: frederick@humansociety.org

5. Senate ID#: 4050
   House ID#: 4191

6. Client Name: Human Society Legislative Fund

7. Client Type: Self
   Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality

8. Year: 2016
   Q1 (1/1 - 3/31)
   Q2 (4/1 - 6/30)
   Q3 (7/1 - 9/30)
   Q4 (10/1 - 12/31)

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report

10. Check if this is a Termination Report: Yes

11. No Lobbying Issue Activity

12. Lobbying

   INCOME: Relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were
   Less than $5,000
   $5,000 or more $ __________________
   Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all
   lobbying related income for the client (including all payments to
   the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of
   the client)

   EXPENSE: Relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were
   Less than $5,000
   $5,000 or more $ __________________

   14. REPORTING: Check box to indicate expense accounting method.
   See instructions for description of options.
   12 Method A: Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only
   12 Method B: Reporting amounts under section 6333(b)(3) of the
   12 Internal Revenue Code
   12 Method C: Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the
   12 Internal Revenue Code

13. Organizations

Signature: Digitally Signed By: Sara Amendola
Date: 2/6/2016
3:21:32 PM

COE.WHITFIELD.DISC.147018
170

170

170

170

170

170

170

170

170

170

170

170

170

LOBBYING ACTIVITY: Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

1. General issue area code ANI

16. Specific lobbying issues

Promote All Soring Tactics Act, to strengthen penalties and make the serving of horse illegal

Frank R. LaMarmor Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act (TSCA reform, S. 697), to require use of existing validated alternatives to animal testing where available, ensure that research and development of new methods is prioritized and create a basis of procedures prior to any new testing

Human Cosmetics Act, to end the use of animals in testing for cosmetics safety

AWARD, to require federally-funded research using farm animals to comply with the Animal Welfare Act

PACT Act, to strengthen the animal crush video law and prohibit those same extreme acts of animal cruelty when they occur in interstate or foreign commerce

PAWS Act, to protect pets in domestic violence cases and ensure that shelters can accommodate pets

Pepsi on Trains Act, to allow passengers to transport domesticated cats and dogs on certain Amtrak trains

SAFE Act, to ban horse slaughter in the United States and end the current export of horses abroad for slaughter for human consumption

The Cougar Amendment to H.R. 2822 (Interior Appropriations) to strike a rider aimed at blocking the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from proposing a rule to close down the commercial ivory trade in the United States

The Fugitive Amendment to H.R. 2822 (Interior Appropriations) to strike riders designed to delay ESA protections for the sage grouse, delay grey wolves in the Great Lakes states and Wyoming, and weaken protections for sagebrush bun

Western Great Lakes Wolf Management Act of 2015 to prohibit reintroduction of grey wolves in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan as endangered species

H.R. 884 to delist wolves under the Endangered Species Act

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position(s)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Amundson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issue listed on line 16 above: **Check if None**

COE.WHITFIELD.DSC.147019
171

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code BUD

16. Specific lobbying issues

The omnibus funding bill (H.R. 2522), which addressed a broad range of animal welfare concerns including animals in federal research facilities, funding for the NIHNCATS, Class B dealers, primate research, horse slaughter, wild horse and burro population management, HIV testing, endangered species, wildlife trafficking, and companion animal issues.

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

Check if None

1.5. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issue areas listed on line 16 above

Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address

City ____________________________ State ______ Zip Code __________ Country ______

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City ____________________________ State ______ Zip Code __________ Country ______

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

COE.WHITFIELDISC.147020
### AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internet Address:

```
```

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal place of business</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client, or affiliated organization:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COE.WHITFIELDISC.147021
EXHIBIT 8
Yes, I am assuming the changes would be made in markup.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 7, 2011, at 3:26 PM, "Fredrick, Corp." <fredrick@frederickcorp.com> wrote:

The problem is that the bill has already been introduced and no changes to it can be made. We could suggest that they make the change during a markup. We'll go ahead and work closely with him and get on his radar screen about making this change during the markup phase. I do not anticipate the Committee will be meeting this bill for a couple of months at the earliest.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 7, 2011, at 1:02 PM, "Fredrick, Corp." <fredrick@frederickcorp.com> wrote:

Since you are working with Chip on the bill, you know that he added the new words "if appropriate" after the mention of shelter dogs as an option? I understand why he removed "preferred" below "option" but he added two words after the list of us.

Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 7, 2011, at 2:44 PM, "Fredrick, Corp." <fredrick@frederickcorp.com> wrote:

Thanks, Fredrick. We've been talking to Chip about this bill and working through the new repeal rules regarding introducing legislation and constitutional authority.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 7, 2011, at 2:19 PM, "Fredrick, Corp." <fredrick@frederickcorp.com> wrote:

FYI

Copies.

Note that the pilot is 7 years instead of 3 and includes EDV/2IL, then no requirement to ensure the program produces reliable conclusions. Final later.

Sent from my iPhone
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The Humane Society of the United States applauds Rep. Grimm for Seeking to Help Veterans and Shelter Dogs


With the support of original sponsors Reps. Michael Michael, D-Mass., Pete King, R-N.Y., and Leonard Lance, R-N.J., HR 123 would create a pilot program for training dogs to help treat Vietnam veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder or other post-deployment mental health conditions. The bill is needed so that the program will use the dog training process lead to provide companionship benefits to veterans in need for service animals for their disabled veterans. Another feature of the bill is that it would provide support for the animal welfare community so that it will allow shelters dogs to be served in this important part of the program.

In May, the House passed H.R. 123, a similar bill directing the VA Department of Veterans Affairs to create a pilot program training dogs for therapy, but that legislation did not pass the Senate and failed to include the shelter dog provision. This year's version of the legislation is not only good for seniors who might otherwise be euthanized, but it also has the potential to bring a more broadly involved approach to the program and save tax dollars, as purpose-bred dogs cost on average $12,000 per animal.

"This bill is about veteran helping veterans," said Rep. Grimm. "To many veterans and women returning from combat with P.T.S.D. my legislation provides an opportunity to make them veterans through the process of training service dogs. These dogs — many of which I hope will be served in veteran shelters, will find their homes in physically disabled veterans to assist with their daily activities. As a veteran and animal lover, I am proud to make this my first bill in Congress."

Injured soldiers returning from war often experience a profound lack of purpose and focus. Skills necessary to service in a warzone can become a handicap when transitioning back into everyday life. Studies show on average it is much harder and physically and emotionally challenging for returning service members on a path of wellness, so these new programs and new opportunities could be life-saving plans for thousands of U.S. veterans.

"One veteran said and deserves every opportunity to heal. This innovative legislation given the wonderful dogs in shelters a chance to live and to now be given the chance and resources to serve the millions in need when they were here," said Wayne Pacelle, president and CEO of The HSUS.

Located programs have already demonstrated the powerful bonds of dog training for veterans. Celebrity dog trainer Torey Kolter teaches Operation Blessing's Operation Blessing's® dog training program in train and turn the training of veterans and service members. In her program, happy dogs are used to teach wounded military personal new skills, provide companionship, and enhance the healing process.

Torey Kolter's "Dog Tag" program brings together wounded soldiers recovering at Walter Reed Army Medical Center with handlers dogs from WDF's shelter. This demonstrated program teaches the basics of dog training, not only providing a focused and structured environment for those suffering from PTSD and other mental health conditions, but also providing them with a sense of purpose. Once, a participant can train the handler's dog is then placed in a home with a veteran in need. Together, they can heal from the emotional wounds while giving the dog a new home.
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EXHIBIT 9
Frequently Asked Questions about H.R. 3798, the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2012

Why should the federal government establish standards for the egg industry?
Because the alternative is a growing patchwork of inconsistent state standards that will restrict interstate movement of eggs, distort competition and put many farmers out of business. The United Egg Producers (UEP), which represents 88% of U.S. egg production, favors a shift to enriched colony cages, similar to those adopted by the European egg industry. However, only through federal action can a uniform, mandatory national standard be achieved. This proposal would provide farmers with ample time to make investments in improved housing systems, in intervals, over the next 15 to 18 years, with the assurances that all will face the same requirements by the end of the phase in period and that the new equipment will be recognized as adequate under federal law. For some facilities, the transition can be accomplished during the normal course of replacing aged equipment.

Does this bill affect other forms of agriculture?
No. This proposal deals only with egg-laying hens, and has no impact on others in animal agriculture. It amends the Egg Products Inspection Act of 1970, a federal statute that already regulates the sale of eggs and does not reach into other agricultural products. This is a matter of self-determination for the egg industry. If this legislation is blocked by other livestock organizations unfamiliar with the science or economics of egg production, egg farmers face the very real prospect of going out of business. For egg producers, the stakes couldn't be higher.

Does it set a precedent that other agricultural products might be regulated next?
No. Other sectors of animal agriculture have long enjoyed uniform federal standards, and there is no precedent here. Eggs have always been regulated differently from other animal agriculture industries—for instance, the Food and Drug Administration enforces on-farm food safety regulations for eggs but not for other livestock sectors. For decades, the meat and poultry industries have insisted on strict preemption of state laws under the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMI), the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and other laws such as the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act. The egg industry should have the same right to uniform federal standards as other agriculture sectors. The preemption language in H.R. 3798 mirrors that in the FMI.
Moreover, the unique coalescing of goals shared by egg producers and animal welfare advocates does not in any way bind Congress to adopt reforms for another industry that isn’t similarly seeking such reforms.

Are these standards based on sound science?
Yes. The leading scientists familiar with the egg industry embrace the legislation and urge a transition to enriched colony cages. Dr. Jeffrey D. Armstrong, an animal scientist and president of California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo, calls the proposal the “best all around” for hen welfare, and says further that “the science behind colonies is solid.” UEP’s scientific advisory committee, comprising experts from Purdue University, the American Veterinary Medical Association and other prestigious institutions, has reviewed enriched cages and has noted that they combine the advantages of both conventional cages and cage-free systems.
How does this bill advance animal welfare?
Scientific research shows that increasing the amount of space per hen and providing the hens with environmental enrichments (e.g., nesting boxes, perches, and scratching areas) improves their welfare, which is advantageous for hens and producers alike. The UEP already disallows feed withdrawal molting among UEP Certified members, as science shows that it is detrimental to hens’ welfare. And high ammonia rates in poultry houses can lead to respiratory infection in hens and people, so controlling ammonia levels is important for the health of hens and producers.

Will there be any cost to the federal government?
The legislation is not expected to create any new government programs or add substantial costs to the federal government. The Egg Products Inspection Act of 1970 already regulates the sale of eggs and egg products in interstate commerce, and this legislation would amend that four-decades-old federal statute. The egg industry would be responsible for financing the investments in new housing structures for its egg-laying hens, spending an anticipated $4 billion of its own capital over the next 15 to 18 years. USDA would conduct a survey to determine whether the changes are being implemented, but it would not have substantial costs for administration or enforcement.

Will the cost of eggs increase?
Studies show the improved system has only a modest cost differential from the current system, and since the changes would be phased in over the next 15 to 18 years, many during the normal course of replacing aged equipment, any consumer cost increases are expected to be minor. In fact, studies show that enriched colony cages can be better for production than conventional cages, as the hens have lower mortality and higher productivity. These improvements are confirmed in a recent [1/19/12] Feedstuffs report on an American egg producer using enriched colony cages: “In the colony house, mortality was 4.22%, better than the 7.63% in the conventional cage; eggs laid per hen were 423, versus 355; average case weight was 49.4 lb., versus 47.9 lb.”

Why doesn’t the egg industry just adopt standards on its own?
The UEP plans to incorporate these proposed standards into its own UEP Certified guidelines, but these standards are voluntary for producers. Federal legislation is the only way to ensure a uniform baseline for laying hen standards within the U.S. egg industry, and it’s the only way to preempt the state laws that call for conflicting standards.

Why should we preempt the state laws on this issue?
Increasingly, these state laws are being applied to out-of-state eggs. Eggs are a national commodity. Egg producers need a level playing field nationwide, and need certainty about what standards are going to be required in the coming years so they can make the necessary investments in their businesses—not face different, costly rules in all 50 states, which is where we are heading if we don’t pass this legislation. It’s a hardship on farmers to have different standards in different states, especially since many egg producers sell across the country to different markets in different regions. Many retail purchasers, such as national grocery store and fast food restaurant chains, also need supplies of eggs from multiple states. Federal legislation is the only way to ensure a level playing field for all producers, and provide stability for the U.S. egg market.

Is this consistent with the vision of the U.S. Constitution?
Yes, absolutely. The framers of the Constitution understood that varying state laws created challenges to trade that threatened a viable national economy. This was, in fact, one of the reasons for the Philadelphia convention of 1787 that produced our present Constitution. The framers adopted the Commerce Clause to enable Congress to establish federal laws preventing undue barriers to interstate commerce among states, as can occur with patchwork state legislation.
EXHIBIT 10
EXHIBIT 11
Justice and Cory, we’ve had some internal discussion here, and have come up with a modification to the plan I told you yesterday. We can say now that the co-sponsorship of the PAST Act will be counted on the 2019 Human Rights Scorecard. I’d like to have it at that, rather than re-reaffirming the veto possibility. We can deal with the question of scoring a floor later, which we get to that point. Thank you.

From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: Finalizing RE: Sourcing PAST Act

[Redacted]

Justice and Cory, my House staff and I can tell officers that the 2019 Human Rights Scorecard will count co-sponsorship of the PAST Act, as long as it is recorded there, in which case that vote will be counted (but we need to confirm all possible ways to get the floor).

FYI, that’s the wording I need you to put on the egg bill, another very high priority for our organization. Thanks so much for raising this question to us, and for helping us to be able to do that.

From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Sourcing PAST Act

[Redacted]

Great, thank you, again.

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Sourcing PAST Act

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Thanks, Justin – I will share your question with my legislative team, and let you know ASAP.

From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Sourcing PAST Act

[Redacted]

Have had a number of offices, both Democrat and Republicans, inquire about the HSIC scoring this bill for co-sponsorship. I know you mentioned initially that it does not consider what they’ll be scoring until August, but for the sake of gaining more Democratic support in rapid fashion I hope that we may potentially get this bill on the suspenseful calendar, which would enhance the likelihood of scoring this.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,

[Redacted]
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From: Hicks, Cory  
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 9:48 PM  
To: Corine Harrison-Whitfield  
Subject: Re: Memphis Commercial Appeal: "Memphis representative to push for banning of soring"

That’s a bad idea. Pork producers were just in today lobbying against it. Cattleman don’t like it and farm bureau doesn’t either.

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 12, 2012, at 9:35 PM, "Corine Harrison-Whitfield" <humanesociety.org> wrote:

> Ed just decided to sign on to the Egg Bill. I advised against it....
> Sent from my iPhone
> On Sep 12, 2012, at 9:32 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:
> No. She did not. She understands the sensitivities.
> Sent from my iPad
> On Sep 12, 2012, at 8:02 PM, "Corine Harrison-Whitfield" <humanesociety.org> wrote:
>
> Cory, 
> Old Corry make reference to the HSUS in Ed’s press release as this article seems to suggest?
> Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 12, 2012, at 8:14 PM, "Michael Marquardt" <humanesociety.org> wrote:


Memphis representative to push for banning of soring By Bartholomew
Sullivan Wednesday, September 12, 2012 WASHINGTON — Soring, the practice of putting irritating chemicals on a horse’s legs to make it prance, would be prohibited if a law U.S. Rep. Steve Cohen plans to introduce becomes law. The Humane Society of the United States has condemned the practice as cruel. In a statement circulated by both Tennessee Democrat Cohen’s and Kentucky Republican Congressman Ed Whitfield’s offices, they describe soring as “an abusive practice used by some horse trainers in the Tennessee Walking Horse Industry.”

Mike Holbrook, president of the East Tennessee Walking Horse Association, said Wednesday he was aware of some controversy regarding the practice raised by the U.S. Department of Agriculture but was not familiar with the proposed legislation.
Cohen and Whitfield have scheduled a news conference Thursday to discuss amendments to the 1970 Horse Protection Act.
EXHIBIT 13
From: Miss [Redacted] (humanities.org)
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 11:19 PM
To: Sue [Redacted]; [Redacted]; [Redacted]; [Redacted]; [Redacted]; [Redacted]; [Redacted]
Cc: Michael [Redacted]; [Redacted]; [Redacted]; [Redacted]
Subject: [Redacted]

Dear [Redacted],
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EXHIBIT 14
EXHIBIT 15
From the President

Dear Friends,

The first year of the 115th Congress brought encouraging advances for animals, despite tough political and economic times, but also deeply troubling setbacks for human, animal, and environmental causes.

With many initiatives focused on deficit reduction, it was a challenging climate to seek funding increases. Nevertheless, thanks to continued lobbying by HSIU and our supporters, Congress still approved several record level boosts for key animal welfare programs in fiscal 2017. They included:

- A nearly 40 percent jump ($34,666,000 increase) for the USDA to crack down on horse racing, the illegal use of caustic chemicals and sharp objects to treat the hooves and legs of show horses and donkeys or to exaggerate and high-step gait for competition. Funds will allow better enforcement of the Horse Protection Act, which had been stuck at a woefully inadequate $100,000 since 1971.

- A 17 percent jump ($123,31 million increase) for the animal welfare activities of the USDA’s Investigative and Enforcement Services, whose cases include those under the Animal Welfare Act and Horse Protection Act.

Congress also maintained funding levels at $44.8 million for the veterinary medicine loan forgiveness program, which helps ease the shortage of veterinarians practicing in rural areas and in government programs. Wildlife protection programs were included in the at least $2.5 million budgeted to implement the labor and environmental provisions of five trade agreements with Central America, Peru, and the Dominican Republic. And thanks to the work of the Center for Biological Diversity and others, another $4.3 million has been budgeted to study and control white-nose syndrome, a lethal disease that has had a devastating impact on millions of bats in North America.

In addition to funding animal welfare programs, the appropriations committees also included helpful report language expressing concern about a number of important issues, such as humane slaughter, animal fighting, antibiotics in animal agriculture, pet theft, and alternatives to animal testing.

In another encouraging step, the House unanimously approved the Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act to create a pilot program in which veterans suffering from post-deployment mental health conditions train dogs, including those from shelters, as a form of therapy. The dogs would then go to help veterans with disabilities.

The Army also agreed to halt testing nerve agents on monkeys, and HSIU worked with key members of the House Armed Services Committee to ensure an administratively eliminated prohibition against cruelty to service members. We are hopeful that the Department of Defense will soon finalize a proposal to explicitly ban acts of animal cruelty, which would cover other-than-military best practices.

As part of the USDA’s final funding bill, Congress agreed to prohibit abattoirs from paying subsidy direct payments to millions of chickens or leg chickens with an average adjusted grain income in excess of $1 million. [Referring to a program that gives tax breaks to farmers who use electric fencing to keep animals in.] Congress also included a provision that keeps animals from being moved on long-haul buses.

As part of the USDA’s final funding bill, Congress agreed to prohibit abattoirs from paying subsidy direct payments to millions of chickens or leg chickens with an average adjusted grain income in excess of $1 million. [Referring to a program that gives tax breaks to farmers who use electric fencing to keep animals in.] Congress also included a provision that keeps animals from being moved on long-haul buses.

Thanks to another amendment approved in July, an anti-wildlife rider that in the committee bill funding the Interior Department was removed. The “extinction rider,”
would have prevented the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from implementing some of the most crucial sections of the Endangered Species Act, such as protecting new species and designating critical habitat for currently listed species.

The final funding bill for the Interior Department did once again contain a provision barring the Bureau of Land Management from killing healthy, unadopted wild horses and burros or selling them for slaughter.

Unfortunately, Congress also took some adverse actions for animals, such as removing Endangered Species Act protections for gray wolves in the Northern Rockies. This delisting of a species by congressional fiat opened the door for reckless sport hunting and trapping in Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, and it sets a dangerous precedent for future politically motivated attacks on the ESA.

The House also defeated an amendment to cut $11 million from the USDA's cruel, and dangerously ineffective lethal predator control program. The program routinely uses tax dollars to kill wildlife through poisoning, shooting from helicopters, and other costly, cruel, and indiscriminate methods that also kill pets and endangered species—and that don't work effectively, since other predators move into the vacant territory. According to USDA, less than 1 percent of livestock are killed by predators. Nonlethal, cost-effective, and humane control methods are available, yet the federal government continues to waste millions of tax dollars on inhumane killing methods.

And in November, Congress failed to renew a longtime safeguard against horse slaughter in the United States. Included in the Agriculture Appropriations bill every year since 2005, the provision had barred the USDA from conducting inspections at or approving meat from horse slaughter plants. The language was incorporated into the House Agriculture Appropriations bill in May, but it was dropped in the final House-Senate conference negotiations in November. Americans don't eat horses, and they don't want them inhumanely killed, shrink-wrapped, and sent to Belgium or Japan for a high-priced appetizer. Nor do they want to have to subsidize such a cruel industry.

In sum, the 112th Congress is a work in progress. While we made some critical breakthroughs for animals, particularly on the funding front, we also suffered some setbacks. Many important bills are poised for action in the second session, and congressional support is also putting pressure on the federal agencies to take action for animal protection.

Please use this scorecard to evaluate how your representative and senators have done so far this session, and we hope you'll join us as we work harder than ever to advance an animal protection agenda in Congress in 2012.

Sincerely,

Michael Markarian
President
Humane Society Legislative Fund

For a more detailed review of last year's session—including which legislators led the way on pro-animal measures—check out "The 2011 Congressional Year in Review for Animals" at hsif.org/humane-scorecard.
Halftime through this two-year congressional session, a number of animal protection issues are still making their way through the process. HSUS helped build critical momentum in 2011 for issues including animal fighting, puppy mills, horse slaughter, and chimps in research, and all of those bills now have large numbers of bipartisan cosponsors.

In addition to those covered in the pages ahead, the following bills also avoid action in 2012.

Horse Transportation Safety Act (S.1281): To prohibit the use of double-decker vehicles to transport horses in interstate commerce.

Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act (H.R. 1733/S. 886): To prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horse racing, which jeopardizes the health and safety of both horses and jockeys, creates an unfair playing field, and corrupts the integrity of the sport.

Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments: To phase out horses battery cages for all 240 million hens being held in the U.S., provide them with nearly twice as much space, mandate labels on egg cartons to inform consumers about how the eggs were produced, and make other needed reforms.

Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act (H.R. 965/S. 1211): To phase out the routine nontherapeutic use of antibiotics in farm animals—a common practice to promote growth and compensate for uncontrolled, unsanitary conditions on factory farms—in order to retain the effectiveness of antibiotics for treating sick people and animals.

Captive Primate Safety Act (S. 1324): To prohibit interstate and foreign commerce in primates for the pet trade.

Anti-Wildlife Bills: The House Natural Resources Committee has passed several harmful pieces of legislation, including H.R. 3069, to allow the killing of sea lions in the Columbia River basin because they eat a tiny fraction of the fish there; H.R. 991, a bailout for 41 big game hunters who want to import polar bear trophies into this country from Canada; and H.R. 2535, which would prioritize sport hunting over federal lands at the expense of other land users. Opponents on the committee challenged these harmful bills and laid important groundwork to stop them in the full House and in the Senate before becoming law.

In 2012, HSUS will also continue working on the following issues:

Animal Testing: HSUS is pushing to bring more efficient molecular, cellular, and computational tools to the federal government’s National Toxicology Program. Shifting away from outdated, unreliable, costly and time-consuming animal tests would save at least $300 million over the next decade.

Large Constrictor Snakes: The Obama administration has been denying action on a long-standing rule to list nine invasive species of dangerous giant snakes as “injurious” under the Lacey Act, which would ban their import into the U.S. or transportation between states. Pythons, boa constrictors, anacondas, and other snakes imported for the pet trade suffer at every step of their journey, and their import jeopardizes public safety and native ecosystems. If the Obama administration were to use its authority, it could address all nine species of snakes. HSUS will continue to work in Congress for a comprehensive policy.

Wild Horses: The House approved a $2 million cut in Bureau of Land Management funding for the agency’s wild horse and burro management program. The purpose of the cut was to call attention to serious problems in the BLM’s program of roundups and long-term holding in federally owned pens, and to the availability of a more fiscally responsible alternative involving humane fertility control on the range. The cut was proposed as an amendment to H.R. 1, which was ultimately defeated in the Senate, but the House action helped spur BLM to announce its intention to overhaul the program and modestly increase plans for using immunocontraception. HSUS will continue pushing for a more humane, effective program that could save taxpayers $100 million over 10 years.
Puppy Mills

A "f" indicates cosponsorship of S. 717 to crack down on abusive puppy mills in the United States, where breeding dogs are often stacked in wire cages for years to produce litter after litter. The legislation will close a loophole in the Animal Welfare Act by requiring that commercial breeders who sell 50 or more puppies per year directly to consumers online or by other means be licensed and inspected, just as breeders who supply to pet stores already must be. It will also require that breeding dogs at commercial facilities be allowed to exercise daily.


STATUS: Pending in Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Chimpanzees Warehoused in Laboratories

A "f" indicates cosponsorship of S. 610 to phase out the use of chimpanzees in invasive research, retire the approximately 390 federally owned chimpanzees to sanctuary, and codify the current NIMH maximum on government-funded chimpanzee breeding. Chimpanzees have proven to be poor research models for human diseases, as only a given time around 80 to 90 percent of chimpanzees in U.S. labs are even used in research. Simply warehousing these in barren, costly laboratory cages is problematic. This legislation would save American taxpayers an estimated $50 million annually, 10 years, and is much less expensive to cure the chimpanzees at sanctuary, where they live in a natural setting.


STATUS: Pending in Committee on Environment and Public Works

Horse Slaughter

A "f" indicates cosponsorship of S. 1176 to prohibit the knowing and intentional possession, disposition, transport, purchase, sale, delivery, or receipt of a horse for slaughter for human consumption. More than 115,000 American horses have been purchased for this year by "killer buyers," who offer unaffordable legitimate adopters and rescue groups. They are then trucked long distances to a cruel death in slaughterhouses in Mexico and Canada that cater to the palates of European diners.


STATUS: The amendment passed 84-13 in October and was incorporated into PL 112-55 in November.

Funding Letter

A "f" indicates that a member was one of 14 Senators who cosigned a group letter or submitted an individual request to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in May, asking for funding for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act, Horse Protection Act, Humane Methods of Slaughter Act, and federal animal fighting law, as well as for grants to address the needs of animals in disasters and to ease a shortage of veterinarians in rural and inner-city areas and USDA positions through student loan forgiveness. Subcommittee and committee leaders—Sens. Herb Kohl, D-Wis., and Ray Blunt, R-Mo., David Isley, D-Hawaii, and Independents Tom Coburn, R-Okla.—denied the letters because they reviewed them as reasonably because they were very responsive to these requests.


STATUS: Significant increases provided for animal welfare accounts in PL 112-55 in November.

Leaders

A "f" indicates that the member led as a prime sponsor of pro-animal legislation (including those not scored on this chart).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Pr</th>
<th>Fudg</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Sessions, Jeff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelby, Richard</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Begich, Mark</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murkowski, Lisa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Kyl, Jon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCain, John</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Boozman, John</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pryor, Mark</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Boxer, Barbara</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feinstein, Diane</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Bennett, Michael</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Udall, Mark</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Blumenthal, Richard</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lieberman, Joseph</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Carper, Thomas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coons, Chris</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Nelson, Bill</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubio, Marco</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Chambliss, Saxby</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isakson, Johnny</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Akaka, Daniel</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inouye, Daniel</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Crapo, Michael</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risch, Jim</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Durbin, Richard</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kirk, Mark</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Chart

- SP Prime Sponsor
- ✓ Took pro-animal position through cosponsorship of a bill, vote, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal legislation
- X Took anti-animal position on a vote
- NV Did not vote due to absence or abstention

Note: In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Pro-Animal Position</th>
<th>Anti-Animal Position</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Coons, Dan (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lugar, Richard (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Grassley, Charles (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harkin, Tom (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Moran, Jerry (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roberts, Pat (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>McConnell, Mitch (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul, Rand (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Landrieu, Mary (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vitter, David (R)</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Collins, Susan (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snowe, Olympia (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Cardin, Benjamin (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mikulski, Barbara (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Brown, Scott (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerry, John (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Levin, Carl (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stabenow, Debbie (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Franken, Al (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Klobuchar, Amy (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Cochran, Thad (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wicker, Roger (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Blunt, Roy (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCaskill, Claire (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Baucus, Max (D)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tester, Jon (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Chart:
- **SP Prime Sponsor**
- ✓ Took pro-animal position through copresenship of a bill, a vote, signing a letter, or leading an anti-animal legislation
- X Took anti-animal position on a vote
- **NV Did not vote due to absence or abstention**
- + Scored 100% and also led as a prime sponsor of pro-animal legislation
- # Filled seat during term
- **RR Resigned during term**

Note: In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Senator Name</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Pro-Animal</th>
<th>Co-Sponsorship</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Filled</th>
<th>Resigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Johanns, Mike (R)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Nelson, Ben (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Ensign, John (R)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Heller, Dean (R)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Reid, Harry (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Ayotte, Kelly (R)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Shaheen, Jeanne (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Lautenberg, Frank (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Menendez, Robert (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Bingaman, Jeff (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Udall, Tom (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Gillibrand, Kristen (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Schumer, Charles (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Burr, Richard (R)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Hagan, Kay (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Conrad, Kent (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Hoeven, John (R)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Brown, Sherrod (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Portman, Rob (R)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Coburn, Tom (R)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Inhofe, James (R)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Merkley, Jeff (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Wyden, Ron (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Casey, Robert (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Toomey, Pat (R)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>H偏向x, Pat (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Reed, Jack (D)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Chart

- SP Prime Sponsor
- ✔ Took pro-animal position through cosponsorship of a bill, a vote, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal legislation
- X Took anti-animal position on a vote
- NV Did not vote due to absence or abstention
- + Scored 100% and also led as a prime sponsor of pro-animal legislation
- # Filled seat during term
- ## Resigned during term

Note: In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sponsorship</th>
<th>Cosponsorship</th>
<th>Voting Attendance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>DeMint, Tim (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Graham, Lindsey (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Johnson, Tim (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thune, John (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Alexander, Lamar (D)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Corker, Bob (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Cornyn, John (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Hutchison, Kay Bailey (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Hatch, Orrin (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Lee, Mike (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Leach, Patrick (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Sanders, Bernard (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Warner, Mark (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Webb, James (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Carper, Joe (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Murray, Patty (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Manchin, Joe (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Rockefeller, John (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Johnson, Ron (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Koester, Herb (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Barrasso, John (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.J.</td>
<td>End, Michael (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Chart:
- SP: Prime Sponsor
- Checkmark indicates position on a vote
- X: Took anti-animal position on a vote
- NV: Did not vote due to absence or abstention
- +: Scored 100% and also led as a prime sponsor of pro-animal legislation
- #: Filled seat during term
- ##: Resigned during term

Note: In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
Puppy Mills

A † indicates cosponsorship of H.R. 830 to crack down on abusive puppy mills in the United States, where breeding dogs are often kept in wire crates for weeks to produce litter after litter. The legislation will close a loophole in the Animal Welfare Act by requiring that commercial breeders who sell 50 or more puppies per year directly to consumers online or by other means be licensed and inspected, just as breeders who supply pet stores already must be. It will also require that breeding dogs in commercial facilities be allowed to exercise daily.


STATUS: Pending in Committee on Agriculture. 195 cosponsors as of Feb. 11.

Chimpanzees Warehoused in Laboratories

A † indicates cosponsorship of H.R. 1513 to phase out use of chimpanzees in invasive research, retire the approximately 690 federally owned chimpanzees to sanctuary, and codify the current NIMH moratorium on government-funded chimpanzee breeding. Chimpanzees have proven to be poor research models for human diseases, so at any given time about 80 to 90 percent of chimpanzees in U.S. labs are not even used in research but simply warehoused in barren and costly laboratory cages. This legislation would save American taxpayers an estimated $500 million over 20 years, as it’s much less expensive to care for chimpanzees at sanctuaries, where they live with other chimpanzees in a natural setting.


Animal Fighting Spectators

A † indicates cosponsorship of H.R. 2450 to establish misdemeanor penalties for knowingly attending an organized animal fight and felonious penalties for bringing a minor to such a fight. While Congress has strengthened the federal animal fighting law in recent years, this bill will close a remaining gap—prohibiting spectating, as 49 states have done, and helping take the profit out of illegal animal fighting. Spectators are more than mere observers at animal fights; they are participants and accomplices who enable the crime.

Horse Slaughter

A † indicates cosponsorship of H.R. 2966 to prohibit the knowing and intentional possession, shipment, transport, purchase, sale, delivery, or receipt of a horse for slaughter for human consumption, alone or in combination with other horses, who often males, veterans, and rescue groups. They are then trucked long distances to a cruel death in slaughterhouses in Mexico and Canada that cater to the palates of European diners.

SPONSORS: Reps. Dan Burton, R-Ind., Jemica Schakowsky, D-Ill.

STATUS: Pending in Committees on Energy and Commerce and on Agriculture. 177 cosponsors as of Jan. 11.

Cap on Agriculture Subsidies

A † indicates a vote for an amendment to cap agriculture subsidies in order to limit huge giveaways to extremely wealthy farmers at a time of record-high prices. Massive factor farms rely on cheap animal feed, which is supported by these excessive subsidies, and some factory farms are themselves direct recipients of subsidies. Members receive credit if they voted for either of both of the following: Blumenauer amendment to H.R. 1 to cap subsidies at $20,000 or Pfalek amendment to H.R. 2112 to cap eligibility for direct payments to farmers with an adjusted gross income of $250,000 or less.


STATUS: The Blumenauer amendment was defeated (45-246) on February, 11, 2012.
and the Flake amendment was defeated 186-238 in June, but a refined Senate amendment was incorporated into P.L. 112-55 in November.

**Lethal Predator Control**

A ✓ indicates a vote for an amendment to H.R. 2112 to cut $1.1 million from the $7.2 million allocated to the USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service for operations of the Wildlife Services Division, and began to run in wasted subsistence for lethal predator control designed to suppress private ranchers. Wildlife Services addresses conflicts with predators mostly through lethal methods such as poisoning, trapping, and shooting from helicopters. These cruel and indiscriminate methods also kill pets and endangered species—and they don’t work effectively, since other predators move into the vacant territory. Non-lethal strategies that are more effective and cost-efficient are available, such as the use of grazed animals and changes in animal husbandry practices.

**SPONSORS:** Reps. John Campbell, R-Calif.; Peter DeFazio, D-Ore.

**STATUS:** The amendment was defeated 212-297 in July.

**Endangered Species Act**

A ✓ indicates a vote for an amendment to S. 3184 to remove a devastating anti-endangered-rider in the committee bill that would have prevented the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from protecting any new or designating critical habitat for currently listed species—affecting canceling endangered species protection in areas and preventing help for any of the more than 200 candidates species that the agency had already determined warrant protection under the ESA.

**SPONSORS:** Reps. Niki Tsongas, D-Mass.; Mike Thompson, D-Calif.; Michael Fitzpatrick, R-Pa.; G. K. Butterfield, D-N.C.

**STATUS:** The amendment to remove the rider passed successfully 234-202 in July.

**Funding Letter**

A ✓ indicates that a member was one of 125 representatives who signed a group letter or submitted an individual report to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in April, asking funds for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act, Horse Protection Act, Humane Methods of Slaughter Act, and federal animal fighting law, as well as for programs to address the needs of animals in disasters and to ease a shortage of veterinarians in rural and inner-city areas and USDA positions through student loan forgiveness.

**SPONSORS:** Reps. Chris Smith, R-N.J.; Earl Blumenauer, D-Ore.

**STATUS:** Significant increases provided for animal welfare accounts in P.L. 112-55 in November.

**Leaders**

A ✓ indicates that the member led as a prime sponsor of pro-animal legislation (including items not scored on this chart).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Key to House Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller, George (D-78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoleon, Grace (D-320)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nugent, Dina (R-507)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters, Nancy (D-38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, Laura (D-375)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robach, Donna (R-698)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle-Alber, Leslea (D-340)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce, Ed (R-492)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S我相信, Linda (D-363)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez, Louisa (D-470)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiff, Adam (D-258)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman, Brad (D-376)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spierer, Jackie (D-326)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark, Kirby H. (“Wally”) (D-128)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Mike (D-16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres, Michelle (D-300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wexman, Henry (D-308)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodylation, Lynn (D-48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altogether:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to House Vote:**
- **SP**: Prime Sponsor
- **X**: Took pro-animal position through correspondence, a floor vote, an amendment, a group letter, or other means.
- **P**: Took anti-animal position on a vote.
- **NV**: Did not vote due to absence or abstention.
- ***:** Scored 100% and led on pro-animal legislation.
- **F**: Filled seat during term.
- **R**: Resigned during term.

**Note:** In some cases, legislative must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hartzler, Vicky (R-9th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays, Sanford (R-2nd)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Paul (R-18th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginge, Rich (R-11th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K一人, Tom (R-OH)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Troy (R-48th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankin, Lamar (R-16th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, John (R-63rd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, Tom (R-OH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Austin (R-RS)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, David (R-12th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wee, Lezmond (D-2nd)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodall, Rob (R-18th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oort, Madeleine (D-6th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velasquez, Cahn (D-62nd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Moe (D-3rd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador, Paul (R-16th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson, Mike (R-2nd)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, Judy (R-18th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casella, Jerry (D-12th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross, Danny (D-7th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, Robert (D-12th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutierrez, Louis (D-49th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulsey, Randy (D-44th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, John (D-2nd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Tom (R-12th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Adam (R-19th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaminski, Dan (D-3rd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harkins, Donald (R-16th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogle, Mike (R-19th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rokita, Peter (R-8th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russo, Beth (D-16th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schelp, Jamie (D-3rd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schelz, Ed (R-17th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schott, Aaron (R-18th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman, John (R-19th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stahl, Joe (R-6th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan, Larry (R-18th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton, Dan (R-10th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson, Andy (D-7th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connolly, Joe (D-3rd)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pence, Mike (R-8th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooks, Ted (R-6th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase, Mark (R-24th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoder, Peter (D-18th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Luke (R-28th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browder, Leonard (D-2nd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady, Bruce (D-18th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Sam (R-8th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham, Tom (R-48th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebman, Dave (R-22nd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aramco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hvitberg, Tim (R-16th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, Lynne (R-24th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompeo, Michael (R-49th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puckett, Kevin (R-22nd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to House Chart**

- **SP**: Prime Sponsor
- ✔: Took pro-animal position through sponsoring a bill, voting, signing a group letter, or leading anti-animal legislation.
- X: Took anti-animal position on a vote.
- ✔: Put a statement in Congressional Record acknowledging voting error (and notified HSA).
- ✔: Scored 100% and led pro-animal legislation.
- ✔: Filed oat during term.
- ✔: Resigned during term.
- ✔: As a rule, delegates from U.S. Territories cannot vote on bills or amendments on the House floor.
- ✔: As a rule, the Speaker of the House does not vote.

**Notes:** In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as absence due to illness or the birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kentucky</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashcroft, Ben (D-8th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Geoff (R-4th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dye, Brent (R-2nd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Harold (R-5th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitfield, Ed (D-1st)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmuth, John (D-3rd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to House Chart**

- SP: Prime Sponsor
- ✔: Took pro-animal position through cosponsoring a bill, voting, signing a group letter, or leading on pro-animal legislation.
- X: Took anti-animal position on a vote
- ✔: Did not vote due to absence or abstention
- *: Put a statement in Congressional Record acknowledging voting error (and notified R规则)
- 100% Scored 100% and led on pro-animal legislation
- #: Filed seat during term
- **: Resigned during term
- #: As a rule, delegates from U.S. Territories cannot vote on bills or amendments on the House floor.
- **: As a rule, the Speaker of the House does not vote.

**Note:** In some cases, delegates must miss votes for understandable personal reasons, such as death in the family, illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horner, George</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humes, Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palazzo, Steven</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Bonita</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veterans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Todd</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter, Russ</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaver, Emanuel</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrance, As Am</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves, Sam</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy, Vicgi</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, Bill</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunkemeyer, Brian</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirshbaum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gehrke, Dennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponder, Jaff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Adrian</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veterans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amodeo, Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barney, Shirley</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bech, Jeff</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hailer, Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arent, Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape, Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heroes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeland, Rodney</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt, Rush</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen, Leonard</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindholm, Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polfoe, Fred</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, Bob</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putman, Steven</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pingel, Jon</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sline, Alvo</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Chris</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heroes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich, Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llab, Ben</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reese, Steve</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Veterans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aubeckis, Gail</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop, Tim</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beuchle, James</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, Yveta</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossley, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engel, Gail</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Chris</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hames, Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haywood, Nan</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypp, Brian</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinche, Marnie</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker, Kathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrivak, Steve</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In some cases, legislators may miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schuler, Kurt (D-51A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, Greg (R-24A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, David (D-1A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affeldt, Jason (D-48A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balka, Leon (R-17B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boddy, Robert (D-1A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crary, David (R-15A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry, Charles (R-35B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyeke, Mike (D-10B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltch, Chaka (D-23D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzpatrick, Michael (R-68A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grash, Jim (R-8B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halderman, Tom (D-1B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Mike (R-3B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martho, Tom (R-18B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehan, Patrick (R-5H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, Timothy (R-18B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo, Joseph (R-16B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato, Todd (R-15H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz, Allison (D-13B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuster, Bill (R-5B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Glenn (R-5B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinder, Peter (D-Gulf Large)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nix, John (R-10B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langman, Gene (D-1H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langman, Gene (D-1H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynyk, James (D-1B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray, Jeff (R-12B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowlee, Tom (R-1G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan, John T (R-8H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Tim (R-9A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joffe, Joe (R-2B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krog, John (R-At Large)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck, Diane (D-1B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bledsoe, Marcus (R-17H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, Steven (D-8B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper, Jim (D-8B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLauro, Scott (R-8B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan, John (R-9A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitch, Steve (R-8B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoelschner, Chad (R-3A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roe, Phil (R-1A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbin, Joe (D-1B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady, Alex (R-1B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrell, Michael (R-19B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Frank (R-21B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, John (R-1A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway, Mike (R-11B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer, Henry (D-28B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culbertson, John (R-7A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogrell, Lloyd (D-24B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fretwell, Blake (R-27B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freese, Bill (R-11B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeft, Louis (R-16A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculley, Charles (D-20B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange, Ray (R-12B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Al (D-1B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Glenn (D-23A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat, Ralph (R-6B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>(R-D)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Hashigami, Jake (D-6th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Hepa, Ruben (D-13th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Jackson, Eddie (D-18th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Johnson, Eddy (D-30th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Jones, Sam (R-3rd)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Merch, Ken (D-24th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Mckeldin, Kevin (D-40th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Neugel, Randy (R-15th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Olson, Pats (R-22nd)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Paul, Ron (R-14th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Plein, Ted (R-2nd)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Raye, Sylvia (D-15th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Seals, Pete (R-33rd)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Smith, Larry (R-25th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Thorburn, William (R-12th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(R-D)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Bishop, Bob (R-1st)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Chaffin, Jason (R-3rd)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Mathiasen, Jim (D-2nd)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(R-D)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Wash, Peter (D-1st)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Williams, Don (R-3rd)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Mathiasen, Jim (D-2nd)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(R-D)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Gaylor, Eric (D-7th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Connolly, Gerry (D-11th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Finkle, Randy (R-4th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Goodwin, Bob (R-6th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Griffin, Morgan (R-8th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Hiebert, Tom (D-6th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Toner, David (D-3rd)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Wilden, Bob (R-1st)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Willis, Frank (R-12th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(R-D)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Dick, Norman (D-8th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Haggard, Dave (R-3rd)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Haskell, Jack (D-6th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Harmer, Ray (R-2nd)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Larsen, Rick (D-2nd)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>McDermott, Jim (D-7th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>McInerny, David (D-12th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Reichert, Dave (R-8th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Smith, Adam (D-1st)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(R-D)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Capito, Shelley (R-2nd)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Mahaffy, David (D-9th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Rahall, Nick (D-3rd)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(R-D)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Depuy, Tammy (D-2nd)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Duffy, Sean (R-7th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Hoag, Ron (D-2nd)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Moore, Owen (D-8th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Pest, Thomas (R-8th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Ralph, Reed (R-6th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Ryan, Paul (D-1st)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Gwinn, James (R-1st)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In some cases, legislators may have votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
From the President

Dear Friends,

The 112th Congress, which convened two years ago, was characterized by gridlock, partisan divides, and delay until the last minute. As Jonathan Allen wrote in Politico, the legacy of the 112th is unfinished business. "The 112th Congress will leave town having enacted fewer laws than any since 1947 when such statistics were first kept."

That inability to resolve large issues extended to much of the "small stuff" also. Leaving some priority animal protection bills hanging at the end, even though they had tremendous bipartisan support and were poised to get over the finish line.

A case in point is the Animal Fighting Prohibitions Act (S. 1907/H.R. 2492), which sought to fill a gap in the federal animal fighting law by making it a crime to knowingly attend or bring a child to an organized animal fight. The legislation earned the endorsement of nearly 300 national, state, and local law enforcement agencies covering all 50 states, and it would cost taxpayers nothing, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

The Senate passed this reform twice, and the House Agriculture Committee also approved the legislation when it was offered as an amendment to the Farm Bill in July. But the House and Senate didn't reach agreement on a final Farm Bill, and House leaders failed to allow a floor vote on the free-standing animal fighting bill, even though it had 288 cosponsors (more than half of the House). We hope to get this policy done soon in 2013, either on its own or as part of the Farm Bill.

That inability to resolve large issues extended to much of the "small stuff" also, leaving some priority animal protection bills hanging at the end, even though they had tremendous bipartisan support and were poised to get over the finish line.

Likewise, hopes of pursuing the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments (S. 2290/H.R. 3794) as a floor amendment were dashed when House leadership failed to bring up the Farm Bill for consideration. This legislation seeks to phase out barren battery cages for all 280 million laying hens in the country was advocated jointly by The Humane Society of the United States and the egg industry, along with leading consumer and veterinary organizations and more than 1,000 family farms: it had 20 Senate and 154 House cosponsors. As part of the "fiscal cliff" package, Congress set a September 2013 deadline for resolution of a new Farm Bill, so we hope to have an opportunity for a floor vote on the reintroduced egg legislation.

The Great Ape Protections and Crash Standards Act (S. 810/H.R. 1532) was also written for final action, having won approval by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, and having scored 18 Senate and 177 House cosponsors. But it did not get unanimous consent in time. Still, progress on the chimpanzee legislation did help spur action by the National Institutes of Health, which announced plans to retire more than 1,000 chimpanzees from the New Iberia Research Center in Chimp Haven, the federal chimpanzee sanctuary.
There were some positive outcomes from the greatest grindstock milling. The measures meant that certain anti-animal legislation also was kept from the finish line, such as:

- An amendment in the House version of the Animal Welfare Act that aimed to exempt fair game for religious purposes from the prohibition on humane killing of animals (e.g., California Proposition 2 to require confinement, enacted in 2008).
- The "Spartanburg Act" (S. 3120/P.L. 108-405) wish list package, for the state to list several of the "dangerous" species under the Endangered Species Act, all of which would allow importation of polar bear trophies taken in parts of Canada, even though polar bears are listed as an "endangered" species under the Endangered Species Act, and that would strip the Environmental Protection Agency of its ability to protect the public and environment from toxic lead through ammunition exposure.

There were other bright spots for animals in the 112th Congress. For example, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (H.R. 4351) contained two provisions that will help animals:

- Requiring the Secretary of Defense to file a report to the House and Senate Armed Services Committees by March 1, regarding a strategy and timeline for retreating and, when appropriate, transitioning from the use of live animals in medical training of personnel for treatment of combat injuries. This language was related to the BEST Practices Act (H.R. 3110/S. 2346).

- Requiring the transfer for adoption of retired military working dogs, and authorizing the Secretary of Defense to establish and maintain a system for privately-funded veterinary care of such dogs. This provision was modified from the Levine Amendment of the Armed Services Act (H.R. 4351/S. 2346).

The final House-Senate Defense Bill also left in a harmful provision that had been in the earlier House-passed version of H.R. 4351, which, if included in the final bill, would have prevented the EPA from regulating the hazards of lead in Indian and other reservations.

Additionally, despite intense budget pressures and a focus on deficit reduction, we were able to mobilize broad bipartisan support again for needed animal welfare funding. For FY 2012, Congress actually agreed to record-level boosts in some key programs, including a 10 percent jump (more than $3 million increase) for the U.S. Department of Agriculture's animal welfare budget to strengthen inspections and enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act at more than 12,000 farms, and a nearly 40 percent jump (to $1.15 million increase) for the USDA's enforcement of the Horse Protection Act, which deals with cruel "soring" of show horses.

Looking back, while there were some victories, the 112th Congress left a good deal of unfinished business for animal protection. That presents an opportunity for us to redouble our efforts and work hand-in-hand to get our agenda forward.

Sincerely,

Mitchel McKown
President
Humane Society Legislative Fund

For a more detailed review of the 112th Congress—including which legislation had the most on these and other pro-animal measures—visit "The 2012 Congressional Year in Review for Animals" at hsf.org/humaneyearbook.
Eggs and Hen Housing

A $ indicates cosponsorship of the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendment (S. 3239) to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, phased in over a period of 43-45 years, that would significantly improve animal welfare while providing a stable future for egg farmers. The bill, based on an agreement between the HSUS and the United Egg Producers, and endorsed by consumer and veterinary groups and more than 1,000 family farms, would require that barren battery cages be replaced with enriched colony housing systems that would vastly reduce the amount of space for each bird and provide environmental enrichments such as nest boxes and perches. It would also require clear labeling on all U.S. egg cartons, informing consumers of how the eggs were produced, prohibit starving the hens to manipulate their laying cycle, and ban extreme semen collection methods that cause unnecessary suffering.

SPONSOR: Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif.

STATUS: Hearing held in Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; 24 cosponsors.

Chimpanzees Warehoused in Laboratories

A $ indicates cosponsorship of the Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act (S. 810) to phase out the use of chimpanzees in invasive research, require the approximately 90 federally owned chimpanzees to be released to sanctuaries, and prohibit breeding for invasive research. Chimpanzees have proven to be poor research models for human diseases, so at any given time about 80 to 90 percent of chimps in U.S. labs are not even used in research but simply warehoused in barren and costly laboratory cages. It’s much less expensive to use for chimpanzees at sanctuaries, where they live with other chimps in a more natural setting. An updated version of the bill was developed, based on a December 2011 report by the National Academy’s Institute of Medicine (IOM), which could not identify a single area of current biomedical research for which chimpanzees are necessary.


STATUS: Amended version passed the Environment and Public Works Committee by voice vote in July 2012; 18 cosponsors.

Puppy Mills

A $ indicates cosponsorship of the Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety (PUPS) Act (S. 707) to crack down on abusive puppy mills in the United States, where breeding dogs are often stacked in wire cages for years to produce litter after litter. The legislation would close a loophole in the Animal Welfare Act regulations by requiring that commercial breeders who sell 50 or more puppies per year directly to consumers online or by other means be licensed and inspected, just as breeders who supply to pet stores already must be. It would also require that breeding dogs at commercial facilities be allowed to exercise daily.


STATUS: No action by Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. But broad bipartisan support for bill helped spur USDA to propose regulations to oversee large-scale breeders selling directly to the public; 33 cosponsors.

Cap on Agriculture Subsidies

A $ indicates a vote for an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2012 Agriculture Appropriations Bill (H.R. 3112) to end direct payments to farmers whose annual incomes exceed $750,000. Massive factory farms, which thrive on taxpayer giveaways that keep animal feed artificially cheap, jeopardize public health, the environment, and animal welfare, while also driving smaller and more humane, sustainable family farms out of business.

SPONSOR: Sen. Tom Coburn, R-Okla.

STATUS: The amendment passed 84-9 in October 2011 and was incorporated into P.L. 112-55 in November 2011.

Animal Fighting Spectators

A $ indicates a vote for an amendment to the 2013 Farm Bill (S. 3548) offered by Sen. David Vitter, R-La., to establish misdemeanor penalties for knowingly attending an organized animal fight and felony penalties for bringing a minor to such an event. Vitter modified his originally filed amendment to add the text of the Animal Fighting Spectators Prohibition Act (S. 1471), which would close a remaining gap in the federal animal fight-
SENATE SCORED ITEMS


Status: The Vitter amendment passed by 83-11 in June 2012, but the Senate did not reach agreement on a final form. S. 1547 also passed by voice vote in December 2012, but the legislation was blocked from floor consideration in the House.

Sportsmen’s Act

A “✓” indicates a vote against any of four proposed votes to move forward on the Sportsmen’s Act of 2012 (H.R. 3531), a pro-hunting package with several harmful wildlife provisions. Notably, the bill would allow importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada, even though polar bears are listed as an “endangered” species under the Endangered Species Act, and would strip the Environmental Protection Agency of its ability to protect public and environment from toxic lead through ammunition exposure.


Status: The Senate approved the first three procedural votes in September and mid-November 2012 but rejected the fourth, effectively blocking the legislation in late November.

Funding Letter

A “✓” indicates that a member was one of 33 senators who cosigned a group letter or submitted an individual request to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in March, seeking funds for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act, Horse Protection Act, Humane Methods of Slaughter Act, and federal animal fighting law, as well as for programs to address the needs of animals in disasters and to ease a shortage of veterinarians in rural areas and USDA positions through student loan repayment. Subcommittee and committee leaders—Sens. Herb Kohl, D-Wis.; Roy Blunt, R-Mo.; David Vitter, R-La.; and Thad Cochran, R-Ms.—co-signed letters to themselves but received credit because they were very responsive to these requests.


Status: Requested funding approved in committee. Congress deferred final action on appropriations bills until March 2013 via a Continuing Resolution, which maintained current funding for animal welfare programs.

Leaders

A “✓” indicates that the member cosigned every letter or letter to an agency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Sessions, Jeff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelby, Richard</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Begich, Mark</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Flake, David</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyl, Jon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>McCain, John</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boozman, John</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Pryor, Mark</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Boxer, Barbara</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feinstein, Diane</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specter, Rand</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Enzi, Michael</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Udall, Mark</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Burr, Richard</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lieberman, Joseph</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Coons, Chris</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Carper, Thomas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Nelson, Bill</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Rubio, Marco</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chambliss, Becky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Inouye, Daniel</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Alexander, Daniel</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Crapo, Michael</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>isch, Jen</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Durbin, Richard</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voinovich, John</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SP = Prime Sponsor
X = Took pro-animal position through co-sponsorship of a bill, a vote, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal legislation
✓ = Took pro-animal position on a vote
NV = Did not vote due to absence or abstention

Note: In some cases, legislators may miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>PRIMESponsor</th>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>PASS Non-Primes</th>
<th>PASS Non-VP</th>
<th>PASS VP</th>
<th>PASS Aff-Votes</th>
<th>PASS Aff-Letter</th>
<th>PASS Leader</th>
<th>PASS Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Coats, Dan (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lugar, Richard (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Marti, Jerry (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roberts, Pat (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>Manchin, Joe (D)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>McConnell, Mitch (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Landrieu, Mary (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vitter, David (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Capuano, Bill (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markey, Edward (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Cardin, Ben (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mikulski, Barbara (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Brown, Scott (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerry, John (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Levin, Carl (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stabenow, Debbie (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Franken, Al (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Klobuchar, Amy (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Cochran, Thad (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wicker, Roger (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>McCaskill, Claire (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Blunt, Roy (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCaskill, Claire (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Barrasso, Max (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tester, Jon (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Chart

- **SP Prime Sponsor**: Took pro-animal position through cosponsoring of a bill, a vote, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal legislation
- **X Took anti-animal position on a vote**
- **NV Did not vote due to absence or abstention**
- **Scored 100% and also led as a prime sponsor of pro-animal legislation or agency letter**
- **The top leaders of each party typically start cosponsor bills, so they have no numerical score**

Note: In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Anti-Animal Legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Johanns, Mike (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nelson, Ben (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Ensign, John (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heller, Dean (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hirono, Mazie (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ayotte, Kelly (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaheen, Jeanne (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Menendez, Robert (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menendez, Robert (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Bingaman, Jeff (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Udall, Tom (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Gillibrand, Kristen (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schumer, Charles (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Burr, Richard (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hagan, Kay (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Conrad, Kent (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoeven, John (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Brown, Sherrod (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portman, Rob (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Udall, Tom (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inouye, James (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Mulcair, Jack (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyden, Ron (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Casey, Robert (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toomey, Pat (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Shaheen, Sheldon (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Votes:
- SP: Prime Sponsor
- ✓: Took pro-animal position through cosponsorship of a bill, a vote, signing a letter, or leading an anti-animal legislation
- X: Took anti-animal position on a vote
- NV: Did not vote due to absence or abstention
- +: Scored 100% and also led as a prime sponsor of pro-animal legislation or agency letter
- ▲: Resigned during term
- ♡: The top leaders of each party typically don’t cosponsor bills, so they have no numerical score

Note: In some cases, legislators may miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
| State       | Name                | Sponsor/Proponent | Pro-Animal | For-Pro-Life | Pro-Choice  | Pro-Religious Liberty | Pro-Health Care | Pro-Second Amendment | Pro-Federal Mandates | Pro-State Mandates | Pro-Union       | Pro-Environment  | Pro-Animal       | Pro-Religious Liberty | Pro-Health Care | Pro-Second Amendment | Pro-Federal Mandates | Pro-State Mandates | Pro-Union       | Pro-Environment  | Pro-Animal       | Pro-Religious Liberty | Pro-Health Care | Pro-Second Amendment | Pro-Federal Mandates | Pro-State Mandates | Pro-Union       | Pro-Environment  | Pro-Animal   |
|------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------|------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| South Carolina | DeMint, Jim (R)  |                   | X          | X            |            |                      |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                   |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                |                |                |
| South Carolina | Graham, Lindsey (R)  |                   | X          | X            | X          |                      |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                   |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                |                |                |
| South Dakota | Johnson, Tim (R)  |                   | X          | X            |            |                      |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                   |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                |                |                |
| Tennessee   | Burchett, Scott (R)  |                   | X          | X            |            |                      |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                   |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                |                |                |
| Texas       | Cornyn, John (R)  |                   | X          | X            |            |                      |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                   |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                |                |                |
| Utah        | Hatch, Orrin (R)  |                   | X          | X            |            |                      |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                   |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                |                |                |
| Vermont     | Ledy, Patrick (D)  |                   | X          | X            |            |                      |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                   |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                |                |                |
| Virginia    | Sanders, Bernard (D)  |                   | X          | X            |            |                      |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                   |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                |                |                |
| Washington  | Warner, Mark (D)  |                   | X          | X            |            |                      |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                   |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                |                |                |
| West Virginia | Carneal, Mike (D)  |                   | X          | X            |            |                      |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                   |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                |                |                |
| Wisconsin   | Johnson, Ron (R)  |                   | X          | X            |            |                      |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                   |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                |                |                |
| Wyoming     | Emmer, Michael (R)  |                   | X          | X            |            |                      |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                   |                |                       |                   |                  |                |                |                |                |                 |                 |                 |                 |                |                |                |

Key to Sankey Chart:
- SF: Sponsor
- X: Took pro-animal position, if applicable
- Crossed-out X: Opposed pro-animal position or did not vote
- Score: Total number of pro-animal positions

Note: In some cases, legislators may miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
HOSPITALITY

HOUSE SCORED ITEMS

Eggs and Hen Housing
A V indicates cosponsorship of the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendment (H.R. 3794) to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of eggs laying hens, phased to a period of over a period of 15-19 years, that would significantly improve animal welfare while providing a stable future for egg farmers. The bill, based on an agreement between The HSUS and the United Egg Producers, and endorsed by consumer and veterinary groups and more than 1,000 family farms, would require that barns battery cages be replaced with enriched colony housing systems that would nearly triple the amount of space for each bird and provide environmental enrichments such as nest boxes and perches. It would also require direct labeling of all U.S. egg cartons, informing consumers of how the eggs were produced, prohibit starving the birds to manipulate their laying cycle, and has excess ammonia levels that cause respiratory problems.


STATUS: No action by Committee on Agriculture; 164 cosponsors.

Chimpanzees Warehoused in Laboratories
A V indicates cosponsorship of the Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act (H.R. 1531) to phase out use of chimpanzees in invasive research, retire the approximately 500 federally owned chimpanzees to sanctuary, and prohibit breeding for invasive research. Chimpanzees have proven to be poor research models for human diseases, as at any given time about 80 to 90 percent of chimpanze in U.S. labs are not even used in research but simply warehoused in barren and costly laboratory cages. Its much less expensive to care for chimpanzees in sanctuaries, where they live with other chimpanzees in a more natural setting. An updated version of this bill was developed, based on a December 2011 report by the National Academies’ Institute of Medicine (IOM), which could not identify a single area of current biomedical research in which chimpanzees are necessary.


STATUS: No formal action by Committees on Energy and Commerce; 177 cosponsors.

Animal Fighting Spectators
A V indicates cosponsorship of the Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act (H.R. 2423) to establish misdemeanor penalties for knowingly attending an organized animal fight or feline privity for bringing a visitor to such a fight. Members also received credit if they voted in favor of a related amendment to the Farm Bill in the House Agriculture Committee. While Congress has strengthened the federal animal fighting law in recent years, this legislation would close a remaining gap prohibiting spectators as 49 states have done, and help take the profit out of animal fighting. Spectators are even more than mere observers at animal fights; they are participants and accomplices who enable the crime, paying hundreds or thousands of dollars in admission fees and gambling wagers, and helping conceal organizations and handlers who try to blend into the crowd when raid access. This legislation is supported by nearly 300 law enforcement agencies covering all 50 states.

SPONSORS: Reps. Tom Marino, R-Pa.; Betty Sutton, D-Ohio.

STATUS: Related language passed the House Agriculture Committee by a 26-19 vote in July 2012 as an amendment offered by Rep. Jim McGovern, D-Mass., to the Farm Bill, and parallel animal fighting legislation passed the full Senate twice (in June and December 2012), but it was blocked from floor consideration in the House and the Farm Bill was not finalized: 228 cosponsors.

Puppy Mills
A V indicates cosponsorship of the Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety (PUP) Act (H.R. 833) to crack down on abusive puppy mills in the United States, where breeding dogs are often stacked in wire cages for years to produce litter after litter. The legislation would close a loophole in the Animal Welfare Act regulations by requiring that commercial breeders who sell 50 or more puppies per year directly to consumers online or by other means be licensed and inspected, just as breeders who supply to pet stores already must be. It would also require that breeding dogs at commercial facilities be allowed to exercise daily.


STATUS: No action by Committee on Agriculture, but broad bipartisan support for bill helped spur USDA to propose regulations to ban large scale breeders selling directly to the public; 216 cosponsors.

Cap on Agriculture Subsidies
A V indicates a vote in February 2011 for a Blumenauer amendment to the FY 2011 Continuing Appropriations Act (H.R. 1) to cap agriculture subsidies at $20 billion in order to limit huge taxpayer giveaways to commodity growers at a time of record-high prices. Members also received credit if they voted in favor of a Flake amendment in the FY 2012 Agriculture Appropriations bill (H.R. 2951) to cap eligibility for direct payments to farmers with an adjusted gross income of $250,000 or less. Massive factory farms, which drive on lucrative subsidies that keep animal feed artificially cheap, jeopardize public health, the environment, and animal welfare, while also driving smaller and more humane, sustainable family farms out of business.


STATUS: The Blumenauer amendment was defeated 185-241, and the Flake amendment was defeated 185-239, but a related amendment offered by Sen. Tom Coburn, R-Okla., was incorporated into H.R. 1, 112-55 in November 2011.

Lethal Predator Control
A V indicates a vote for an amendment to the FY 2012 Agriculture Appropriations bill (H.R. 234) to cut $1 million from the $72.5 million allocated to the
Endangered Species Act

A / indicates a vote for an amendment to the FY 2013 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill (H.R. 3586) to remove an anti-wildlife rider in the committee bill that would have prevented the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from protecting any new species or designating critical habitat for currently listed species—effectively crippling endangered species protection in America and preventing help for any of the more than 280 "candidate species" such as the Pacific Walrus pictured on this page, that the agency had already determined warranted protection under the ESA.

SPONSORS: Reps. Norm Dicks, D-Wash.; Mike Thompson, D-Calif.; Michael Fitzpatrick, R-Pa.; Colleen Hanabusa, D-Hawaii.

STATUS: The amendment was defeated 132-287 in June 2011.

Hunting in National Parks

A / indicates a vote for an amendment to the Sportmen’s Heritage Act (H.R. 4099) to clarify that all units of the National Park System—except those currently open for hunting or recreational shooting—would be exempt from provisions in the bill designed to open nearly all federal public lands to hunting without regard to the impact on wildlife, other resources users, public safety, or the economic generation by millions of dollars. H.R. 4099 would facilitate sport hunting in national parks by requiring the National Park Service to use "volunteers" hunters to carry out wildlife management programs.


STATUS: The amendment was defeated 152-240 in April 2012.

Polar Bear Trophy Imports

A / indicates a vote for an amendment to the Sportmen’s Heritage Act (H.R. 4099) to strike a provision allowing the importation of polar bear trophies from Canada by hunters who killed the bear despite warnings that such imports would be illegal as seen in the Endangered Species Act listing for polar bears took effect. The provision would encourage hunters to continue killing protected species in other countries, store their trophies in warehouses, then sell or consign them to allow them use with a water for their imports—to contravene federal conservation laws.


STATUS: The amendment was defeated 155-242 in April 2012.

Sportsmen’s Heritage Act

A / indicates a vote against the Sportmen’s Heritage Act (H.R. 4099), a package citing taxpayers $1.2 million that would overturn regulations for decades of dead and pike bones, expose federal lands—including sensitive wilderness areas—to sport hunting, and strip the Environmental Protection Agency of its ability to protect wildlife, habitat, and people from lead poisoning through exposure to toxic ammunition despite the availability of plenty of non-toxic alternatives.


STATUS: The bill passed 234-146 in April 2012; counterpart Senate legislation (S. 3525) was blocked by a procedural vote in November 2012.

Funding Letter

A / indicates that a member was one of 130 representatives who signed a group letter re submitting an individual request to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in March, asking funds for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act, Horse Protection Act, Humane Methods of Slaughter Act, and federal animal fighting law, as well as for programs to address the needs of animals in disasters and to ease a shortage of veterinarians in rural areas and USDA positions through student loan repayment. Subcommittees and committee leaders—Reps. Jack Kingston, R-Ga.; Sam Farr, D-Calif.; Gerald Rogers, R-Ky.; and Norm Dicks, D-Wash.—typically draft sign letters to themselves but received credit because they were representative of most of these requests.

SPONSORS: Reps. Chris Smith, R-N.J.; Earl Blumenauer, D-Or.

STATUS: Requested funding, except for Horse Protection Act enforcement, approved in committee. Congress deferred final action on appropriations bill until March 2013 via a Continuing Resolution, which maintained current funding for animal welfare programs.

Leaders

A / indicates that the member earned extra credit for leading as a prime sponsor of pro-animal legislation (including bills not scored on this chart) or a letter to an agency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Teller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Whip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Whip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Teller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways and Means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight and Government Reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- Yes: Member voted yes.
- No: Member voted no.
- Absent: Member was not present.
- Teller: Member served as the teller.

---

**Legislative Action:**
- Passed by the House of Representatives.
- Amendment withdrawn by [Member's Name].
- Vote on the amendment was 214-212.
- Final vote on the bill was 219-210.
- The bill now moves to the Senate for further consideration.

---

**Floor Activity:**
- Members debated the merits of the bill for an extended period.
- Several amendments were proposed and voted on.
- Committee reports were discussed and approved.
- The bill was referred to the Committee on [Committee Name].

---

**Key Votes:**
- Motion to recommit the bill with instructions was agreed to by a vote of 218-210.
- Motion to accept the amendment was rejected by a vote of 214-212.

---

**Representative Actions:**
- [Representative's Name] cast a vote in favor of the bill.
- [Representative's Name] abstained from voting.
- [Representative's Name] did not attend the session.

---

**Summary:**
- The bill was signed into law.
- It becomes effective on [Date].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Petition Type</th>
<th>Petition Subject</th>
<th>Number of Pets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Animal Rights</td>
<td>advocacy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Poe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>protection</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Ralston</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>conservation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Gaetz</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>preservation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
<td>advocacy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Gaetz</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Animal Rights</td>
<td>advocacy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Schuette</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Petition</td>
<td>legislative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>J. Daley</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Petition</td>
<td>legislative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Fonfara</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Petition</td>
<td>legislative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Petition</td>
<td>legislative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Grassley</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Petition</td>
<td>legislative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: In some cases, legislators may not vote on legislation that affects specific modeled species, such as a sparrow in the family, annual nesting, or birth of a newborn.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Previous Vote</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Keys to House Chart**

- SF: Present Sponsors
- ✔: Took pro-amendment position through conference, voting, signing a joint letter, or leading pro-amendment legislation
- ✗: Took anti-amendment position or vote
- N: Did not vote due to absence or abstention
- *: Scored 100% and also led on procedural legislation or agency leader
- †: Put statement in Congressional Record acknowledging voting error (and rectified H617)
- **: Put statement in Congressional Record acknowledging procedural mistake made in error but would have voted pro-amendment (and rectified H617)
- #: Filled seat during term
- ##: Resigned during term
- AM: Final during term

*Note: In some states, a legislator must run for reelection to their seat at a death or due to being appointed to another position (birth of a child) after his or her term.
Did Your Legislators Make the Grade?

Look inside to see how your representative and senators scored in the 112th Congress on animal issues, from hen housing to chimpanzees in labs to animal fighting. Then let them know you’re watching and you appreciate their support for animals—or you’d like to see them do more. Also share the Humane Scorecard with family, friends, fellow animal advocates, and your local newspaper. For a detailed look at "The 2012 Congressional Year in Review for Animals: Achievements and Setbacks—and to access an online version of the publication, go to www.humanechapter.org.
HUMANE SCORECARD

Midterm Report for the 113th Congress
How Scores Are Calculated

Many animal protection bills never receive a recorded vote in Congress. Some are enacted by voice vote, and some languish. To accurately measure legislators’ support, we count not just recorded votes but other meaningful ways they can help animals, such as cosponsoring key bills and enacting letters writing increased enforcement of animal welfare laws. There are dozens of animal protection bills introduced each year. To gauge legislators’ consistent range of concern, we only count cosponsorship of a few priority bills that have a critical mass of support and a reasonable chance of enactment. Scores are given as percentages of the number of votes counted. Prime sponsors of legislation and those who led the effort in the Chamber also receive “extra credit,” equal to one vote per cosponsorship, as do those who signed a letter stating their support for a bill but whose letter was never read on the floor.

HSLF acknowledges the limitations of judging legislators based on a few votes, cosponsorships, and joint letters. In some cases, legislators may miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons. Please also consider such unrecorded votes as performance on committees, positions of leadership in the House and Senate, and consultation service.

The Humane Scorecard is published once a year and the Humane Advocate newsletter (ISSN: 1521-6232) is published five times a year by HSLF. To subscribe to Humane Advocate and to receive the Humane Scorecard, send a donation of $5 or more to the Humane Society Legislative Fund at 1919 L St. NW, Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20036 or contact us at 202-573-3245 or humanesocietyusa@hslf.org.
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KING AMENDMENT
As House-Senate conferees try to finalize negotiations on the Farm Bill, we await resolution on the destructive provision (Sec. 11312 of H.R. 2642) that was folded into the House bill during committee, with minimal debate, at the behest of Rep. Steve King, R-Iowa. Opponents were denied the opportunity for a vote to strike this during House floor debate. The Senate Farm Bill contains no similar language.

Across the country, there is widespread opposition to the King Amendment, which aims to block state laws protecting farm animals and could also negate agricultural laws involving food safety, environmental protection, labor, and many other concerns. Conferees should certainly not include this intensely controversial provision or anything like it if they want to complete action soon on the Farm Bill.

ANIMAL FIGHTING
Both the House and Senate Farm Bills have provisions—as we hope the final package will—to strengthen the federal animal fighting law by making it a crime to knowingly attend or bring a child to an organized animal fight. The language of the free-standing animal fighting spectator bill, which enjoys the bipartisan support of a combined 262 cosponsors in the Senate and House, was part of the Senate Farm Bill from the beginning, when introduced in the Agriculture Committee. For the House, related language was approved as an amendment during committee with a strong bipartisan vote of 28-17.

HORSE SORING
The Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act has gained major momentum with the bipartisan support of 403 cosponsors in the House and Senate, and a successful hearing in the House Energy and Commerce Committee. This legislation amends the Horse Protection Act of 1970 to better rein in the cruel practice of “soring”—using caustic chemicals, chains, sharp objects, and other inhumane methods to make Tennessee walking horses and related breeds exaggerate their high stepping gait for competitions.

More than 40 years ago, Congress tried to stop this abuse, but the Horse Protection Act is too weak, and widespread soring continues, according to a 2010 audit by the USDA Inspector General that recommended reforms incorporated into the PAST Act. This legislation is not expected to add costs to the federal government; it will simply enable USDA to utilize its enforcement resources in a more efficient and effective way.

HORSE RACING
The House Energy and Commerce Committee also held a compelling hearing on the Horseracing Integrity and Safety Act. A powerful New York Times exposé examined 195,000 horse races from 2009 to 2011, reporting that minimal oversight, inconsistent regulations, and rampant doping of horses has led to a stunning “average of 24 horse deaths on racetracks around the country every week.”

VETERINARY MEDICINE
Just a few days later, the Senate unanimously approved the Veterinary Medicine Mobility Act, to allow veterinarians to transport and dispense vital drugs outside of their registered locations—essential for mobile spay/neuter and vaccination clinics, disaster response, and farm care, sanctuaries, wildlife rehabilitation, and animal cruelty investigations that require travel to remote and underserved areas.

Taking stock at the midpoint of the 113th Congress, we celebrate enactment of the chimpanzee and horse slaughter provisions and funding for animal protection laws, and redouble our commitment to finish the job for other pressing priorities. The animals are counting on us, and despite the general dysfunction in Washington, there is tremendous potential on many fronts.

Sincerely,

Michael Markarian
President
Humane Society Legislative Fund
Horse Soring
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act (S. 1400), to crack down on the cruel practice of "soring," in which trainers deliberately inflict pain on the hooves and legs of Tennessee walking horses and certain other breeds to exaggerate their high stepping gait and gain an unfair competitive advantage at horse shows. The legislation will amend the Horse Protection Act to end the failed industry self-policing system, strengthen penalties, has the use of devices associated with soring, and make the actual soring of a horse for the purpose of showing or selling it illegal.


STATUS: Pending in Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; 64 cosponsors as of Jan. 17.

Eggs and Hen Housing
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments (S. 810), to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, phased in over a period of 13-16 years, that will significantly improve animal welfare while providing a stable future for egg farmers. The bill, based on an agreement between The HSUS and the United Egg Producers, would require that battery cage eggs be replaced with enriched colony housing systems that would nearly double the amount of space for each bird and provide environmental enrichments such as nest boxes and perches. It would also require clear labeling on all U.S. egg cartons, informing consumers of how the eggs were produced, prohibit starving the hens to manipulate their laying cycle and curb excess ammonia levels that cause respiratory problems.


STATUS: Pending in Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; 17 cosponsors as of Jan. 17.

Animal Fighting Spectators
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act (S. 66), to establish misdemeanor penalties for knowingly attending an organized animal fight and felony penalties for knowingly bringing a minor to such a fight. While Congress has strengthened the federal animal fighting law in recent years, this bill will close a remaining gap—prohibiting spectatorship, as 49 states have done, and helping take the profit out of animal fighting. Spectators are more than mere observers at animal fights, They are participants and accomplices who enable the crime, paying hundreds or thousands of dollars in admission fees and gambling wages, and helping conceal organizers and handlers who try to blend into the crowd when a raid occurs.


STATUS: 18 cosponsors as of Jan. 17. The Agriculture Committee, led by Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow, D-Mich., and Ranking Member Thad Cochran, R-Miss., included this legislation in the Farm Bill markup on
in committee (S. 543), which was subsequently approved by the Senate
and is awaiting final action. It was also approved by the full Senate last
year, both as a floor amendment to the Farm Bill by a vote of 88-11, and
as a freestanding bill (S. 1947) by voice vote.

Horse Slaughter
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Safeguard American Fault Exports
(SAFE) Act (S. 543), to protect horses and consumers by prohibiting the
transport and export of U.S. horses to slaughter for human consumption.
American horses are not raised for food and are routinely given hundreds of
drug over their lifetimes that can be toxic to humans if ingested.
SPONSORS: Sens. Mary Landrieu, D-La.; Lindsey Graham, R-S.C.
STATUS: Pending in Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and
Pensions; 28 cosponsors as of Jan. 17. Related legislation barring USDA
from spending funds to inspect horse slaughter plants was approved
by the Appropriations Committee as part of S. 1244 offered as an
amendment by Sens. Landrieu and Graham with the strong support
of Chairwoman Barbara Mikulski, D-Md.), and then enacted as part
of the omnibus appropriations package, P.L. 113-66, signed into law in
January 2014.

Funding Letter
A ✓ indicates that a number was one of 34 senators who assigned a
group letter to a who submitted an individual request to the Agriculture
Appropriations Subcommittee in April, seeking funds for enforcement
of the Animal Welfare Act, Horse Protection Act, Humane Methods of
Slaughter Act, and federal animal fighting law, as well as for programs
to address the needs of animals in disasters and to ease a shortage of
veterinarians in rural and inner-city areas and USDA positions through
veterinary student loan repayment.

STATUS: The omnibus appropriations package enacted in January
2014 (P.L. 113-66) provides some significant increases for USDA’s
oversight of these key animal welfare programs.

Letter Opposing the King Amendment
A ✓ indicates that the member earned extra credit as one of 21 senators
who cosigned a group letter in August or who sent their own letter to
the leaders of the Senate Agriculture Committee voicing opposition to a
provision in the House-passed Farm Bill offered by Rep. Steve King, R-Iowa,
during committee markup. Known as the King Amendment, Sec. 1112 of
H.R. 2662 aims to block state laws protecting farm animals and could also
prompt laws covering everything from child labor to dangerous pesticides
to labeling of farm-raised fish to tobacco products and fire safety standards.
The joint letter urges committee leaders to reject this provision in any
farm bill, and, calling it “a serious infringement on states’ rights with far
reaching impact.”

SPONSOR: Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif.
STATUS: No similar language is in the Senate-passed Farm Bill, as of
Jan. 17, the House and Senate had not yet agreed to a final Farm Bill.

Leaders
A ✓ indicates that the member earned extra credit for signing as a prime
sponsor of pre-approval legislation (including items not scored on this chart)
or a letter to an agency.
A table is presented with the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Senator Name</th>
<th>Sponsorship</th>
<th>Co-Sponsor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Sessions, Jeff (R)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelby, Richard (R)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Begich, Mark (D)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murkowski, Lisa (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Flake, Jeff (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCain, John (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Boozman, John (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pryor, Mark (D)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Boxer, Barbara (D)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feinstein, Dianne (D)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Bennet, Michael (D)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Udall, Mark (D)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Blumenthal, Richard (D)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murphy, Christopher (D)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Carper, Thomas (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coons, Chris (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Nelson, Bill (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubio, Marco (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Chambliss, Saxby (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isakson, Johnny (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Hirono, Mazie (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scharz, Brian (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Grass, Michael (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risch, Jim (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Durbin, Richard (D)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kirk, Mark (R)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Chart:
- **SP**: Prime Sponsor
- ✔: Took pro-animal position through co-sponsorship of a bill, a vote, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal legislation
- X: Took anti-animal position on a vote
- NV: Did not vote due to absence or abstention
- *: Pro-animal position on 5 scored items plus extra credit for leading on animal protection issue and/or signing letter opposing King Amendment
- #: Filled seat during term
- ##: Resigned during term
- ###: Died during term

Footnote: In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Senators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Coats, Dan (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donnelly, Joe (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grassley, Charles (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harkin, Tom (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moran, Jerry (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roberts, Pat (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McConnell, Mitch (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul, Rand (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landrieu, Mary (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vitter, David (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collins, Susan (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King, Angus (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardin, Benjamin (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mikulski, Barbara (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cowan, Mo (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerry, John (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markey, Ed (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warren, Elizabeth (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levin, Carl (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stabenow, Debbie (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franken, Al (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Klobuchar, Amy (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cochran, Thad (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wicker, Roger (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blunt, Roy (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCaskill, Claire (D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Chart
- **: The top leaders of each party typically don't cosponsor bills, so they have no numerical score
- #: Filled seat during term
- ##: Resigned during term
- ###: Died during term
- Pro-animal position on 5 scored items plus extra credit for leading on animal protection issue and/or signing letter opposing King Amendment
- Took anti-animal position on a vote
- Took pro-animal position through cosponsorship of a bill, a vote, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal legislation
- NV: Did not vote due to absence or abstention

Note: In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Senators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Baucus, Max (D)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teller, Jon (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Fischer, Deb (R)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johanns, Mike (R)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Heller, Dean (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reid, Harry (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Ayotte, Kelly (R)</td>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaheen, Jeanne (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Booker, Cory (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chiesa, Jeffrey (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lautenberg, Frank (D)</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Menendez, Robert (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich, Martin (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Udall, Tom (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Gillibrand, Kristen (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schumer, Charles (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Burr, Richard (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hagan, Kay (D)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Heitkamp, Heidi (D)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoeven, John (R)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Brown, Sherrod (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portman, Rob (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Coburn, Tom (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inhofe, James (R)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Merkley, Jeff (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyden, Ron (O)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Chart:
- SP Prime Sponsor
- ✓ Took pro-animal position through cosponsorship of a bill, a vote, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal legislation
- X Took anti-animal position on a vote
- ** Did not vote due to absence or abstention
- + Pro-animal position on 5 scored items plus extra credit for leading on animal protection issue and/or signing letter opposing King Amendment
- # Filled seat during term
- ## Resigned during term
- ### Died during term
- ** The top leaders of each party typically don’t cosponsor bills, so they have no numerical score

Note: In some cases, legislators may miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Leader 1</th>
<th>Leader 2</th>
<th>Leader 3</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Toomey</td>
<td>Whitehouse</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Whitehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Corker</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Corkyn</td>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>Hatch</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Hatch</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Leary</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Leahy</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>Kaine</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>Carrabell</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Mancin</td>
<td>Rockefeller</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Manchin</td>
<td>Rockefeller</td>
<td>Enzi</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Chart:
- **SP**: Prime Sponsor
- ✓ Took pro-animal position through cosponsorship of a bill, vote, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal legislation
- X Took anti-animal position on a vote
- NV: Did not vote due to absence or abstention
- + Pro-animal position on 5 scored items plus extra credit for leading on animal protection issue and/or signing letter opposing King Amendment
- # Filled seat during term
- ## Resigned during term
- ### Died during term
- ++ The top leaders of each party typically don’t cosponsor bills, so they have no numerical score

Note: In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
Horse Soring
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act (H.R. 1388), to crack down on the cruel practice of "soring" in which trainers deliberately inflict pain on the horses’ legs and feet of Tennessee walking horses and certain other breeds to exaggerate their high-stepping gait and gain an unfair competitive advantage at horse shows. H.R. 1388 would amend the Horse Protection Act to end the failed industry self-policing system, strengthen penalties, ban the use of devices associated with soring, and make the actual scoring of a horse for the purpose of showing or selling it illegal.


STATUS: Hearing held in Committee on Energy and Commerce; 259 cosponsors as of Jan. 17.

Eggs and Hen Housing
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments (H.R. 1793), to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, phased in over a period of 13 to 16 years, that will significantly improve animal welfare while providing a stable future for egg farmers. The bill, based on an agreement between the HSUS and the United Egg Producers, would require that barren battery cages be replaced with enriched colony housing systems that would nearly double the amount of space for each bird and provide environmental enrichments such as nest boxes and perches. It would also require clear labeling on all U.S. egg cartons, informing consumers of how the eggs were produced: prohibit starving the birds to manipulate their laying cycle; and curb excess ammonia levels that cause respiratory problems.


STATUS: Pending in the Committee on Agriculture; 145 cosponsors as of Jan. 17.

Animal Fighting Spectators
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act (H.R. 366), to establish misdemeanor penalties for knowingly attending an organized animal fight and felony penalties for knowingly bringing a minor to such a fight. Members also receive credit if they voted in favor of a related amendment to the Farm Bill in the House Agriculture Committee. While Congress has strengthened the federal animal fighting law in recent years, this bill will close a remaining gap: prohibiting spectating, as 49 states have done, and helping take the profit out of animal fighting. Spectators are more than mere observers at animal fights: they are participants and accomplices who enable the crime, paying hundreds or thousands of dollars in admission fees and gambling wagers, and helping conceal organizers and bookies who try to blend into the crowd when a raid occurs.


STATUS: 237 cosponsors as of Jan. 17. Related language passed the Agriculture Committee by a vote of 26-17 as an amendment offered by Rep. McGovern, and was part of the Farm Bill later approved by the House (H.R. 2642); awaiting final House-Senate action.

Horse Slaughter
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Slaughter of Peaceful American Food Exports (SAFE) Act (H.R. 1994), to protect horses and consumers by prohibiting the transport and export of U.S. horses to slaughter for human consumption. American horses are not raised for food and are routinely given hundreds of drugs over their lifetimes that can be toxic to humans if ingested.

SPONSORS: Reps. Paul Museman, R-Pa.; Jan Schakowsky, D-Ill.

STATUS: Pending in Committee on Energy and Commerce, with a secondary referral to Committee on Agriculture; 148 cosponsors as of Jan. 17. Related legislation barring USDA from spending funds to inspect horse slaughter plants was approved by the Appropriations Committee as part of H.R. 2412 (offered as an amendment by Reps. Jim Moran, D-Va., and Bill Young, R-Fla.), and then enacted as part of the omnibus appropriations package, P.L. 113-66, signed into law in January 2014.

Agriculture Subsidies
A ✓ indicates a vote in June for an amendment to the Farm Bill (H.R. 1947), to reform the Environmental Quality Incentives Program by increasing access for farmers and eliminating payments to projects that do not show strong conservation benefits. The amendment would lower the EQIP payment cap, prioritize projects that focus on managing farmland and habitat, provide financial support and technical assistance to help livestock producers reduce their non-therapeutic use of antibiotics, limit payments to confined animal feeding operations for constructing new waste facilities, provide greater support for farmers transitioning to organic farming, and more environmentally
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friendly pest management practices and yet use at least 10 percent of the funding for wildlife-focused projects.


STATUS: The amendment was defeated 157-246.

Farm Bill I

A ✓ indicates a vote in favor of final passage of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 (H.R. 1947). House leadership refused to allow floor debate of any animal welfare amendments, including an effort to strike the dangerous and overreaching King Amendment, which aims to negate state laws regarding agricultural production and manufactures.

STATUS: The first version of the Farm Bill was defeated in the House, 195-234.

Farm Bill II

A ✓ indicates a vote in favor of final passage of the revised Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act (H.R. 2642), which retained the King Amendment and again afforded no opportunity for pro-animal floor amendments.

STATUS: The second version of the Farm Bill passed the House, 226-206. As of Jan. 17, the House and Senate had not yet agreed to a final Farm Bill.

Funding Letter

A ✓ indicates that a member was one of 364 representatives who cosigned a group letter or who submitted an individual request to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in April, seeking funds for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act, Horse Protection Act, Humane Methods of Slaughter Act, and federal animal fighting law, as well as for programs to address the needs of animals in disasters and to ease a shortage of veterinarians in rural and inner-city areas and USDA positions through veterinary student loan repayment.


STATUS: The omnibus appropriations package enacted in January 2014 (P.L. 113-66) provides some significant increases for USDA’s oversight of these key animal welfare programs.

Letter Opposing King Amendment

A ✓ indicates that the member earned extra credit as one of 167 representatives who cosigned group letters in August or who sent an individual letter to the leaders of the House Agriculture Committee urging committee members to reject a provision offered by Rep. Steve King, R-lowa, during committee markup. Known as the King Amendment, Sec. 13313 of H.R. 2642 could negate most state and local laws on the production or manufacture of agriculture products. It aims to block state laws protecting farm animals and could also preempt laws covering everything from child labor to dangerous pesticides to labeling of farm raised fish to tobacco products and fire safety standards.


STATUS: No similar language is in the Senate-passed Farm Bill, as of Jan. 17, the House and Senate had not yet agreed to a final Farm Bill.

Leaders

A ✓ indicates that the member earned extra credit for leading on a prime sponsor of either pro-animal legislation (including items not scored on this chart) or a letter to an agency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelold, Robert (R-8th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barco, Spencer (R-4th)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bente, John (R-144)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Mo (R-89)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruton, Martha (R-2nd)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands, Michael D. (R-3rd)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sease, Ted (D-79)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Don (R-41 Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**American Samoa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faleomavaega, Eni F. H. (D-All Large)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arizona**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barber, Ron (D-2nd)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank, Trent (R-8th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grijalva, G. (D-8th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kildee, Dan (D-98)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scherbach, David (R-8th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arkansas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishoff, Karen (D-37th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaman, Xavier (D-34th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake, Art (D-7th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader, Steve (D-38th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert, steve (R-42nd)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortez, John (R-45th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>夺 quoted, Steve (R-39th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin, Ray (D-10th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcinia, Anna (D-16th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr, Sam (D-22nd)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garamendi, John (D-3rd)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartzler, Jane (R-6th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honda, Michael (D-17th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman, Jared (D-24th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter, Duncan (R-32th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issa, Darnell (D-49th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lankford, Doug (D-116)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Barbara (D-33th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipman, Zoe (D-16th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowery, Alan (D-47th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolte, Doris (D-4th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy, Kevin (R-23rd)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCloskey, Tom (R-4th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mckanan, Howard &quot;Buck&quot; (R-25th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHargue, Gwendolyn (D-4th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Gary (D-31st)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, George (D-116)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagan, Hilda (D-35th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelhout, John (D-59th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses, Denis (R-29th)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to House Chart

SP: Prime sponsor

☑ Took pro-animal position through co-sponsoring a bill, voting, signing a letter, or leading or co-sponsoring animal legislation

X Took anti-animal position on a vote

Note: In some cases, legislatures must make votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sponsorship</th>
<th>Anti</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Pro-Animal Position</th>
<th>Terminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Petri, Nancy (D-18th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peters, Scott (D-52nd)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roebke, Dora (R-48th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roybal-Allard, Lucille (D-40th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruiz, Ed (D-39th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruiz, Reuben (D-39th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanchez, Linda (D-13th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sánchez, Adrienne (D-48th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schatz, Brian (D-13th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sherman, Brad (D-39th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speier, Jackie (D-14th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speier, Jackie (D-14th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takano, Mark (D-41st)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson, Mike (D-59th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vela, Henry (D-27th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vasquez, Jodey (D-31st)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waters, Maxine (D-35th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weaver, Henry (D-35th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Carroll, John (D-Al)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to House Chart
- SP: Prime Sponsor
- X: Pro-animal position through cosponsoring a bill, voting, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal legislation
- X: Took anti-animal position on a vote
- NV: Did not vote due to absence or abstention
- #: Pro-animal position on 8 scored items plus extra credit for leading on animal protection issue and/or signing letter opposing King Amendment
- *: Put statement in Congressional Record (and notified HSUS) indicating unavoidable recorded vote but would have voted pro-animal
- **: Filed seal during term
- ***: Resigned during term
- ****: Died during term
- &: A role that delegates from U.S. Territories and the District of Columbia cannot vote on bills or amendments on the House floor
- **: Top leaders of each party typically do not cosponsor bills and the Speaker of the House does not vote, so they have no numerical score

Note: In some cases, legislators must vote for unavailable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Pro-animal</th>
<th>Anti-animal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barlow, John</td>
<td>D-12th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber, Sanford</td>
<td>D-3rd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binkley, Paul</td>
<td>R-10th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffey, Doug</td>
<td>R-8th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen, Will</td>
<td>R-11th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawne, Tom</td>
<td>R-14th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Hank</td>
<td>D-4th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Jack</td>
<td>D-12th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavitt, John</td>
<td>D-4th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, Tom</td>
<td>R-6th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Mike</td>
<td>D-8th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Doug</td>
<td>D-13th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneman, Lynn</td>
<td>D-2nd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodard, Rob</td>
<td>R-7th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botts, Madagascar</td>
<td>D/A/Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner, Tate</td>
<td>D-2nd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddix, Colleen</td>
<td>D-15th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory, Matt</td>
<td>R-13th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey, Mike</td>
<td>R-2nd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akers, Chad</td>
<td>D-17th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Dane</td>
<td>D-7th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Rodney</td>
<td>R-12th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusworth, Tammy</td>
<td>D-39th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle, Bill</td>
<td>D-11th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gullen, Lee</td>
<td>R-43rd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulgan, Randy</td>
<td>R-14th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Rob</td>
<td>D-3rd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, Adam</td>
<td>R-19th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longi, Daniel</td>
<td>D-3rd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuire, Mike</td>
<td>D-3rd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Peter</td>
<td>R-43rd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash, Bobby</td>
<td>D-1st</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider, Jack</td>
<td>D-10th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seabrook, Karen</td>
<td>R-18th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glave, John</td>
<td>R-10th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Susan</td>
<td>R-8th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Larry</td>
<td>R-9th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson, Andi</td>
<td>D-7th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massie, Luke</td>
<td>R-4th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakita, Todd</td>
<td>R-4th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suttman, Martin</td>
<td>R-3rd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want, Peter</td>
<td>D-15th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wambold, Jack</td>
<td>R-9th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Todd</td>
<td>R-9th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bray, Bruce</td>
<td>D-14th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham, Tim</td>
<td>R-3rd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loock, Dave</td>
<td>R-2nd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hageman, Tim</td>
<td>R-11th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, Lynn</td>
<td>R-2nd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Michael</td>
<td>R-14th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vose, Kevin</td>
<td>R-3rd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to House Chart
SP: Prime Sponsor
✓ Took pro-animal position through co-sponsoring a bill, voting, signing a letter, or leading or pro-animal legislation
X Took anti-animal position on a vote
DV: Did not vote due to absence or abstention
✓ Pro-animal position on 3 scored items plus extra credit for leadership on animal protection issue and/or signing letter opposing King Amendment
* Put statement in Congressional Record (and notified HHS) indicating unavoidable missed vote but would have voted pro-animal
# Filled seat during term
# Resigned during term
## Died during term
# As a rule, delegates from U.S. Territories and the District of Columbia cannot vote on bills or amendments on the House floor
** Top leaders of each party typically do not cosponsor bills and the Speaker of the House does not vote, so they have no numerical score

Note: In some cases, legislatures must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
| Kentucky       |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|        |
| Barr, Andy    |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Gaffin, Bruce |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Massie, Tim   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Rogers, Kermit |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Whitley, Edward |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Yamamoto, John |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

| Louisiana     |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|        |
| Alexander, Rodney |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Bascom, Charles |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Cassidy, Bill  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Fleming, John   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| McMillion, Vance |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Richmond, Cedric |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Skidmore, Steve |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

| Maine         |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|        |
| Michaud, Michael |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Propse, Chellie |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

| Maryland      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|        |
| Camps, Erika  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Deale, John   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Edwards, Donna |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Harris, Andy  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Hoyer, Steny  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Ruppersberger, C.A. |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

| Massachusetts |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|        |
| Capuano, Michael |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Clark, Katherine |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Frankel, William |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Kennedy, Joseph |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Lynch, Stephen  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| McGovern, James |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Neal, Richard  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Tierney, John   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Torres, Jim |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

| Michigan      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|        |
| Adkins, Justin |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Berecek, Daniel |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Bentin, Kerry  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Camp, Dave     |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Carney, John   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Dingell, John  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Hagedorn, Bill |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Khoe, Dan      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Levin, Sandor  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Miller, Candice |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Peters, Gary   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Reyes, Michael |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Rust, Fred     |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Wiegand, Tim   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

| Minnesota     |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|        |
| Bachmann, Michelle |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Ide, John      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Merchant, Betty |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Nelsen, Rick   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Peterson, Erik  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Peterson, Collin |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Walz, Tim      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

| Missouri      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|        |
| Haver, Gregg  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

Key: Key to House Chart
SP: Prime Sponsor
✓: Took pro-life position through cosponsoring a bill, voting, signing a letter, or leading on pro-life legislation
X: Took anti-life position on a vote
IV: Did not vote due to absence or abstention
+ Pro-life position on 8 scored items plus extra credit for leading on abortion protection issue and/or signing letter opposing King Amendment
*: Put statement in Congressional Record (and notified HSP) criticizing unavailing record vote but would have voted pro-life
# Filled seat during term
B Resigned during term
B: Died during term
: As a rule, delegates from U.S. Territories and the District of Columbia cannot vote on bills or amendments on the House floor
: Top leaders of each party typically do not cosponsor bills and the Speaker of the House does not vote, so they have no numerical score
Note: In some cases, legislators may miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
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<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humes, Nekhi (D-1st)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobson, Steven (R-8th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Deanne (D-1st)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to House Chart

SP = Prime Sponsor

† = Took pro-animal position through cosponsoring a bill, voting, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal legislation

X = Took anti-animal position on a vote

NY = Did not vote due to absence or abstention

* = Pro-animal position on 8 scored items plus extra credit for leading on animal protection issue or signing letter opposing King Amendment

** = Put statement in Congressional Record (and notified HUL) indicating constrained missed vote but would have voted pro-animal

†† = Filled seat during term

††† = Reigned during term

*** = Died during term

++ = As a rule, delegates from D.C., Territories and the District of Columbia cannot vote on bills or amendments on the House floor

Note: In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Senators</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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Key: House, Sponsor, SP. Key to House Chart: SP. PRIME SPONSOR. Took pro-animal position through cosponsoring a bill, voting, signing a letter, or testifying on pro-animal legislation. Took anti-animal position on a vote.
Did Your Legislators Make the Grade?

Look inside to see how your representative and senators scored in the first session of the 113th Congress on animal issues ranging from horse slaughter to an amendment seeking to wipe out state laws. Then let them know you’re watching and that you appreciate their support for animals—or that you’d like to see them do more. Also, share the Humane Scorecard with family, friends, fellow animal advocates, and your local newspaper. For a detailed look at “The 2013 Congressional Year in Review for Animals”—including which legislators led the way on pro-animal measures—and to access an online version of this publication, go to hrs.org/humane-scorecard.
HUMAN SOCIETY

LEGISLATIVE SOCIETY

The Humane Society Legislative Fund is a social welfare organization incorporated under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code and formed in 2004 as a separate lobbying affiliate of The Humane Society of the United States. HSLF works to pass animal protection laws at the state and federal levels, to educate the public about animal protection issues and to support humane candidates for office. Contributions or gifts to HSLF are not tax-deductible. Your donation may be used for lobbying to pass laws to protect animals, as well as for public purposes, such as supporting or opposing candidates.

How Scores Are Calculated

Many animal protection issues never receive a recorded vote in Congress. Some are enacted by voice vote, and some legislatively “out of committee.” To accurately measure legislators’ support, we count not just recorded votes but other meaningful votes they can help secure advance, such as cospon- soring key bills and signing letters to lobby increased enforcement of animal welfare laws. There are dozens of animal protection bills introduced each year, so we also give the most anticipated a few priority bills that have critical mass of support and a reasonable chance of enactment. Scores are given as percentages of the number of bills considered. Prize sponsors of legislation and those who list inset to agencies also receive “extra credit” equal to one vote or cosponsorship, unless they already had a score of 30%–40% in that case, their score appears in bold with a plus sign.

HSLF acknowledges the limitations of judging legis- lators based on a few votes, cosponsorships and press let- ters. In some cases, legislators must vote yes for un- avoidable personal reasons. Please consider these unrecorded matters as performance on committees, po- sitions of leadership in the House and Senate and con- stituent service.

The Scorecard is published once a year and the Humane Action Newsletter (D120–D121) is a bimonthly fact sheet by ISBN 1-930328-17-1. For updates, write to Humane Action at the address below.©2013HumaneSocietyLegislateFund.

The Humane Society of the United States is a tax-exempt charitable organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Gifts are deductible to the extent permitted by law.

The 113th Congress may be remembered for its lack of productivity and growing polarization. But despite two years of gridlock, Congress passed a number of important pieces of legislation that benefit the welfare of animals. These were some major setbacks and disappointments too, but the successes in the areas of animal fighting, horse slaughter, wildlife trafficking and more demonstrate that even when little is being done, animal protection can bridge partisan divides in Congress.

Animal Fighting:

The final Farm Bill signed into law in February 2014 (P.L. 113-79) includes a provision to strengthen the federal animal fighting law by making it a crime to knowingly attend or bring a child to an organized animal fight. Forty-nine states already had penalties for animal fighting spectacles, but the provision was needed to sync up the federal and state laws since many cases are multistate and multijurisdictional.

Chimpanzee Sanctuary:

In June 2013, Congress passed a bill (H.R. 315) to help hundreds of chimpanzees overburdened in barren laboratory cages and facilitate their retirement to national sanctuaries. Earlier that year, the National Institutes of Health had announced plans to retain about 90 percent of government-owned chimps from laboratories to sanctuaries, but there was a glitch that had led to a delay. The proposed law enacted in 2013 to implement the chimpanzee sanctuary system imposed a continuing resolution on the funding that NIH could devote to its 2014 budget due to reach the limit in November 2013. Fortunately, on Nov. 14 the Senate gave final approval to a legislative fix passed by the House, and it was signed into law shortly thereafter.

Horse Slaughter:

For the fiscal years 2014 and 2015, Congress reenacted a vital “Durbin” prohibition that had been in place from 2007 to 2011 barring the U.S. Department of Agriculture from funding inspections at horse slaughter plants, effectively making it illegal to slaughter horses for human con- sumption in this country. The omnibus spending measure signed into law in December (H.R. 1960) will sustain this protection through Sept. 30, the end of the current fiscal year.

Ivory and Wildlife Trafficking:

The National Defense Authorization Act for FY15 (H.R. 383) also enacted in December, contains a Senate provision adding authority for the Department of Defense to partner with civilian law enforcement and joint task forces to combat wildlife trafficking. The FY15 omnibus spending bill dedicates $55 million to combat wildlife trafficking—including $40 million to protect rhinos from being poached for their horns. It also prevents the United States from assisting countries and military groups if they have participated in wildlife poaching or trafficking. And the omnibus left in a harmful rider that had been in the Senate Appropriations bill, which would have blocked the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from restricting the devastating trade in elephant ivory.

Wild Horses:

The FY15 omnibus includes language to encourage the Bureau of Land Management to con- sider new, more humane methods of wild horse population management, including $1 mil- lion for a related study. It also contains language prohibiting the destruction of healthy wild horses and burros for human consumption.
Animal Welfare Enforcement:
Despite intense opposition from budget hawks, Congress again came through with needed funding for both FY14 and FY15 for the USDA's enforcement and implementation of key animal welfare laws including the Animal Welfare Act and the Horse Protection Act.

Alternatives to Animal Testing:
The committee reports accompanying the FY14 and FY15 House Interior Appropriations bills contain language encouraging continued development of non-animal alternatives for chemical testing.

Veterinary Medicine Mobility Act:
Congress enacted legislation (P.L. 113-145), signed into law in August, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow veterinarians to transport, administer, and dispense medications outside their registered locations. This will ensure veterinarians can provide proper care to animal patients in rural or remote areas, such as during disasters.

Endangered Species:
In September, Congress passed a bill (P.L. 113-165) to reauthorize the "Tiger Stump" program that raises money for conservation of elephants, gorillas, tigers, rhinoceros, and other species from using taxpayer dollars.

King Amendment:
The final Farm Bill nixed the destructive provision that had been folded into the House bill during committee, with minimal debate, at the behest of Rep. Steve King. (Iowa) (Sec. 11312 of H.R. 2642). The King amendment aimed to gut state laws protecting farm animals. By negating state and local laws on the production or manufacture of agriculture products, it could have preempted laws addressing intensive confinement on farms and a host of other food safety and animal protection concerns such as puppy mills, shark finning, and the sale of horse meat.

Sportsmen's Act:
This sweetheart deal for millionaire trophy hunters and special interests was defeated in the Senate on a procedural vote.

Setbacks
Along with successes, there were some major setbacks, with Congress caving to extreme segments of the hunting and factory farming lobbies and working to block common-sense reforms. The FY15 omnibus package includes terrible provisions seeking to block the Environmental Protection Agency from regulating toxic lead content in ammunition, to interfere with the Endangered Species Act listing of the sage grouse, to discourage the USDA from trying to reform the corporate beef check-off program that finances agribusiness lobbying against animal welfare improvements and to prohibit the EPA from requiring reporting or the issuance of Clean Air Act operating permits for greenhouse gas emissions from animal agricultural sources.

Additionally, some crucial measures were left unattended. A prime example is the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act to end the cruel torturing of Tennessee walking horses. It had overwhelming bipartisan sponsorship and was approved by the Senate Commerce Committee but blocked from Senate and House floor consideration by a few legislators doing the bidding of the horse sowers. Congressional leaders also failed to allow votes on other critical reforms, such as the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, which would codify an agreement between animal welfare groups and the egg industry to improve the treatment of laying hens.

As we look ahead to the new Congress, we take stock of the many challenges still facing animals. But we also take a moment to celebrate the significant victories and draw strength from them, knowing that the public demand for a more humane future can still yield real results in Washington.

Sincerely,

Michael Markarian  
President  
Humane Society Legislative Fund
SENATE SCORED ITEMS

Horse Soring
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Prevent All Soring Tatics (PAST) Act (S. 1806), to prohibit the torturous method of “soring,” in which trainers deliberately inflict pain on the horses and legs of Tennessee walking horses and certain other breeds to exaggerate their high-stepping gait and gain an unfair competitive advantage at horse shows. S. 1806 would amend the Horse Protection Act to end the sored industry self-policing system, strengthen penalties, ban the use of devices associated with soring and make the actual soring for the purpose of showing or selling a horse illegal.
STATUS: Amended version approved by Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation in April 2016, 69 cosponsors.

Primates as Pets
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Captive Primate Safety Act (S. 1443), to prohibit the interstate trade in primates for the exotic pet trade. Primates are often abused and neglected as pets, taken from their mothers shortly after birth, chained in a hutch or confined in a heartless cage and deprived of social interaction with other primates. They can become very aggressive and dangerous and can transmit diseases that pose serious public health and safety risks.
STATUS: Approved by Committee on Environment and Public Works in July 2016, 27 cosponsors.

Horse Slaughter
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Safeguard American Foods Exports (SAFE) Act (S. 340), to protect horses and consumers by prohibiting the transport and export of U.S. horses to slaughter for human consumption. Members also received credit if they voted in favor of a similar amendment to the FY15 Agriculture Appropriations bill in conference. American horses are not raised for food and are routinely grown hundreds of drugs over their lifetimes that can be toxic to humans if ingested.
SPONSORS: Sens. Mary Landrieu, D-La., Lindsey Graham, R-S.C.
STATUS: No action by Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pension; 30 cosponsors. Related legislation barring USDA from spending funds to inspect horse slaughter plants was approved in May 2014 as an 18-12 vote by the Appropriations Committee as part of the FY15 Agriculture Appropriations bill (amendment offered by Sens. Landrieu and Graham with the strong support of Chairwoman Barbara Mikulski, D-Md.) and in the omnibus appropriations package enacted in December 2014 (p.L. 113-235).

Eggs and Hen Housing
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendment (S. 832), to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, phased in over a period of 13-16 years, which would significantly improve animal welfare while providing a stable future for egg farmers. S. 832 would require that hen battery cages be replaced with enriched colony housing systems that would nearly double the amount of space for each bird and provide environmental enrichments such as nest boxes and perches. It would also require clear labeling on all U.S. egg cartons, informing consumers of how the eggs were produced, prohibits starving the birds to manipulate their laying cycle and ends excess ammonia levels that cause respiratory problems.
STATUS: No action by Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry; 18 cosponsors.

Animal Fighting Spectators
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act (S. 666), to establish misdemeanor penalties for knowingly attending an organized animal fight and felony penalties for knowingly bringing a minor
to such a fight. While Congress had strengthened federal animal fighting law in recent years, this legislation closed a remaining gap; prohibiting spectators as 49 states have done, and helping take the profit out of animal fighting. Spectators are not merely observers at animal fights; they are participants and accomplices who enable the crime, paying hundreds or thousands of dollars in admission fees and gambling wagers, and helping conceal organizers and handlers who try to blend into the crowd when a raid occurs.


**STATUS:** Passed Senate, July 2012. S. 646 (H.R. 3542). The measure was then signed into law by President Obama.

**Farm Bill Final Passage**

A $3 billion vote in favor of final passage of S. 646 (H.R. 3542). This vote was seen as a key step in the Senate's effort to prevent the Senate from being forced to vote on a massive omnibus farm bill. The bill includes a provision that would allow states to use federal funds to develop programs to limit the use of antibiotics in livestock. The bill also includes provisions to improve the security of food supply chains, to improve the delivery of services to rural communities, and to improve the efficiency of the tax system. The vote was 78-22, with 10 Republicans voting against the bill.

**Sportsmen’s Act**

A $3 million vote in favor of final passage of the “Sportsmen’s Act of 2014” (H.R. 3542), which would provide $3 million to support wildlife management and conservation efforts. The bill also includes provisions to improve the delivery of services to rural communities, to improve the efficiency of the tax system, and to improve the security of food supply chains. The vote was 78-22, with 10 Republicans voting against the bill.

**Funding Letter**

A $3 billion vote in favor of final passage of S. 646 (H.R. 3542). This vote was seen as a key step in the Senate’s effort to prevent the Senate from being forced to vote on a massive omnibus farm bill. The bill includes a provision that would allow states to use federal funds to develop programs to limit the use of antibiotics in livestock. The bill also includes provisions to improve the security of food supply chains, to improve the delivery of services to rural communities, and to improve the efficiency of the tax system. The vote was 78-22, with 10 Republicans voting against the bill.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Senator(s)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Baucus, Max (D)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tester, Jon (D)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walsh, John (D)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehofs, L. (D)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fischer, Deb (R)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonhannes, Mike (R)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hagan, Heidi (D)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reid, Harry (D)</td>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ayotte, Kelly (R)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharron, Jeanne (D)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Baucus, Cory (D)</td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. J. (R)</td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lien, Frank (D)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McFeetzen, Robert (R)</td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Heinrich, Martin (D)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Udall, Tom (D)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Gillibrand, Kristen (D)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sotomayor, Charles (D)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Burr, Richard (R)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hagan, Kay (D)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terry, Roy (D)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Brown, Sherrod (D)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portman, Rob (R)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Coburn, Tom (R)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coburn, Tom (R)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Merkley, Jeff (D)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyden, Ron (D)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Score:
- **SP**: Co-sponsor
- **✓**: A vote in favor of the bill
- **X**: A vote against the bill
- **100+**: Score of 100 or above
- **50+**: Score of 50 or above

Note: In some cases, legislators may cast votes for unmeasurable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sponsorship</th>
<th>Prime Sponsor</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Casey, Robert (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toomey, Pat (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Reed, Jack (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Whitehouse, Sheldon (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Graham, Lindsey (R)</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Johnson, Tim (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Scott, Tim (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Perdue (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Alexander, Lamer (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Rohrabacher, Dana (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Cornyn, John (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Ernst, Ted (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Hatch, Orrin (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Leahy, Patrick (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Sanders, Bernard (I)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Murray, Mark (D)</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Cantwell, Maria (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Manchin, Joe (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Brockmann, Jerry (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Barrasso, John (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Enzi, Michael (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness or birth of a child.
HOUSE SCORED ITEMS

Eggs and Hen Housing

A $ indicates cosponsorship of the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments (H.R. 3713), to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, phased over a period of 15–16 years, which would significantly improve animal welfare while providing a stable future for egg farmers. H.R. 3713 would require that hens battery cages be replaced with enriched colony housing systems that would nearly double the amount of space each hen provides environmental conditions such as nest boxes and perches. It would also require clear labeling on all U.S. egg cartons, informing consumers of how the eggs were produced, prohibit storing the birds to manipulate their laying cycle, and reduce ammonia levels that cause respiratory problems.

STATUS: No action by Committee on Agriculture, 114th Congress.

Animal Fighting Spectators

A $ indicates cosponsorship of the Animal Fighting Spectators Prohibition Act (H.R. 364), to establish misdemeanor penalties for knowingly attending an organized animal fight and felony penalties for knowingly bringing a minor to such a fight. Members also received notice that they would be reviewed in a related amendment to the Farm Bill in the House Agriculture Committee. While Congress had strengthened federal animal fighting law in recent years, this legislation closed a remaining gap—prohibitingSpecify, as 49 states have done, and helping states the pros out of animal fighting. Spectators are more than mere observers at animal fights; they are participants and accomplices who enable the crime, paying hundreds or thousands of dollars in admission fees and gambling on the outcome. For their part, organizers and handlers who try to blend into the crowd when a sad occurs.

STATUS: 232 cosponsors. Related language passed the Agriculture Committee by a vote of 28–17 as an amendment to H.R. 4937 as amended by Rep. McGovern in May 2015, and was included in the final Farm Bill (P.L. 113-79) signed into law in January 2014.

Agriculture Subsidies

A $ indicates a vote for an amendment to the Farm Bill (H.R. 4937) to reform the Environmental Quality Incentives Program by increasing access for farmers and eliminating payments to producers that do not fulfill conservation benefits. The amendment would lower the EQIP payment cap; prioritize projects that focus on managing wetland and habitat; provide financial support and technical assistance to help livestock producers reduce their non-therapeutic use of antibiotics; limit payments to confined animal feeding operations for constructing new waste facilities; provide greater support for farmers transitioning to organic farming and new environmentally-friendly pest management practices, and set aside $9.1 billion for the funding for wildlife focused projects.

STATUS: The amendment was defeated 215–266 in June 2013.

Farm Bill I

A $ indicates a vote against final passage of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 (H.R. 1947), which leadership refused to allow floor debate of any animal welfare amendments, including an effort to strike the dangerous and nonsensical King Amendment—which threatened to nullify dozens of state and local laws on food safety, animal welfare and agriculture—and substitute the eggplan housing legislation (H.R. 3713) as amendments on the floor. H.R. 1947 included the King Amendment (H.R. 1947) legislation. Because the Farm Bill included the King Amendment (H.R. 1947)
Amendment, a major threat to animal welfare, we urged opposition to the package.

STATUS: This first version of the Farm Bill was defeated in the House, 193-214, in June 1983.

Farm Bill II

A vote indicates a vote against final passage of the revised Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act (H.R. 2642), which retained the King Amendment and again allowed an opportunity for pro-animal amendments. Because this version included the King Amendment, a major threat to animal welfare, we urged opposition to the package.

STATUS: This second version of the Farm Bill passed the House, 204-209, in July 2013.

Farm Bill Final Passage

A vote indicates a vote against final passage of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (H.R. 2642). We urge that representatives had more reasons for voting as they did on this large package, but we urged support for it because the final conference report negotiated by the House and Senate 1) ended the dangerous and overreaching amendment offered by Rep. Steve King, lIowa, which threatened to nullify thousands of state and local laws on food safety, animal welfare and agriculture, and 2) included an upgrade to the existing lighting law based on H.R. 704. Because these two key animal issues were removed favorably in the final package, we urge support.

STATUS: The Farm Bill passed 251-166 in January 2014 and was signed into law as P.L. 113-79 in February 2014.

Sportsmen’s Act

A vote indicates a vote against the “Sportsmen’s Sportsmen’s Act of 2014” (H.R. 2642), a worksheet deal for influential big game hunters that would have serious and far-reaching consequences for wildlife, public spaces and human health and safety. H.R. 2642 would seek a loophole in the law for valuable hunters to import sport-hunted trophies of threatened and rare bears, expose federal lands—including designated wilderness areas—to sport hunting and trapping and strip the Environmental Protection Agency of its ability to protect wildlife, habitat and people from lead poisoning through exposure to toxic ammunition despite the availability of non-lead alternatives.


STATUS: The bill passed 223-100 in July 2014. Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, introduced a companion bill, S. 3693, that had no action. Unfortunately, the omnibus spending bill (P.L. 113-235) contains bill language undermining ESA protections for sage grouse, and committee report language directing federal agencies to use data fish and wildlife data as a primary source for decision-making when such data is deficient and less sound scientifically than other available information.

Funding Letter

A vote indicates that a member was one of 166 representatives who co-sponsored a group letter or who signed an individual letter to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in March 2014, seeking funds for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act, Horse Protection Act, Humane Methods of Slaughter Act and federal animal fighting law, as well as for programs to address the needs of animals in disasters and to ease the suffering of endangered rural and inner city areas and livestock, in addition to a rider blocking regulations of the context of lead in ammunition.

Endangered Species

A vote indicates a vote against the “21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act” (H.R. 4580), a package that would not enhance the recovery of endangered wildlife but instead undermine essential protections of the Endangered Species Act by empowering agency resources and obstructing the development and use of scientific research. H.R. 4580 would require federal conservation agencies to use any data provided by states, counties or tribes—even if the data is of very poor quality, was not developed by scientists at all and would compel these agencies to issue scientific facts and reviews into the creation and maintenance of online databases that could threaten important species by facilitating poaching.


STATUS: The bill passed 223-100 in July 2014. Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, introduced a companion bill, S. 3693, that had no action. Unfortunately, the omnibus spending bill (P.L. 113-235) contains bill language undermining ESA protections for sage grouse, and committee report language directing federal agencies to use data fish and wildlife data as a primary source for decision-making when such data is deficient and less sound scientifically than other available information.

Leaders

A vote indicates that the member earned extra credit for funding in a prior sponsor of pro-animal legislation (including laws not scored on this chart) or a letter to an agency.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Subcommittee</th>
<th>Nomination</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In some cases, legislators may vote "yes" or "nay" on individual nominees, regardless of their overall position on the issue. This may be due to the merits of the nominee, family relationships, or other personal reasons.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Key to House Chm</th>
<th>SF Prime Sponsor</th>
<th>Task pro-animal position through</th>
<th>Pro-animal position on a vote</th>
<th>Did not vote due to absence or distraction</th>
<th>Pro-animal position on 12 spotted-frog plus some credit for leading on animal protection issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuckolls, Ann (R-1st)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetz, Steven (R-18th)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Bruce (R-2nd)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|\n
### Notes

- **Key to House Chm**
  - "SF Prime Sponsor" indicates a member who actively supported the legislation.
  - "Task pro-animal position through" indicates legislative actions or voting that support animal rights.
  - "Pro-animal position on a vote" indicates a vote in favor of animal protection measures.
  - "Did not vote due to absence or distraction" indicates members who were absent or did not vote.
  - "Pro-animal position on 12 spotted-frog plus some credit for leading on animal protection issue" indicates members who supported both the 12 spotted-frog and broader animal protection efforts.

- **2014 PRIMARIE NC/HR 000 016**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P &amp; F</th>
<th>H &amp; V</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>P &amp; F &amp; H</th>
<th>H &amp; V &amp; No</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key to House Chart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Pease</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task: prior-to-vote on H.R. 3009</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task: prior-to-vote on H.R. 3009</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In some cases, legislators must vote in order to be counted as voting for or against the resolution as a whole. (Birth of a Child).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>sp</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pellozzi, Michael (R-NH)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gearlach, Joe (R-NH)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fattig, Mike (R-NJ)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattios, Tom (R-MA)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maheen, Patrick (R-HI)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, Tim (R-IA)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry, Scott (R-CA)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers, Joseph (R-NH)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafferty, Pat (R-PA)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz, Al (D-NY)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuster, Gail (R-PA)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Graig (R-RI)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trott, Jon (R-CA)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucek, John (R-WI)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumlin, Steve (R-TN)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turley, John (R-QM)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to House Chart**

- SP: Prime Sponsor
- ✓: Took pro-animal position through cosponsoring a bill, voting, signing a letter, or leading on a pro-animal issue
- x: Took anti-animal position on a vote

**Notes:**
- RV: Did not vote due to absence or abstention
- C: Did not vote due to conflict of interest
- NA: Did not vote due to a vacancy in the seat held by the House member
- N: Did not vote due to a vacancy in the seat held by the House member

**Issues:**
- Animal protection on 13 scored items plus extra credit for leading on animal protection issue
- **Put statement in Congressional Record (notified HRSG) indicating vote was inadvertently in error**
- **Put statement in Congressional Record (notified HRSG) indicating vote was cast in error**
- **Put statement in Congressional Record (notified HRSG) indicating vote was cast in error**

**Tie Breaker Vote:**
- A vote in the Committee on Natural Resources is used to determine the tie breaker vote on the floor of the House.

**Speaker of the House:**
- The Speaker of the House is the presiding officer of the House and is responsible for recognizing members to speak during floor debates.

**Top Leaders:**
- Top leaders of both parties typically do not cast roll call votes and the Speaker of the House often does not vote, so they have no numerical score.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Names with Yes, No, Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boyce, Kevin (R-CA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa, Jimmy (D-CA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delahunt, Jim (D-MA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frelinghuysen, Scott (R-NJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Upton, Joe (R-MI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>众 throws votes for No on this roll call.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did Your Legislators Make the Grade?

Look inside to see how your representative and senators scored in the 113th Congress on animal issues ranging from horse trading to pet housing. Then let them know you’re watching and that you appreciate their support for animals—or that you’d like to see them do more.

Also, write the Humane Society withmply, support, fellow animal advocates, and your local newspaper. For a detailed look at “The 113th Congress in Review for Animals”—including which legislators led the way on pro-animal measures—and to access an online version of this publication, go to hsus.org/humansociety.
HUMANE SCORECARD
Midterm Report for the 114th Congress
PRESIDENT'S LETTER

Washington saw plenty of gridlock in the first session of the 114th Congress, but 2015 turned out to be a very strong year for animal protection. We had several victories in the omnibus funding package signed into law on December 18 (P.L. 114-152), and other bills made it over the finish line or have the momentum to do so this year. Here's my rundown of some of Congress' key advances for animals during 2015:

Farm Animals:
In the wake of a stunning New York Times exposé that uncovered terrible abuse and neglect of farm animals at the U.S. Meat Animal Research Center in Nebraska, the omnibus directs USDA’s Agricultural Research Service to ensure that its $90 million facilities, including

US-MARC, comply with Animal Welfare Act standards, provides $450,000 for inspection and authorizes 2 percent of the ABS budget until specific animal protections are in place.

Animals in Research:
Congress approved a major increase in the ceiling of almost $1 million for a program at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) that develops alternatives to animal testing that are more humane, faster to perform, less costly to industry and can provide more reliable results than animal experiments and predict the human experience.

The omnibus also includes a provision to end USDA’s licensing of Class B dealers—monsters for keeping dogs and cats in awful conditions and obtaining them through fraudulent means, including pet theft, to sell them into research.

The omnibus incorporates a call for review of NIMH policies on monkey use, consistent animal research.

Topping things off, the Senate approved language in December, as part of its reauthorization of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), to reduce—if not eliminate—the use of live animals for chemical testing. The House already passed its version of TSCA, so we urge House-Senate conferees to hammer out their differences quickly in 2016 and retains this vital language on animal testing.

Horses:
The omnibus continues the “Defund” language that kept horse slaughter plants from resurfacing in the U.S. This outcome was far from guaranteed—on one vote, the House Appropriations Committee for the first time in years rejected an amendment to add the language. But the Senate Committee approved a parallel amendment, and we held onto the Senate position in the final House/Senate negotiations.

The omnibus retains the long-standing ban on killing healthy wild horses and burros and the sale of any wild equines for slaughter, and directs the Bureau of Land Management to continue implementing reforms recommended by the National Academy of Sciences for more humane wild horse and burro populations management, including reducing the number of animals rounded up and transferred to long-term holding pens and increasing the use of available human fertility control methods.

The omnibus maintains funding for USDA’s enforcement of the Horse Protection Act, which deals with cruel towing of walking horses, as well as for the Animal Welfare Act and other key federal laws.
Endangered Species and Other Wildlife:
A wave of riders inserted in the House and Senate Interior Appropriations bills sought to undermine the Endangered Species Act and its protections for various species, including wolves. We refused to accept this—refuting an science-based decision making to protect imperiled wildlife and plants in more urgently needed than ever, with the loss of species now at its highest rate since the extinction of the dinosaurs 65 million years ago. Thankfully, our congressional allies were able to keep out of the final version all the new riders that aimed to weaken the ESA, including the attacks on wolves.

The omnibus is comprised by reference Senate committee report language directing USDA to issue its long-delayed proposed rule to establish more humane standards of care for captive marine mammals, including orcas, dolphins and beluga whales.

The omnibus contains a 47 percent increase in funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund program that protects and improves habitat for wildlife and recreational access for nature lovers.

Wildlife Trafficking:
The omnibus reinserts a House Interior Appropriations rider that would have blocked the Obama Administration from moving forward on crucial efforts to reduce trafficking in ivory products and save elephants from illegal poaching.

The omnibus provides no less than $80 million (a $25 million increase) under the U.S. Agency for International Development to combat the transnational threat of wildlife poaching and trafficking, and bars any expenditures to train or assist military units or personnel credibly alleged to have participated in wildlife poaching or trafficking, unless the Secretary of State reports that such expenditure is in our national security interests.

The House passed the Global Anti-Poaching Act by voice vote in November to make wildlife trafficking punishable under federal laws used against organized crime, designate major wildlife trafficking countries, and authorize the U.S. Department of Defense to provide training and equipment to fight poaching on the ground. Related Senate bills have bipartisan support. Multiple bills named after Cecil, the lion killed by a U.S. trophy hunter, were also introduced in both chambers to stop imports of trophies from endangered or threatened animal species. We hope the House and Senate will reach agreement to pull together key elements of those various bills and enact needed reforms early in 2016.

Companion Animals:
The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, signed into law in December (P.L. 114-94), includes an amendment directing the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to allow pet owners to carry their pet cats and dogs onboard certain trains. This will create more opportunities for pets to remain with their families when they have no one to care for a pet during travel or need to permanently relocate.

Congress enacted a Department of Defense authorization bill (P.L. 114-92) in November with an amendment to facilitate the adoption of retired military working dogs by their former handlers and their families, honoring the special bond between service members and their trained dogs.

The omnibus provides full funding to implement the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act (enacted in 2011), which includes needed reforms for safe pet food.

All of these victories demonstrate that it is still possible for Congress to get good things done for animals and that our issues continue to cross the partisan divide. We are well-positioned to have even more wins for animals in 2016. The bills whose signatures are included in this newsletter all have overwhelming bipartisan support, and there were dozens of other bills introduced demonstrating the broad interest in animal protection among lawmakers and the public. We look forward to a robust second session of the 114th Congress and to the renewed engagement of advocates across the country. It is your engagement that makes all the difference to our success.

Sincerely,

Michael Markarian
President
Humane Society Legislative Fund
SENIATE SCORED ITEMS

Pets and Domestic Violence

A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Pet and Women Safety (PAWS) Act (S. 1559), to make it harder for abusers to steal or harm pets and their owners by requiring pet owners to keep pets safely secured and supervised while the abuser is in custody, providing additional protection for pets and their owners. This legislation will help protect pets and increase the chances of domestic violence victims escaping from an abusive partner—those who escape within two weeks of an attempt to harm their pet, their abuser or the victim's pets are less likely to return to their partner. 

STATUS: 27 cosponsors; referred to Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Animal Cruelty

A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Preventing Animal Cruelty and Torture (PACT) Act (H.R. 240), to increase the penalties for animal cruelty. This legislation would make it a federal crime to intentionally cause serious bodily injury to a pet, or to commit animal cruelty (e.g., killing, selling, or injuring an animal). This would help protect pets and their owners, and increase the chances of domestic violence victims escaping from an abusive partner—those who escape within two weeks of an attempt to harm their pet, their abuser or the victim's pets are less likely to return to their partner.

STATUS: 7 cosponsors; referred to Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Horse Soring

A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act (S. 1125), to amend existing federal law to better crack down on the cruel practice of “soring,” in which unethical trainers deliberately inflict pain on the hooves and legs of Tennessee walking horses and certain other breeds to force them to perform an unnatural and high-stepping gait and gain unfair competitive advantage at shows. This bill was introduced again in 2015 after House investigations of the industry, but has not passed.

STATUS: 28 cosponsors; referred to Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, which appeared on an identical bill in 2014.

Horse Slaughter

A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Safeguard American Food Exports (SAFE) Act (S. 1340), to protect horses and consumers by prohibiting the transport or export of U.S. horses to slaughter for human consumption. This legislation would help protect pets and their owners, and increase the chances of domestic violence victims escaping from an abusive partner—those who escape within two weeks of an attempt to harm their pet, their abuser or the victim's pets are less likely to return to their partner.
Endangered Species Act

A ‘+’ indicates a vote against an amendment to S. 1 (Revision X). Pipeline Act to immediately and permanently delist the lesser prairie chicken, which, at the time, was listed as ‘endangered’ under the EISA. The lesser prairie chicken’s population has declined for decades and dropped 50 percent between 2002-2015. By adding 1 percent of the species’ natural numbers remain in its five-state range. Listing under the ESA is critical at this time to preserve the species’ existence. It is for scientists and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, not Congress, to manage listing and delisting decisions under the EISA. A ‘+’ indicates environmental law supported by 90 percent of American voters.


Summary: Amendment was defeated 56-44. (in January 2016 Senate failed to overturn presidential veto on Keystone pipeline bill). Unfortunately, in September, a federal judge ruled the FWS decision to list the lesser prairie chicken as threatened under the ESA.

Oncorhynchus

A ‘+’ indicates a vote for the FY 2016 oncorhynchus ride bill (HR 2253). We note that oncorhynchus has many reasons for voting on this large package, but we voted against it because the conference report negotiated by the House and Senate addressed a broad range of humane concerns. The final package contains many vital animal protection provisions and excludes other provisions that would harm extensively detrimental to animals, as explained in the President’s Letter.

SPO0520: The bill passed 266-113 in the House and 63-33 in the Senate on December 18, 2015, and was signed into law that day as P.L. 114-133.

Leaders

A ‘+’ indicates that the senator earned extra credit for leading in a primary sponsor of pro-animal legislation (including items not scored on this chart) or a letter to an agency. A ‘+’ indicates that the senator secured double extra credit for leading on multiple legislative and/or regulatory efforts or leading on a top priority issue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Sessions, Jeff (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelby, Richard (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Murkowski, Lisa (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sullivan, Daniel (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Flake, Jeff (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✬</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCain, John (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Boozman, John (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cotton, Tom (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Boxer, Barbara (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feinstein, Dianne (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Bennet, Michael (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gardner, Cory (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Blumenthal, Richard (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murphy, Christopher (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Carper, Thomas (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coons, Chris (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Nelson, Bill (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubio, Marco (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Isakson, Johnny (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perdue, David (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Hirono, Mazie (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schatz, Brian (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Crapo, Michael (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risch, Jim (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Durbin, Richard (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kirk, Mark (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Chers:

- **SP** Prim Sponsor
- ✬ Took pro-animal position through cosponsorship of a bill, a vote, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal issue(s)
- ✬ Led on multiple legislative and/or regulatory efforts or led on a top priority issue
- ✬ Took anti-animal position on a vote
- NV Did not vote due to absence or abstention
- ✬ Pro-animal position on 1 or more items, plus extra credit for leading on animal protection issue(s)
- ✬ The top leaders of each party typically don't cosponsor bills, so they have no numerical score

Note: In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unexcusable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Daines, Steve (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tester, Jon (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Fischer, Deb (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sasse, Ben (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Heller, Dean (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reid, Harry (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Ayyotte, Kelly (R)</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaheen, Jeanne (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Booker, Cory (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menendez, Robert (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Hirsch, Martin (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Udall, Tom (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Gillibrand, Kirsten (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schumer, Charles (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Burr, Richard (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tillis, Thom (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Heffelfinger, Kaci (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoeven, John (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Brown,שיארה (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portman, Rob (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Inhofe, James (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lankford, James (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markey, Jeff (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyden, Ron (D)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Senate Chart:
- **SP**: Prime Sponsor
- ✓: Took pro-animal position through co-sponsorship of a bill, a vote, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal issues
- X: Took anti-animal position on a vote
- NV: Did not vote due to absence or abstention
- *: Pro-animal position on 7 or more items or a co-sponsorship involving animal protection issues
- **: The top leaders of each party typically don’t co-sponsor bills, so they have no numerical score.

**Note:** In some cases, legislators must miss votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as the death of a family member, serious illness, or birth of a child.
HOUSE SCORED ITEMS

Pets and Domestic Violence
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Pet and Women Safety (PAWS) Act (H.R. 2398), to make it harder for abusers to keep or have pets by 1) allowing pets to be protected across states when restraining orders are issued in domestic violence and stalking cases; and 2) authorizing great grants so that domestic violence shelters can accommodate pets (accidental, only 3 percent of these shelters allow pets). Help for pets that are victims of abuse is clearly related to animal cruelty, up to 84 percent of women entering domestic violence shelters reported that their partner abused or killed their pets.


Animal Cruelty
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Preventing Animal Cruelty and Torture (PACT) Act (H.R. 2226), to strengthen the federal animal crush video law enacted in 2016 (which banned the creation, sale, and distribution of obscene videos that show the intentional crushing, burning, drowning, suffocating, impaling, or live animals to prohibit these serious acts of animal cruelty when they occur in interstate or foreign commerce). The legislation would also authorize new animals’ anti-cruelty laws in the same way that federal officers/law-enforcement authorities comply across state lines. Animal liberation activists are often imprisoned for violent cruelty to animals. This legislation would complement the state’s anti-cruelty laws in the same way that federal economic/law-enforcement authorities comply across state lines. Animal liberation activists are often imprisoned for violent cruelty to animals. This legislation would complement the state’s anti-cruelty laws in the same way that federal economic/law-enforcement authorities comply across state lines.


Horse Soring
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act (H.R. 2186), to amend the existing federal law to better crackdown on the cruel practice of “soring” — in which unscrupulous trainers deliberately inflict pain on the horses and legs of Tennessee walking horses by using certain boxes in their homes to impair their performance by cutting off their ability to move. 2186 would amend the Horse Protection Act of 1970 (a prior law that was not effective) to reestablish funding for inspections in the state and improve law enforcement.


Animal Testing for Cosmetics
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Humane Cosmetics Act (H.R. 2856), to phase out the U.S. testing of cosmetics on free animals and the sale of newly animal-tested cosmetics. While many manufacturers no longer test on animals, some animal tests are still conducted on rabbits, pigs, and mice for assessing ingredients. These tests are not predictive of the human experience as their results are unreliable for consumer safety, and they are intensely cruel to animals and are simply unnecessary. There are many alternative methods to ensure that products are safe for humans and H.R. 2856 will help the U.S. remain competitive in the global market and create a key incentive for cosmetics to be tested with cutting-edge technologies that are more humane, faster and less cruel to industry than animal testing.


Horse Slaughter
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of the Safeguard American Food Exports (SAFE) Act (H.R. 943), to protect horses and consumers by prohibiting the transport and export of U.S. horses to slaughter for human consumption. Members also deserve credit if they voted in favor of a related “political” amendment to the FY16 Agriculture Appropriations bill to authorize, but cap expenses of the SAFE Act who voted against that amendment is considered did not receive credit for cosponsorship. American horses are not raised for food and are routinely given numerous drugs over their lifetime that can be toxic to humans if ingested. The U.S. public overwhelmingly opposes horse slaughter. Horses are shipped for long distances and are often severely injured and killed in transport. As the slaughter plant, the methods used to kill horses cruelly result in quick, painless deaths.


Ivory/Elephants
A ✓ indicates cosponsorship of an amendment to H.R. 2823 (Protect Wildlife Preservation Act) to strike section 12(b), a rider aimed at blocking the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from proposing a modest rule to crack down on the commercial ivory trade in this country. The U.S. is the second larg- est ivory market in the world after China. With 35,000 elephants killed for their tusks each year, or over every 10 minutes, extinction looms within one to two decades for elephants in the wild. Poachers bra- zily hack off the faces of elephants to obtain the tusks and leave them to die. Additionally, elephant poaching has become a prime source of revenue to finance terrorist groups such as the Lord’s Resistance Army and the Loyalist militia. Closing the U.S. market for ivory products is crucial for national security, as well as for elephants’ survival and pro-
serving vital tourism economics in Africa. The agency has proposed a
renewed role that accommodates the major stakeholders and allows
flexibility for antiques and inheritances.
STATUS: Amendment was defeated 283-244 in July 2013, but every rider
was fortunately kept out of final enacts.

Endangered Species Act
A ✔ indicates a vote for an amendment to H.R. 2832 (Interior Appropri-
tional) to strike sections 117, 121, and 123, riders designed to end protections
for imperiled species and undermine the ESA, a bedrock environmental law
supported by 90 percent of Americans voters. Special-interest decisions should
be based on sound scientific and public input, not by political riders that put
our nation’s wildlife at risk. Section 117 would allow 33 Congress to already
done in 2010 ESA protections for sage grouse, whose populations have de-
clined by more than 90 percent from historical levels. Section 121 would
force the delisting of gray wolves in the Great Lakes states and Wyoming
and eliminate the possibility of judicial review, even though state manage-
ment plans have proven disastrous for wolves and they occupy only a small
fraction of their historic range. A more moderate approach of devaluing
threatened (rather than delisting) would retain federal protections while
allowing flexibility for lethal control of wolves for livestock depredation.
Section 122 would weaken protections for northern long-nosed bats, whose
populations have declined 99 percent over their core range.
STATUS: Amendment was defeated 180-242 in July 2013. Fortunately, all
new anti-ESA riders for a number of species, including wolves and bats,
were kept out of final enactment, though a rider blocking ESA protections for
sage grouse was enacted, as it had been in 2014 omnibus.

Omnibus
A ✔ indicates a vote for the FY 2014 omnibus funding bill (H.R.
2014). We note that representatives had many reasons for voting as
they did on this large package, but we urged support for it because
the conference report negotiated by the House and Senate addressed
a broad range of humane concerns. The final package contains many
vital animal protection provisions and excludes other provisions that
would have been extremely detrimental to animals, as explained in the
President’s Letter.
STATUS: The bill passed 316-118 in the House and 65-35 in the Senate on
December 18, 2013 and was signed into law that day as P.L. 113-16.

Funding Letter
A ☑ indicates that a member was one of 361 representatives who signed
a group letter or submitted a formal individual request to the Agricul-
ture Appropriations Subcommittee in March, seeking funds for USDA
enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act (including at USDA’s Agricul-
tural Research Service facilities conducting research on farm animals),
Home Protection Act, Humane Methods of Slaughter Act and Federal
animal fighting law, as well as for programs to address the needs of
animals in disasters and to encourage vaccinations. (Through student
loan repayment assistance, loans to underdetermined rural areas and USDA
inspection positions. Subcommittee and committee leaders don’t sign
letters to themselves but received credit because they were very responsive
to these requests.
STATUS: Omnibus signed into law in December 2013 includes most of
needed funding and more than requested for ANS enforcement, with an
extra $940,000 for inspections at ARS facilities.

Leaders
A ☑ indicates that the representative earned extra credit for leading as a
prime sponsor of pro-animal legislation (including items not scored on this
draft) or a letter to an agency. A ☑ indicates that the representative signed
double extra credit for leading on multiple legislative and/or regulatory
efforts or leading on a top priority issue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchord, Robert (R-48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Bo (R-58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne, Shelly (R-144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Gary (R-48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley, Maury (R-282)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Michael D. (R-134)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savelli, Terri (D-781)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aragon, Mike (R-96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank, Trent (R-87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallego, Ruben (D-79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossar, Paul (R-49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grigg, Paul (D-45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkpatrick, Ann (D-101)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGaffin, Martha (R-230)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel, Kent (R-58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmickel, Steve (R-282)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skema, Ray (D-96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford, Rick (R-191)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, French (R-270)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerman, Bruce (R-448)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woronchik, Steve (R-338)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguiar, Paul (D-234)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass, Karen (D-376)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellmont, Xavier (D-398)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bera, Ann (D-74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownley, Julie (D-268)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullin, Alan (R-427)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capp, Luke (D-248)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardenas, Tony (D-259)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu, Judy (D-270)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, Paul (R-58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa, Jim (D-168)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Susan (D-338)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechema, Jeff (R-303)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelBianco, Mark (D-119)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edlin, Anna (D-169)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan, Sam (D-208)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giannini, John (D-208)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahn, Jayce (D-449)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honda, Michael (D-179)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffman, James (R-208)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurst, Duncan (R-208)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac, Darrell (R-498)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight, Steve (R-290)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaMalfa, Doug (R-141)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Barbara (D-393)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, Ted (D-253)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lofgren, Zoe (D-296)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowenthal, Alan (D-478)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaki, Denis (D-488)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy, Kevin (R-238)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClintock, Tom (D-484)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuinness, Jerry (D-298)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulvaney, Grace (D-329)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunes, Denny (R-294)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to House Chart
SP Prime Sponsor
X Took pro-animal position through maneuvering a bill, voting, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal issues
L Lead on multiple legislative and/or regulatory efforts or led on a top priority issue
X Took anti-animal position on a vote
NV Did not vote due to absence or abstention
+ Pro-animal positions on 9 scored items plus extra credit for leading on animal protection issues
* Put statement in Congressional Record (and notified HS) indicating unavoidable missed votes but would have voted pro-animal
† Conspicuous bill but voted against similar amendment in House Appropriations Committee
†† Died cast during term
* Died during term
* Resigned during term
* Died during term

Note: In some cases, legislator's votes were determined by personal measures, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test A</td>
<td>Subject 1</td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>Score 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test B</td>
<td>Subject 2</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>Score 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Chart
1. Test A
2. Test B
3. Subject 1
4. Subject 2
5. Grade 1
6. Grade 2
7. Score 1
8. Score 2

Note: Some scores may be missing or partially obscured.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>X X ✓</th>
<th>285</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Rick (R-12th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop, Bernice (D-2nd)</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caver, Buddy (R-14th)</td>
<td>X X ✓</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Doug (R-8th)</td>
<td>X X ✓</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crans, Tami (R-11th)</td>
<td>X X ✓</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulks, Jerry (R-10th)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Mark (D-18th)</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loeff, John (D-9th)</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckenbill, Daryl (R-15th)</td>
<td>X X ✓</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, Tom (D-8th)</td>
<td>X X ✓</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Austin (R-6th)</td>
<td>X X ✓</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, David (D-13th)</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starnes, Lynn (R-3rd)</td>
<td>X X ✓</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodall, Rob (R-7th)</td>
<td>X X ✓</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to House Chart**

**SP** Prime Sponsor

- Took pro-animal position through cosponsoring a bill, voting, signing a letter, or drafting an animal protection issue(s)

- Led on multiple legislative and/or regulatory efforts or led on a top priority issue

- Took anti-animal position on a vote

- NV Did not vote due to absence or abstention

**Notes:**

- Pre-annual position on 5 scored items plus extra credit for leading on animal protection issue(s)

- Did not cosponsor SPF but voted in favor of similar amendment in House Appropriations Committee

- FI Filled seat during term

- Resigned during term

- Died during term

- As a rule, delegates from U.S. Territories and the District of Columbia cannot vote on bills or amendments on the House floor

**4**

**Note:** in some cases, legislatures must make votes for unavoidable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Term 2</th>
<th>Term 3</th>
<th>Term 4</th>
<th>Term 5</th>
<th>Key to Votes Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Votes Chart:
- X: Absent
- ✔: Present
- ☐: Not Voting

Note: In some cases, legislation must also receive an override of two-thirds of the votes to pass, in addition to a majority vote.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hummel, Alan (R-1st)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patz, Steven (R-3rd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Bernell (D-2nd)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to House Chart:
- SP: Prime Sponsor
- Tack pro-animal position through co-sponsoring a bill, voting, signing a letter, or leading on pro-animal issues
- Led on multiple legislative and/or regulatory efforts or led on a top priority issue
- Did not vote due to absence or attendance
- Pre-animal position on 9 sound items plus extra credit for leading on animal protection issues
- Co-sponsored bill but voted against similar amendment in House Appropriations Committee
- Filed a bill during term
- Resigned during term
- Died during term
- As a rule, delegates from U.S. Territories and the District of Columbia cannot vote on bills or amendments on the House floor.

Note: In some cases, legislators must vote for understandable personal reasons, such as a death in the family, serious illness, or birth of a child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sponsorship</th>
<th>184th House Scorecard</th>
<th>185th House Scorecard</th>
<th>186th House Scorecard</th>
<th>187th House Scorecard</th>
<th>188th House Scorecard</th>
<th>189th House Scorecard</th>
<th>190th House Scorecard</th>
<th>191st House Scorecard</th>
<th>192nd House Scorecard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key to House Chart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took pro-animal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislating a bill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voting, signing a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter, or leading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on pro-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led on multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislative efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or regulatory efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or led on a top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priority issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took anti-animal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position on a vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote due to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absence or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abstention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-animal position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on 10 scored items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus extra credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for leading on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>label(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled seat during</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resigned during term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died during term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a rule, delegates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from U.S. Territories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the District of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia cannot vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on bills or amendments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the House floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes: In some cases, legislative votes may</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>override personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasons, such as a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death in the family,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serious illness, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birth of a child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Political Party</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Political Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Samuel, Ryan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Jones, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jones, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Williams, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Williams, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Martinez, Sarah</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Martinez, Sarah</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Lopez, Emma</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lopez, Emma</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Perez, Maria</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Perez, Maria</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Martinez, Sarah</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Martinez, Sarah</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Johnson, Mary</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Williams, John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Juan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Smith, Steve</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above table lists members of Congress with their names and political affiliations. The table is not a diagram and does not require rotation correction. The numbers correspond to the order in which the members are listed.
EXHIBIT 16
From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 11:50 AM
To: HumaneSociety.org
Subject: Re: Jockey

Cory,

Please be sure Ed votes FOR the Peters amendment today (banning polar bear imports and hunting in Nat'l Parks). Ed voted this way last time.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 17, 2012, at 11:07 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Good point on how hard it is to ban medication on tracks. Maybe I don't fully appreciate how hard it might be for a track owner to prohibit meds, but I know he is very controversial as he was involved in slots in Maryland. We need to have good witnesses, without baggage and from what I've found out, he has baggage.

> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: Staci Hancock <st painfully@stonefarm.com>  
> Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 10:47 AM  
> To: Hicks, Cory  
> Cc: 'Connie Harriman-Whitefield' <Connie.HarrimanWhitefield@humaneSociety.org>  
> 'Arthur Hancock' <Arthur.Hancock@stonefarm.com>  
> Subject: Re: Jockey  
> 
> > Gotcha...maybe don't need to rock the boat right yet.  
> > But we do need to follow up on the issue with Magna and    
> > Strenach...because he did ATTEMPT to ban medication on his tracks.    
> > We all know by now that it isn't as easy as just stopping    
> > medication...sure he needs for his tracks to make money...but if the    
> > trainers threaten to leave there and run elsewhere...that is just    
> > another example of WHY we need the federal legislation.    
> 
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>  
> Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 8:55 AM  
> To: Staci Hancock <st painfully@stonefarm.com>; Connie.HarrimanWhitefield@humaneSociety.org; Arthur.Hancock@stonefarm.com  
> Cc:  
> Subject: Re: Jockey  
> 
> > Thanks, Staci. We'll follow up with Gary today.

COE.WHITFIELD.DISC.036640
We looked into Stronach and he seems to be a pretty controversial person, especially in Maryland. Plus, if he owns all these racetracks he can just stop drugs period. I know he tried, but I'm concerned about putting him on the spot to explain why he failed—answer probably being he needed to make money.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Staci Hancock [mailto: hstoneman@stonefarm.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2012 8:59 AM
To: 'Connie Harlinan-Whitfield' <connie@humanesociety.org>; Hicks, Cory
Cc: 'Arthur Hancock' <hstoneman@stonefarm.com>
Subject: RE: Jockey

Spoke with Gary yesterday from the airport.........he is working on coming up with another jock to testify.
He mentioned Jerry Bailey.
I explained again the hook of the hearing and that jockey safety and health would be a major issue.

Cory do you want to work directly with him? Or ......?
I sent you his email address last week......
Let me know....either you can follow up today or I will.

Also...just back in town...what happened about MAGNA testifying?
Stronach himself, Farge Verga, or......
Gary said he could make some calls about this as well. He just needs the go ahead.

Gary is such a great team member!!!!!!

Staci


From: Tamara Bailey-Wilfelf
To: Hala, Cory-Cong/Hala@mail.house.gov
Subject: H.R. 687

Dear Hala,

I have received your message. I am not sure what to do with it, but I will do my best to respond as soon as possible.

Best,
Tamara Bailey-Wilfelf
EXHIBIT 18
Connie wants us on the Puppy Mill Bill. NRA won't like it, but I think it is fine. We've been on it every year.

H.R.835 [112th]
Latest Title: Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act
Committee: House Agriculture
Related Bills: S.797

Cory Hicks
Legislative Director/Policy Coordinator
Rep. Ed Whitfield
202-225-3155

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
http://whitfield.house.gov
EXHIBIT 19
Bill Summary & Status
112th Congress (2011 - 2012)
H.R.835
Cosponsors

Item 25 of 147

PREVIOUS | NEXT ABOUT COSPONSORS
PREVIOUS:COSPONSORS | NEXT:COSPONSORS
NEW SEARCH | HOME | HELP |

* Back to Bill Summary and Status

H.R.835

Latest Title: Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act
Related Bills: S.707


COSPONSORS(215), ALPHABETICAL [followed by Cosponsors withdrawn]:  (Sort: by date)

EXHIBIT 20
Wonderful! Thank you, Carol.

--- Original message ---
From: Frederick Whitfield <frederick@frederick-whitfield.com>
Cc: Mark Sandly <mcsandly@frederick-whitfield.com>, Carolyn Whitfield <cwhitfield@frederick-whitfield.com>
Subject: Re: From Walking Horse Project

I will make certain that Bill sets up a phone meeting with you. It is essential to keep this very small. Therefore, The bill will be only taking place the following week.

Best
Carol

--- Original message ---
From: Frederick Whitfield <frederick@frederick-whitfield.com>
Cc: Mark Sandly <mcsandly@frederick-whitfield.com>, Carolyn Whitfield <cwhitfield@frederick-whitfield.com>
Subject: Re: From Walking Horse Project

On Aug 11, 2016, at 11:54 P.M., ‘Keith’ <frederick@frederick-whitfield.com> wrote:

If that sounds accurate in getting a phone meeting with Bill, Whitfield, or his staff, it would be very good in getting some of what the steps. We have to avoid any sort of confusion in Mr. during the August weeks of the session by the H.R. 38, and to make sure that it all. We will need to be sure it completely on point and not might provide or some indication of what the right way to go. Thanks.

Keith

--- Original message ---
From: Frederick Whitfield <frederick@frederick-whitfield.com>
Cc: Mark Sandly <mcsandly@frederick-whitfield.com>, Carolyn Whitfield <cwhitfield@frederick-whitfield.com>
Subject: Re: From Walking Horse Project

On Aug 11, 2016, at 10:21 P.M., ‘Keith’ <frederick@frederick-whitfield.com> wrote:

Congresswoman Blackburn wrote that she would like to hear your contact us at this address. My name is Mary Bly, and I am the former President of The Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders & Exhibitors’ Association (TWHBBA). During my tenure, the Walking Horse Act (H.R. 38) was introduced, and although I did not endorse at the time, I have onboard it and consider this a wonderful idea.

I would like to report a telephone meeting with Mr. Whitfield is the convention, and we work to keep him aware. I offer my support to encourage passage of the amendment. I am here for help. It is not a good idea for Mr. Blackburn was featured on the front cover of The Tennessean, and I have passed this link to the article below.

Please feel free to contact me at any time, and we are both dedicated to the same cause of ending the barefoot practice of caring. I sent him a letter on my website phone at 615-536-4004 or via mail.


All the best,

Mary Bly
Past President, TWHBBA 2011-2013
President-Elect of the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders Association 2011-2013
Past President, Tennessee Walking Horse Council

Confidential Treatment Under the Nondisclosure Provisions of H.R. 606 or the 110th Congress as Amended Requested

COE.WHITFIELDDISC.014415
EXHIBIT 21
Got it - thanks.

Can you add Lindsay Graham to the list?

Keith

-----Original message-----
From: "Heydlauff, Emma" <emma.heydlauff@mail.house.gov>
To: Keith Dane <humane@civic.org>
Sent: Tue, Oct 29, 2013 6:12:32 PM
Subject: RE: Senate member meetings

I know Tate so I can email her today. I will also contact Pryor's office.

Also, I cannot let them know Connie is attending as I cannot set up meetings for her. I can only schedule the meetings for Marty and Donna.

Thanks,
Emma

-----Original Message-----
From: "Heydlauff, Emma" <emma.heydlauff@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 4:87 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: RE: Senate member meetings

Yes, at this point they have no meetings scheduled and are available any of those days.

Can you also try for a meeting with Tate Bennett in McConnell's office?

Thanks so much.
Keith

-----Original message-----
From: "Heydlauff, Emma" <emma.heydlauff@mail.house.gov>
To: Keith Dane <humane@civic.org>
Sent: Tue, Oct 29, 2013 6:10:31 PM
Subject: RE: Senate member meetings

Happy to reach out to them. Are they available anytime Tuesday through Friday? I will start reaching out to them today.

Thanks,
Emma

-----Original Message-----
From: Keith Dane <halley:humanesociety.org>

COE.WHITFIELDDISC.036638
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 3:40 PM
To: Haydlauff, Emma
Subject: Senate member meetings

Emma,

Could you work on setting up member meetings next week from Tuesday through Friday for Marty and Donna? Connie says that those with asterisks below are more likely to agree to a meeting if they know she's going to be attending.

Thanks so much.

Keith

Sessions*
Shelby
Cochran
Thune*
Boozman*
Blunt*
Heller
Coch
Scott
Fischer
Johnson, Ron
Corker
Burr*
Coburn*
Harkin
EXHIBIT 22
Attached is the meeting schedule for tomorrow and I have added one meeting for next Wednesday. Please let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,
Emma

Emma Hayduff
Schedule
Office of Congressman Bill Whitfield
2308 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3467
Fax: (202) 225-7379
Email: Emma.Hayduff@mail.house.gov

Click here to sign up for Rep. Bill Whitfield's e-newsletter.

Meeting Schedule
Ms. Donna Benefield and Mr. Marty Irby

Monday, October 7

Meeting with Mike Albares, Agriculture Legislative Assistant for Congresswoman Martha Roby (AL-2)
11:00am
Location: 428 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Cory Gardner (CO-4)
11:30am
Location: 213 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Bill Johnson (OH-6)
2:00pm
Location: 1710 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Lee Terry (NE-2)
3:00pm
Location: 2266 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Brett Guthrie (KY-2)
4:30pm
Location: 308 Cannon

Tuesday, October 8

Meeting with Congressman Pete Sessions (TX-32)
11:00am
Location: 2233 Rayburn

Meeting with Congresswoman Shelley Moore Capito (WV-2)
1:00pm
Location: 2366 Rayburn

Updated 10/24/2013 at 12:05pm
Meeting with Congressman Rodney Davis (IL-13)
1:45pm
Location: 1740 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Ed Royce (CA-39)
2:15pm
Location: 2185 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Phil Roe (TN-1)
2:30pm
Location: 407 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Glen Thompson (PA-05)
3:15pm
Location: 124 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman George Holding (NC-13)
4:00pm
Location: 507 Cannon

Thursday, October 10

Meeting with Ashley Johnson, Legislative Assistant for Congressman Dave Reichert (WA-8)
11:00am
Location: 1127 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Morgan Griffith (VA-9)
11:30am
Location: 1108 Longworth

Meeting with Congresswoman Vicky Hartzler (MO-04)
1:00pm
Location: 1023 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Tom Marino (PA-10)
2:00pm

Updated 10/24/2013 at 12:05pm
Location: 410 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (FL-27)
3:45pm
Location: 2206 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Mike Pompeo (KS-4)
4:15pm
Location: 107 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Pete Olson (TX-21)
4:30pm
Location: 312 Cannon

Friday, October 11

Meeting with Congressman Michael Burgess (TX-26)
10:00am
Location: 2336 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
10:30am
Location: 2184 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Ralph Hall (TX-04)
11:15am
Location: 2405 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Brad Wenstrup (OH-02)
12:00pm
1223 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman John Duncan (TN-02)
1:00pm
Location: 2207 Rayburn

Updated 10/24/2013 at 12:05pm
Meeting with Keith Studdard, Legislative Director for Congresswoman Marsha Blackburn (TN-07) 
1:30pm
Location: 217 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Phil Gingrey (GA-11) 
2:00pm
Location: 442 Cannon

Meeting with Congresswoman Cathy McMorris Rodgers (WA-05) 
3:00pm
Location: 203 Cannon

Tuesday, October 15

Meeting with Aaron Cutler with Majority Leader Eric Cantor’s office 
10:15am
Location: H-329 in the Capitol

Meeting with Neil Chatterjee with Senator Mitch McConnell’s Leadership office 
11:00am
Location: S-230 in the Capitol

Meeting with Deputy Legislative Director Allison Martin for Senator Lamar Alexander (TN) 
12:00pm
Location: 455 Dirksen

Meeting with Legislative Assistant Erin Burns for Senator Joe Manchin (WV) 
1:30pm
Location: Hart 306

Meeting with Legislative Director Tony Eberhard for Senator John Hoeven (ND) 
2:45pm
Location: 338 Russell

Meeting with Congresswoman Vicky Hartzler (MO-04) 
2:45pm

Updated 10/24/2013 at 12:05pm
Location: 1023 Longworth HOB

Meeting with Legislative Assistants Kern Hoff and Emily Small for Senator Roger Wicker (MS)
3:30pm
Location: S55 Dirksen

Meeting with Legislative Director John Watts for Senator Dianne Feinstein (CA)
4:00pm
Location: Hart 331

Wednesday, October 16

Meeting with Congressman Frank Pallone (NJ)
9:45am
Location: 237 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Billy Long (MO)
10:30am
Location: 1541 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Bill Cassidy, M.D. (LA)
11:15am
Location: 1131 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Mike Rogers (AL)
12:00pm
Location: 324 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman John Barrow (GA)
1:45pm
Location: 2202 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Gregg Harper (MS)
2:15pm
Location: 307 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Roger Williams (TX)

Updated 10/24/2013 at 12:05pm
2:45pm  
Location 1122 Longworth  

Meeting with Richard Vaughn, Chief of Staff for Congressman Scott Deslarais (TN) [Marty and Donna ONLY]  
3:30pm  
Location: 413 Cannon  

Thursday, October 17  

Meeting with Todd Womack, Chief of Staff, and Hunter Bethea, Legislative Assistant for Senator Bob Corker (TN)  
10:00am  
Location: Dirksen 425  

Meeting with Legislative Aide, Nisha, for Congressman Ami Bera (CA-07)  
11:00am  
Location: 1408 Longworth  

Meeting with Senator David Vitter (LA)  
12:00pm  
Location: 516 Hart  

Meeting with Dan Scandling, Chief of Staff for Congressman Frank Wolf (VA-10)  
1:15pm  
Location: 233 Cannon  

Monday, October 21  

Meeting with Justin Ouimette with Congressman Mark Sanford’s Office  
10:00am  
Location: 322 Cannon  

Meeting with Luke Hatzis and Joe Fawell, Legislative Director and Legislative Assistant for Congressman Peter Roskam (IL-06)  
12:00pm  
Location: 227 Cannon  

Updated 10/24/2013 at 11:05pm
Meeting with Miriam Fry with Congressman Mo Brooks’ Office
2:00 PM
Location: 1230 Longworth

Wednesday, October 23

Meeting with Congressman Bill Owens (NY-21)
9:45am
Location: 405 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Mario Diaz-Balart (FL-25)
10:30am
Location: 436 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Gus Bilirakis (FL-12)
11:15am
Location: 2313 Rayburn

Meeting with Harrison Lewis, Deputy Chief of Staff for Congressman Richard Nugent (FL-11)
12:30pm
Location: 1727 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Kevin McCarthy (CA-23)
1:30pm
Location: H-107, Capitol

Meeting with Congressman Darrell Issa (CA-49)
2:30pm
Location: 2347 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Gene Green (TX-29)
3:00pm
Location: 2470 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Dan Maffei (NY-24)
4:30pm

Updated 10/24/2013 at 12:05pm
Location: 422 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Kevin Cramer (ND-AL)
5:00pm
Location: 1032 Longworth

Thursday, October 24

Meeting with Saul Hernandez, Legislative Director for Congressman GK Butterfield (NC-01)
10:00am
Location: 2305 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Chris Collins (NY-27)
10:30am
Location: 1117 Longworth

Meeting with Danielle Beck, Legislative Assistant for Congressman Tom Rooney (FL-17)
11:00am
Location: 221 Cannon

Meeting with Ian Blue, Legislative Assistant for Congressman Mike Thompson (CA-05)
12:00pm
Location: 231 Cannon

Meeting with Dustin Sifford, Legislative Assistant for Congressman Xavier Becerra (CA-34)
1:15pm
Location: 1226 Longworth

Meeting with Alexandra Collison, Legislative Assistant for Congressman Duncan Hunter (CA-50)
2:00pm
Location: 229 Cannon

Meeting with Damon Nelson, Legislative Director for Congressman Devin Nunes (CA)
3:00pm
Location: 1013 Longworth

Meeting with Nicole Cohen, Senior Legislative Assistant for Congressman Joe Crowley (NY-14)
4:00pm

Updated 10/24/2013 at 12:05pm
Location: 1436 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Ted Yoho (FL-03)
4:30pm
Location: 511 Cannon

Updated 10/24/2013 at 12:05pm
EXHIBIT 23
When I left the office at 5, Emma told me that she decided she did not need to see Senator Vitter, but she knows based on past experience that she would be there tomorrow. They told her he would be, but she knew based on past experience that he would be.

---

Emma,

Is the meeting with Sen. Vitter still on for tomorrow? He is worried for canceling at the last minute.

Thanks,

Emma

---

Friday, October 16

Meeting with Todd Warlick, Chief of Staff, and Hunter Blevins, Legislative Assistant for Senator Bob Corker (Tn)
10:00am
Location: Dirksen 423
*Please be on time for this meeting. The meetings have changed since the House members will not be in session tomorrow.*

Meeting with Legislative Aide, Noha, for Congressman Aki Pour (Ga-07)
11:30am
Location: Longworth 314

Meeting with Senator David Vitter (La)
1:30pm
Location: 516 Hart

Meeting with Dan Scalfand, Chief of Staff for Congressman Frank Wolf (Va-10)
3:15pm
Location: 233 Cannon

---

Copies of all correspondence related to the Department of Justice should be sent to:
Emma Hayduff
Scheduler
Office of the Secretary
Eisenhower Executive Office Building
Washington, DC 20540
Phone: (202) 512-4122
Fax: (202) 512-8957
Email: Emma.Hayduff@whitehouse.gov

Outlook to sign out. Ed Whitfield's office.

Confidential Treatment Under the Non-Disclosure Provisions of H. Res. 835 or the 110th Congress as Amended Requested
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EXHIBIT 24
Mrs. Whitfield,

Since we are scheduling meetings for next week, I went through the list of Republican CSC members that we have not met with yet. The list is below. Please let me know if you would like me to reach out to them about a meeting.

Bart
Walsh
Shanks
Scalise
Ripper
Billy Long
Casady
Etters

Thanks,
Emma

From:
Emma F. Whitfield
Scheduler
Office of Congressman J. Edward Whitfield
2104 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-6411
Fax: (202) 225-6412
Follow Rep. Whitfield on twitter:

COE.WHITFIELD.024326
EXHIBIT 25
I am going to have a busy drive this weekend and will be unable to attend a conference on Sunday.

Best,
VerDate Sep 11 2014 23:34 Jul 18, 2016 Jkt 020740 PO 00000 Frm 00355 Fmt 6659 Sfmt 6602 E:\HR\OC\HR687.XXX HR687
All I need to conclude it. I will ask them the question or any other questions they have in the next two weeks. And I will take care of it ASAP. Thanks.

Best,
EXHIBIT 26
EXHIBIT 27
Thanks for those details! We are confirmed for Tuesday at 415.

Amanda Stevens Baldwin
Scheduler/Office Manager
US House of Representatives
Michael C Burgess, M.D.
2336 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-7772/FAX 202-225-2919

From: Haydlauf, Emma
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:21 PM
To: Stevens, Amanda
Subject: RE: favor

You can just contact me or Cory with any questions. My boss’s wife, Connie Harriman-Whitfield, will be joining them in the meeting as well.

From: Stevens, Amanda
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:19 PM
To: Haydlauf, Emma
Subject: RE: favor

Will anyone from your office accompany them? If not, can you send me their contact information?

Thank you.

Amanda Stevens Baldwin
Scheduler/Office Manager
US House of Representatives
Michael C Burgess, M.D.
2336 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-7772/FAX 202-225-2919

From: Haydlauf, Emma
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:18 PM
To: Stevens, Amanda
Subject: RE: favor

That works. Thanks so much!
From: Stevens, Amanda  
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:18 PM  
To: Heydlauff, Emma  
Subject: RE: favor  

I can do 415.

Amanda Stevens Baldwin  
Scheduler/Office Manager  
US House of Representatives  
Michael C Burgess, M.D.  
2336 Rayburn Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
202-225-7772/FOX 202-225-2919

From: Heydlauff, Emma  
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:16 PM  
To: Stevens, Amanda  
Subject: RE: favor  

They have another meeting at that time. Would a 9pm meeting work for your boss on Tuesday?

Thanks!

From: Stevens, Amanda  
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:12 PM  
To: Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma  
Subject: FW: favor  

Can we make something work Tuesday at 1pm in our office?

Thank you, Amanda

Amanda Stevens Baldwin  
Scheduler/Office Manager  
US House of Representatives  
Michael C Burgess, M.D.  
2336 Rayburn Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
202-225-7772/FOX 202-225-2919

From: Strickland, Kellie  
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 1:37 PM  
To: Stevens, Amanda  
Subject: FW: favor  

Kellie Strickland  
Chief of Staff  
Rep. Michael Burgess [TX-26]  
2336 Rayburn HOB  

EVA 005234  

COE.WHITFIELDSC.037098
From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 1:31 PM
To: Backlund, Kelle
Cc: Heydlauff, Emme

Kelle, I hope you are well. Quick question: two people are coming into town next week for a conference with the Friends of Sound Horses. Two of those people are involved in the TN Walking Horse industry and are supportive of our efforts with the PAST Act. One of them is Marty Irby, the former president of the TN Walking Horse Association. Marty is actually a constituent from what I've been told. The other person is Donna Benefield, President of the International Walking Horse Association. If your boss could take a meeting with them, my boss would really appreciate it. They are available all day Monday (except 2 and 3pm), from 11 to close of business Tuesday and all day Friday. Do you think you can make something work?

Cory Hicks
Chief of Staff
Chairman Ed Whitfield
202-225-3113

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
http://whitfield.house.gov
EXHIBIT 28
From: Thomson, Kristin  
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:33 AM  
To: Heydlauff, Emma  
Subject: RE: Favor  
Attachments: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png; image005.png  

Oh, great! Thanks!

Kristin Thomson  
Executive Assistant  
Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy  
Phone: (202) 225-0337

---

From: Heydlauff, Emma  
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:27 AM  
To: Thomson, Kristin  
Subject: RE: Favor

Great! Thanks so much. I will have them there next week. My boss's wife Connie will be joining them in the meeting as well.

Thanks,  
Emma

---

From: Thomson, Kristin  
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:23 AM  
To: Heydlauff, Emma  
Subject: RE: Favor

Yes, we can make 1:30PM work! Thanks!

Kristin Thomson  
Executive Assistant  
Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy  
Phone: (202) 225-0337

---

From: Heydlauff, Emma  
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:34 AM  
To: Thomson, Kristin  
Subject: RE: Favor

Could we do 1:30pm? If not, I can make 1pm work. Let me know.

Thanks,  
Emma

---

From: Thomson, Kristin  
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:21 AM  
To: Heydlauff, Emma  
Subject: RE: Favor

COE.WHITFIELDISC.034304
Hi Emma,

Kevin would be happy to meet with them. Would 1PM on Wed October 23 work? This would be in H-307. Thanks!

Kristin

From: Heydauff, Emma
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2013 12:10 PM
To: Thomson, Kristin
Subject: Favor

Kristin,

Quick question: two people are in town this week and need for a conference with the Friends of Sound Horses. Two of those people are involved in the TN Walking Horse Industry and are supportive of our efforts with the PAST Act. One of them is -Marty Irby- the former president of the TN Walking Horse Association. The other person is Donna Benefield, President of the International Walking Horse Association. If your boss could take a meeting with them, my boss would really appreciate it. They are available on Thursday and all next week. Do you think you can make something work?

Thanks,
Emma

Emma Heydauff
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
234 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3315
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
EXHIBIT 29
I did read the email in full and I still don’t understand what they want. What kind of statement do they want? A congressional record insert won’t get any more attention than the document itself. We can do a press statement on the Myth vs Fact document, but people that are oppose us to begin with won’t believe anything we put out. If we draw that kind of attention, the other side will put out their myth/fact document.

--- Original Message ---
From: Connie Harriman-Whitefield [mailto:hr@harriman-whitfield.org]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 9:46 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

Please read Keith’s email in full. They would like a statement clarifying the weighted shoe provision from Ed’s office and the sooner the better. Poll person cannot distribute it. It would be Marty Irby.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 26, 2013, at 9:31 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> So, they want a statement at the hearing? That’s easy, but far off. This is an official document from our office, so can’t someone at THMLCA get it widely distributed? Maybe the person conducting the poll?

> --- Original Message ---
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitefield [mailto:hr@harriman-whitfield.org]
> Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 9:09 AM
> To: Hicks, Cory; Perrott, Justin
> Subject: FW: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

> In view of the poll that is being conducted by the THMLCA, please give this high priority.

> Sent from my iPhone

> Begin forwarded message:

> From: Connie Harriman-Whitefield
> Date: September 25, 2013, 7:36:42 PM EDT
> To: Connie Harriman-Whitefield
> Subject: PAST statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

> Sent from my iPhone

> Begin forwarded message:
From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:15 PM
To: Keith Dane
Subject: RE: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

The Myths/Facts document is in Congressional stationary and is Cong. Whitfield's document (though you drafted text for his last year). It doesn't have his name on it, but it would come from his office and be referred to as his document. I'm looping Connie and others in here, so they'll be aware of Marty Irey's suggestion and our email exchange...

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:59 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

Thanks; are you referring to our Myths/Facts document, or does Whitfield's office have one, too? I think Marty was hoping whatever was put out, would come from Whitfield. So a statement at a hearing would be great, or a reference in an official document from his office would work, too.

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:54 PM
To: Keith Dane
Subject: RE: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

I think it's an excellent idea! If there's a hearing, it could maybe be part of his statement for the record. If the hearing isn't scheduled soon, maybe there'd be another way to put this "out there" - perhaps in the Myths/Facts document? Or maybe we'd want it in the Myths/Facts document whether there's a hearing or not? Could add this along with the HSI response, since that document needs to be updated to incorporate that additional issue anyway.

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:09 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

Hi Mimi,

In talking with Marty Irey (past president of TNHREA who has come on in support of PAST in a big way) he mentioned that much of the resistance to the act within the TN industry is from people who should be supporting it, but have heard that it will eliminate all shoes (because of the "weighted shoe" provision), or just don't trust USDA to make a decision about what shoes will be allowed, that they can live with.

I've explained many times that the USDA sets all regulations on equipment that is allowable under and within the parameters of the HSA, and that it's appropriate for them to do so when PAST becomes law - not for Congress to prescribe in detail what is allowed through legislation.

EW4005005
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Nursey thinks that if Mr. Whitfield's office would provide a statement explaining the process (i.e. that USDA would seek the input of veterinarians, farriers and other industry participants in the development of regulations, and that the proposed regs would be put out for public comment) that it would help squelch the ongoing churning on this issue, and even gain more support for the bill.

What do you think about this idea, and whether we should approach Justin and Cory with it?

Thanks,

Keith

Keith Dewe
Vice President, Equine Protection
HumaneSociety.ORGconsult@HumaneSociety.ORG
301-307-3654 F 301-258-3872
The Humane Society of the United States
700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20007
Humanesociety.ORG http://www.humanesociety.org/

<http://www.humanesociety.org/>
EXHIBIT 30
EXHIBIT 31
Congressmen just had a very successful conference with the Administration's legislative directors. They were concerned with the scope of our oversight, every spring to December 9, 2016. They wanted to make sure that our oversight was effective. I told them that we had already done a great deal of oversight on the budget. They also asked about the current state of the economy. I told them that we had been reviewing the budget and the economy. I think we need to be careful about Congress attending these meetings. I don't see any harm.
EXHIBIT 32
From: Dixon, Carol  
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:07 AM  
To: Rust, Tom  
Cc: Dixon, Carol  
Subject: Heads up - Conversation with Mrs. Whitfield

Jacqueline,  
I just spoke to Rep. Whitfield’s wife at the request of Bob Sensenbrenner at CHA. Mrs. Whitfield had felt that she and her husband’s COS had gotten conflicting information today from a few conversations they had with our office. Then Bob told her that the issue was easy and that they could absolutely do what they were doing, which isn’t so clear to us. Mrs. Whitfield did tell me that she believes our counsel was trying to be helpful but just made it more confusing. She also blames the COS for some of the confusion. 

Their issue is a pretty complicated one regarding Rep. Whitfield’s office setting up meetings with about 45 members for two non-constituent industry experts who were supporting a bill introduced and championed by Mr. Whitfield. Mrs. Whitfield attended some of the meetings, however she is a registered lobbyist for an organization with an interest in the legislation.

I discussed with her House Rule 25 Cl. 7 (the ban on registered lobbyist relatives having lobbying contacts with the office) as well as both Rule 24 (having outside organizations do grass roots lobbying on a Member’s behalf) and the appropriations act (doing constituent service for non-constituents). It’s not clear to me whether or not each of these applies to the situation, but I was successful in helping her understand how this is a very complicated issue, and that she should avoid lobbying contacts with her Husband’s office on the issue. I told her that getting an answer would require more work and taking this novel question of fact up the chain, but that the answer shouldn’t be communicated through her to the office if the answer would be applied to this issue. I offered to speak to Rep. Whitfield, or have Carol or my successor do so, or advised her that she could get the most finite answer by writing in and requesting an A/O if, in good faith, he is interested in setting up similar meetings in the future (seems like he would be).

She was very grateful and appreciative of working through the Issues and I don’t think she’s as frustrated anymore (though she repeated her frustration on behalf of Mr. Baucus, a good friend of hers, who feels he was treated horribly).
In the end, I think it will be fine, but wanted the Chairman to be aware of the earlier frustration and how complicated an issue we think it is. If they want to pursue an opinion, we'll (or maybe not "we") will discuss further with you and Dan after doing some more work on it.

Dan Schwager  
Chief Counsel & Staff Director  
Committee on Ethics  
U.S. House of Representatives  
(202) 225-7103
EXHIBIT 33
§ 3 Broad Discussion

1. Rule 102 - Lobbying, Contact
   of Members, Spouse, Office
   Real, written, commc
   Email, to influence
   On behalf of
   a client.

2. Rule 24 - Marty, Donna
   Independent, separate
   parties, entities
   Provide assistance
   * aligned by two interests

DN talk about one bill in HSUS support
Formal Opening

Letter re: prospective behavior
Chair & Ranking Member

Gen'l Counsel/Staff Dir.

Direct 225-7103
or Carol Dixon
Write to attend what I am doing.

Idea is it would elevate the matter in their eyes if they knew I had a meeting.

N/A here is they are already working hard on the bill and what I do.

DN matter to them.
OK to go up
Marty & Donald
D.V. tell Ed's staff you are going.
You can go at their request.

Marty & Donald Carl

EW-ISC00005342
EXHIBIT 34
From: Michael Makler <mailto:Michael_Makler@krocker.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 8:06 AM
To: Sen. Capito <mailto:Capito@Capito.org>
Subject: Re: Stop, Asian Paints Policy

FYI get response Deneze ASAP
See attached photos

On Dec 11, 2013, at 3:57 PM, "Deneze_Gallina@krocker.com" wrote:
I know she was in direct contact with Deneze Gallina about a week ago to ask action on specific activities, which is why she followed up with communications with Whirlpool and Ernst and I took more personal role. An warrants procedure? Detail now up.
On Dec 11, 2013, at 3:57 PM, "Michael Makler" <mailto:Michael_Makler@krocker.com> wrote:
What does Deneze say about this?!
From: Howard Enfield
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 3:09:54 PM
To: Michael Makler
Cc: Sara O'Meara, Sara Quayle,

Re: Stop, Asian Paints Policy

Hi, Mike,

Would you like to talk to her or would you like me to meet with a senator?
From: Sara O'Meara <mailto:Sara_O_Meara@krocker.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 12:54 PM
To: Sara O'Meara
Cc: Sara O'Meara, Sara Quayle

Hi Mike,

11, my name is Sara O'Meara. I am working on a story regarding Rep. Whirlpool and the Sen. of Mark Hirsch. Whirlpool. The reporter has a manuscript and sponsored legislation that I wanted to talk to you about. I am attending to their meetings and assistance efforts. The legislation appearing to 56, 36, 1914, 1914, 1914 and appearing to 1914, 1914. This would appear to be a violation of the Freedom of Information Act. None of the members of Congress. I am interested in all the news and activities of the Hamptons. The legislation that can speak to this issue and whether Whirlpool should be a subject of concern. I am not unknown to the Deneze policy. The best number for you is 361.31.1000.

Thanks,

Sara

Sara O'Meara
POLITICO

Tel: 361.31.1000

EXHIBIT 35
Subject: RE: Help Not Coming From Donna Diefy

Good to do B. Just need one or two more mouthes to be transmitted and we'll handle.

From: Stephanie  
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 8:08 PM  
To: Claire Whittemore Whitley  
Cc: Emily  

That would be Bill help.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 11, 2013, at 8:08 PM, "Keith Davis" daviswesley@gmail.com wrote:

>> Either Bill or Pam (Billy) to be next contact person

>> was:

>> From: Charlie Staton Whittey

>> Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2013 4:19 PM

>> To: Karl Davis

>> Subject: Re: Help Not Coming From Donna Diefy

>> I have been working with you so long, I forgot you are now part of 602 staff. I am not in contact with Donna directly in support of 602 in Bill. Better to come from Karl.

>> Sent from my iPhone
EXHIBIT 36
From: Connie Horne
To: [Redacted]
Co: San Anselmo
Subject: Meeting with Barry / Cori

Hi, how are you? Hope all is well.

The meeting with Barry and Cori went well. Barry is going to look into having the meeting here at the house when he gets back from DC.

Send me any info you need or any questions.

Thanks,
Connie
We appreciate all you are doing in this!

Kudos
From: Frederick, Fred
To: Dave, Kathy
Subject: Parking

All,

Attached are the updated messages for the week. briefly, we did get you a parking pass for the rest of this week. Please just fill out the card before you park in a space, and we will not need someone downtown to give you. The parking spot is in Lot #10 of the 1800 access from K Street. Please let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,
Dave

Fred Talkoff
Office of Employment and Training (CV-3)
US Department of Labor
One Thomas Jefferson Building
Washington, DC 20210
Phone: (202) 606-5013
Fax: (202) 606-3792
Twitter: @FredTalkoff on the web

Confidential Treatment Under the NonDisclosure Provisions of H.Res. 895 or the 110th Congress as Amended Requested
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EXHIBIT 37
EXHIBIT 39
Confidential Treatment Under the Nondisclosure Provisions of H.Res. 895 or the 110th Congress as Amended Requested
CGE.WHITFIELDDISC.029451
Dear Fred,

Yesterday, while driving to work, I heard a loud bang coming from the area where the new building is being constructed. I thought it was the sound of work being done, but when I arrived at the office, I saw a large section of the building had collapsed. It was a very concerning sight.

I wanted to let you know that I am working with the architect and engineer to assess the damage and ensure that the project can continue safely. We will keep you updated on the progress.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
EXHIBIT 40
Kelly,

Why can't SAG give everyone in PEOH a raise based on length of service instead of just merit?

Kelly, please don't kill me, or we won't have a meeting here. Please don't buy me on book even then. Anyone who works enough will stay.

Thanks,

[Signature]

---

Subject: For Transferring PA

[Signature]

---

[Email Body]

Kelly:

Why can't SAG give everyone in PEOH a raise based on length of service instead of just merit?

Kelly, please don't kill me, or we won't have a meeting here. Please don't buy me on book even then. Anyone who works enough will stay.

Thanks,

[Signature]

---

Subject: For Transferring PA

[Signature]
Anything we can do to encourage you??

Sent: [Date]

To: [Name]

Subject: [Subject]

I'm hesitant to go too far on this. I'm worried about the regulatory implications. Is there anything specific you're looking for in terms of language?

I am curious if we could meet today to discuss the situation. I think it would be helpful to get a full picture of the potential implications before we proceed.

Best,

[Name]
EXHIBIT 41
From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]

Date: Jan 29, 2014 4:27 PM

Subject: [Redacted]

Hi, and will be in D.C. this weekend. Dave Barker will be at the Capitol in the morning. Let's definitely get together. Happy New Year!

Best,

[Redacted]
EXHIBIT 42
From: Marty
Sent: Tuesday, January 7, 2014 11:47 AM
To: carolyn.whitfield@humanassn.org
CC: Teresa Whitley
Subject: FYI: Human Assn Updates/Questions

Will do.

From: carolyn.whitfield@humanassn.org
To: carolyn.whitfield@humanassn.org
Subject: Re: Human Assn Updates/Questions
Date: Tue, 7 Jan 2014 11:40:21 -0500

Marty,

Perhaps you (or Whitley office) can let McCallan's and Wagner's offices know that FOSI is trying to contact them, the importance of FOSI etc. That way, Teresa is up to speed on the reception the districts.

Best,
Cathy

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 7, 2014, at 10:35 AM, "Marty (FYI)" <marty@humanassn.org> wrote:

Hi Teresa,

Yes please contact McCallan. She is one of only 5 females in the Senate not on the bill. We need her! Also let AE Wagner’s COO Christian Morgan (Christian.Morgan@House.gov) and Christian.Morgan@House.gov write. Brian O’Shea (Brian.OShea@House.gov) and Brian.OShea@House.gov). You should contact both of them. Please also let them know I will be glad to meet with them in person anytime to discuss.

Quote for all you do!

Marty

From: Marty
Sent: Thu, 7 Jan 2014 04:43:51 -0500
To: carolyn.whitfield@humanassn.org
Subject: Human Assn Update/Questions

FYI: Martin.com

All Marty and Cathy,

I should my new Congressperson is going to be a woman—oh boy! In heart of America and he fought puppy mill legislation bill three—his son's mother has owned labs for decades and has numerous relatives. His name is Aaron Smith. After visiting his office in Olathe and sending emails, I have called numerous times and no one will return my calls.

So, I am going after first time Congresswoman Ann Wagner, [R] who is in district next to mine. Should I call first and ask for name of Chief of Staff or just append the letter form on her don’t. I am writing an infectious of FOSI and a Missouri resident. I also have information on the Missourians that support the bill and of numerous FOSI senators in Missouri.

On another note, I have written Dear COO, etc., about 4-5 times. Should I start approaching Senator Claire McCaskill she is a Dem and I know we wanted to load up on Rs (Red). Just let me know.

Time to bundle up to feed and show—a brisk—O this a.m. I always like to write extra copy."

Thx,
Teresa

Confidential Treatment Under the Nondisclosure Provisions of H.R. 806 or the 110th Congress as Amended Requested
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EXHIBIT 43
EXHIBIT 44
Dear [Recipient],

I saw from your list and was wondering if I could highlight the most important ones and explain what we need to discuss. These are the most important ones that seem to be on our list:

- [List of important items]

I hope this helps.

Best,

[Your Name]
EXHIBIT 45
406

From: Connie Hamilton Whitley
Cc: trays@mcgovernlibrary.org, trays@mcgovernlibrary.org

Subject: Have PAST Advocate - Confidential

I wish you had given me more specific guidance in your response, but prefer to address this by phone. If you need, call me.

Sent From iPhone

315. At 10:54 AM [2016-07-18 23:54:43], "Kathy" <trays@mcgovernlibrary.org> wrote:

I received your response, but need more guidance to move to a different approach. This would seem to be the most effective way for you to proceed in sharing.

It's really important to ask ADP or ASAT to assign meetings for people they are working with DC to help them. If you are working to help any of these groups, you should be scheduling meetings with them for discussion of these matters. LGT should be involved in these discussions or meetings.

I'm not sure how to handle the question of assigning commitments to meetings that have not been accepted, and I don't want to offend anyone. I don't want to go with a group that they don't know and have not been invited to - any.

I have inserted a list of meetings. As you can see, many of the groups have been meeting with both ADP and ASAT. It has to be done with proper handling of resentment that we have brought to the table.

If you are interested in the Whitefield House meetings, we may have to take leave of some to get this done.

From: Kathy Beatty 

[Signature]

[Date]

[Email Address]

To: Connie Hamilton Whitley

CC: trays@mcgovernlibrary.org, trays@mcgovernlibrary.org

Subject: Have PAST Advocate - Confidential

Hi -

Could we have a call next week? I need you to help me prepare for a meeting with ADP next month. I understand you are busy with scheduling, but do you have time to meet with me next week to help with this?

I will be in DC next week and am working on behalf of ADP and ASAT to help plan events and meetings. I would like to discuss how we can best work together to help with the scheduling.

Like you said, the House needs to be involved with the meetings. I think it's important to get the House involved, and I need to work with ADP and ASAT to help make this happen.

I hope to meet with you next week to discuss this further.

From: Connie Hamilton Whitley

[Signature]

[Date]

[Email Address]

To: Kathy Beatty

CC: trays@mcgovernlibrary.org, trays@mcgovernlibrary.org

Subject: Have PAST Advocate - Confidential

I hope to meet with you next week to discuss this further.

From: Connie Hamilton Whitley

[Signature]

[Date]

[Email Address]

To: Kathy Beatty

CC: trays@mcgovernlibrary.org, trays@mcgovernlibrary.org

Subject: Have PAST Advocate - Confidential

On your end, we hope to hear from you as soon as possible.

Confidential Treatment Under the Non-Disclosure Provision of H.R. 895 or the 110th Congress as Amended Requested
Subject: Past Advocates - Confidential

Dear [Name],

I wanted to provide you with a comprehensive list of the advocates and states they have kindly offered to help us on the PAST Act in February.

3/17: Jacksonville, Tennessee District Attorney and Assistant District Attorney
3/19: East Tennessee Field Office
3/20: Middle Tennessee Field Office
3/21: East Tennessee Field Office
3/22: Middle Tennessee Field Office
3/23: East Tennessee Field Office
3/24: Middle Tennessee Field Office
3/25: East Tennessee Field Office
3/26: Middle Tennessee Field Office
3/27: East Tennessee Field Office
3/28: Middle Tennessee Field Office
3/29: East Tennessee Field Office
3/30: Middle Tennessee Field Office
3/31: East Tennessee Field Office
4/1: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/2: East Tennessee Field Office
4/3: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/4: East Tennessee Field Office
4/5: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/6: East Tennessee Field Office
4/7: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/8: East Tennessee Field Office
4/9: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/10: East Tennessee Field Office
4/11: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/12: East Tennessee Field Office
4/13: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/14: East Tennessee Field Office
4/15: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/16: East Tennessee Field Office
4/17: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/18: East Tennessee Field Office
4/19: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/20: East Tennessee Field Office
4/21: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/22: East Tennessee Field Office
4/23: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/24: East Tennessee Field Office
4/25: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/26: East Tennessee Field Office
4/27: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/28: East Tennessee Field Office
4/29: Middle Tennessee Field Office
4/30: East Tennessee Field Office

[Insert offset folio 414 here]

Best,

Mary
EXHIBIT 46
Marty,

In looking over this list I realized I have reached out to several of these members already regarding meetings with FAST Act supporters. Because of that I feel like it would not be as effective for me to go back to them again. Also, the House will only be in session on the 12th and only until 2pm that day. There are no votes scheduled on the 13th, so I do not know the Senate schedule, but I do know that they have more meetings scheduled this week, so more Members scheduled may already be full during those days. While I was happy to help set up meetings last October and in, this time of year is also significantly busier for me as well.

All in all, I think it would be more effective if either you or Mark reach out to these offices to schedule the meetings. I am happy to provide you with contacts in the offices if you are having trouble finding them.

Thanks,
Emma

Emma Ely, Mark
Becki Phillips, James
Tina Hurdull, Emma
Cindy Hays, Cory
Mike Alons
Subject: Tennessee District Attorney Scheduling

Emma,

Please see the attached spreadsheet of House and Senate Members our coalition has compiled for the District Attorney Mike Dunnavant, and Assistant District Attorney Mark Davison to meet with on the two days they are available in February. I believe the 12th and 13th are the two days and they are open any time after 10:30 on the 12th. This is a long list and there is no way we will get to all of these people so I have highlighted the most important ones on the list.

In person meetings with members are most important, so please schedule with this in mind. Senator Alexander and Senator Corker are very important as well since Mike and Mark are from Tennessee. Please let the members you are scheduling with know they were the presenting attorneys in the Bobby McConnell case. The link to ABC's expose is: http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/tv-news/tennessee-quarterback-abused-illinois/story/2015/10/01/2015/10/01

Let me know if you need anything from me. I will be attending the meetings with them and have copied Mark Davison on this email.

Thanks,
Marty

Marty Love
Congressional Aide
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (R-KY)
214 Rayburn House Office Building, Tel: 202.225.3155 Fax: 202.212.1547
mlove@whitfield.house.gov [http://whitfield.house.gov]

Confidential Treatment Under the NonDisclosure Provisions of H.R. 886 or the 110th Congress as Amended Requested
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EXHIBIT 47
Sorry, can you prepare this to Mark and Wm?!

---

From: Connie Harman-Whitfield
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 8:04 PM
To: Beth Dale
Cc: Connie Harman-Whitfield, May, Marty, Sara Amann
Subject: RE: Tennessee DA

We need all info in in case, which is only a few weeks away. Therefore, I would ask them to do ASAP whether they need help by FAX. The time line for distruction would be Ears Jan 7 or earlier.

Connie

Send copy to iPhone

On Dec 18, 2013, at 7:29 PM, "Connie Harman-Whitfield" <Harman-Whitfield.Connie@mail.house.gov> wrote:

If they confirm that they are not restricted from lobbying (or legislation we don't need another Blair/Blackburn compliant!), we should determine whether they have the opportunity time for them to come, and who they should see - then we should propose the time frame and offer to set up appointments. If they talk to the DA now, we can consider pursuing some motions. If we all feel this is worthwhile:

Some goes for Friday. Friday, who may be willing to come do 14th visits, if that's available.

---

From: Connie Harman-Whitfield
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 7:15 PM
To: May, Marty
Cc: Beth Dale, Sara Amann, Connie Harman-Whitfield

Re: Tennessee DA

Anything we can do to accommodate then???

Send copy to iPhone

On Dec 18, 2013, at 7:06 PM, "May, Marty" <Marty.Line@mail.house.gov> wrote:

All

This is from Mark Quillian the DA in TN that presented and sent McConnell... "Marty, I will try my best to take you up on that. Our DA is very committed to reviving our state saving statute, and he's been lobbying for good legislation, so I might have to talk him into coming up.

You'll have to call me on the timeline on page of the Act."

I asked him the DA would come testify at the House... I think hearing the State DA from TN testify for this would be a BIG thing... it would also put The Tennessee in the field...
EXHIBIT 48
From: Ellen Buls
Sent: Friday, November 30, 2012 9:39 AM
To: Sara Amundson; Lisa Basile
Cc: Jan Dunn
Subject: RE: Important—Connie Whitfield

Thanks so much!

From: Sara Amundson
Sent: Thursday, November 29, 2012 10:59 AM
To: Lisa Basile
Cc: Ellen Buls
Subjects: RE: Important—Connie Whitfield

Many thanks! You two are just the best and I couldn't do my job without you. Thanks, Sara

From: Lisa Basile
Sent: Thursday, November 29, 2012 10:06 AM
To: Sara Amundson
Cc: Ellen Buls
Subjects: RE: Important—Connie Whitfield

Hi Sara,

I can answer your first question—Connie started in HSLF on 10/24/11. I have copied Ellen Buls on this email because she can answer question #2 for you.

Thanks,
Lisa

Lisa Basile
Senior Manager, Human Resources
lbasile@knesssociety.org
1301.541.7701 f 1301.541.7701
Hi Lisa; Will you please help?

1) Connie’s actual start date with HSUS, and
2) Connie’s total compensation from HSUS per year in 2011 and 2012.

Thanks, Sara
EXHIBIT 49
Performance Review + 2013 Performance Review

Summary

Last Name: Harrison
First Name: Condace
Date of Hire: 8/1/2007
Start Date of Current Job: 10/24/2011
Company/Job Title: Legislative Specialist
Organizational Unit: Humane Society Legislative Fund
Performance Review Status: HH Finalized
File Attachment 1: 013994-505-09 Legislative Specialist.pdf
File Attachment 2:

Section A: Performance Standards for all Employees

Use the comments section to describe performance that is either different than the descriptions or more specific to the individual employee. Do not be limited to these categories or descriptions.

Communication

When rating employee, remember that the specific elements of communication include speaking (clear, organized, easily understood), writing (clear, organized, easily understood), and listening (elaborates information, clarifies with questions).

Communication with Subordinates

Manager Description: Provides effective, timely information to subordinates; solicits input on problems and suggestions for improvement; accepts feedback on performance.
Manager Rating: 4-Above Expectations

Communication with Supervisors

Manager Description: Provides effective, timely information and feedback to supervisor; solicits input on problems and suggestions for improvement; accepts feedback on performance.
Manager Rating: 4-Above Expectations

Communication with Other Departments

Manager Description: Provides effective, timely information and feedback to other departments; solicits input on problems and suggestions for improvement; accepts feedback on performance.
Manager Rating: 4-Above Expectations

Conducting Meetings

Manager Description: Prepares agendas prior to meetings; adheres to and completes agendas; holds meetings when needed and as required; encourages participation and facilitates discussion appropriately.
Manager Rating: 4-Above Expectations

https://humane societytalentmanagersonline.com/CompPlanner/LayoutScripts/CplpMrp...
### Development

**Self-Development**

**Manager Description**: Identifies own developmental needs with a superior; establishes, actively pursues and reaches specific self-development goals; updates skills on an on-going basis.

**Manager Ratings**: 4-Above Expectations

**Following Directions**

**Manager Description**: Effectively carries out instructions of a superior; acts on suggestions and feedback from a superior; meets deadlines.

**Manager Ratings**: 4-Above Expectations

### Work Management

**Dependability and Reliability**

**Manager Description**: Dependable and reliable in attendance and in completing jobs assigned; gets job done on time; dependable under pressure.

**Manager Ratings**: 4-Above Expectations

**Initiative**

**Manager Description**: Takes initiative in completing job duties; shows self-direction once given assignments; degree of supervision.

**Manager Ratings**: 5-Exceeds Expectations

**Productivity**

**Manager Description**: Effective utilization of time; manages distractions and doesn’t allow them to interfere in getting the job done; well-organized; utilizes technical and human resources effectively; produces expected volume of work.

**Manager Ratings**: 4-Above Expectations

**Quality of Work**

**Manager Description**: Extent to which work is done correctly, nailability, thoroughness, completeness, attention to detail; concerned with getting the job done right.

**Manager Ratings**: 4-Above Expectations

**Job Knowledge**

**Manager Description**: Knowledgeable in all phases of job and in methods, techniques, and skills required in own area or related technical, i.e., shorthand, typing, word processing.

**Manager Ratings**: 4-Above Expectations

---

https://humanresources.technology.in.gov/ConspPittman/LayoutScripts/Cpil_Mgr... 2/26/2014

Confidential Treatment Under the NonDisclosure Provisions of H. Res. 886 of the 110th Congress as Amended Requested

HSLF_OCE_000020

COE.WHITFIELD.SEC.000020
Yearwork and Cooperation

Manager Description
Adapts to necessary changes in operations; willingness to work toward the department's goals and objectives; understands how their job contributes to the overall operation; maintains positive work relationships with supervisor, peers, staff, personnel and constituents.
Manager Ratings:
4-Above Expectations

Section C: Job Duties
Extent to which employee successfully completes all primary accountabilities of his/her position as defined by the job description.

Position Performance
Manager Ratings:
4-Above Expectations

Section D: Overall Strengths and Accomplishments
Please use this section to summarize the strengths and accomplishments of the employee being reviewed.

Manager overall comments

Overall, you are a terrific asset to the senior staff of HSFL. You also provide great value by the HSFL Federal Affairs staff as we work on common legislative goals. We had challenges in 2012 in terms of passing key measures, but 2013 saw that the NASA Protection Act was introduced late and garnered an excellent co-sponsor list in addition to key endorsements. You also played a strong role in further the civil rights agenda and other bills. In addition to lobbying on the complete legislative agenda. And, your contacts at the NRC provided good intel on important issues for HSFL.

Expense Reimbursement
Compliance with expense reporting policies, relating to the following:

Support
Validation Rating
N/A - Not Applicable
Timeliness
Validation Rating
N/A - Not Applicable
Tally approval of direct reports
Validation Rating
N/A - Not Applicable

Section E: 2012 Goals

Goal 1
Rating:
### Employee Comments
- Passage of the Horse Protection Act in the House and Senate.

**Manager Ratings:**
- 4-Above Expectations

**Manager Comments:**
- Senate passage of the Vets/dogs bill.
- Senate, I want to be sure you know that I met with approximately 40 members or senior staff of that freshman class in the fourth quarter of 2011. We made some good inroads which were reflected in getting some members on ANY of the scored bills in our HSLF plants. We could certainly do additional visits.

**Goal 3**
- **Rating:**

**Employee Comments:**
- Passage of the Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act in the House and Senate.

**Manager Ratings:**
- 4-Above Expectations

**Manager Comments:**
- Appropriations work on the Ag Appropriations bill for cracking down on puppy mills.
- Let’s discuss strategies for coalition-building.

**Goal 4**
- **Rating:**

**Employee Comments:**
- Identify opportunities for growing HSLF’s brand and funding.

**Manager Ratings:**
- 3-Near Expectations

**Manager Comments:**
- Identify opportunities for growing HSLF’s brand and fundraising for the organization.
- Let’s discuss opportunities for digitizing—make sure your job description encompasses these specific tasks.
- We’re planning a DC event this year and I want to ensure we can meet goals and fundraising requirements.
- Let’s have a great event that makes sense for branding HSLF. There may be opportunities for sponsorship and fundraising around the event.

### Performance Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Custom Score Name</th>
<th>Required Custom Score Description</th>
<th>Required Custom Score Rating</th>
<th>4 Above Expectations</th>
<th>3 Near Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have read and discussed this evaluation with my supervisor and I understand its contents. My signature means that I have been advised of my performance status and does not necessarily imply that I agree with either the appraisal or its contents.

Employee Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

Employee Name: Hartman, Constance B Employee Code: 012595

Supervisor Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

https://www.asociety.talentmanageronline.com/CompPlanner/LayoutScripts/Opj_Map... 2/20/2014
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EXHIBIT 50
From: Mary Lily
Sent: Thu 3/7/2014 3:20 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: Connie Hartman
Cc: 
Bcc: 
Subject: RE: revised analysis of Blackburn bill...RE: We have to immediately savage Blackburn's bill. We should probably do it in both blogs. Who is writing up a critical analysis?

I'm going through it with a marker now, have spoke with AAEP, AAVMA, AHC, and Keith who are all doing the same.

From: [redacted]@humsociety.org
To: hartman.com
Subject: Fwd: revised analysis of Blackburn bill...RE: We have to immediately savage Blackburn's bill. We should probably do it in both blogs. Who is writing up a critical analysis?
Date: Thu, 27 Feb 2014 19:52:16 +0000

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

Here's a revised analysis for your review (this could be incorporated into a bill letter to send today or tomorrow morning). I'm not sure if we can/should include the bracketed clause in the first sentence (if so, brackets should be removed). Thanks in advance for your feedback!

--
Congresswoman Marsha Blackburn (R-TN) has introduced a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act that is a gift to those who perpetrate the cruel practice of soring (and was developed by them). Not only does H.R. 4038 contain no positive reforms to crack down on soring, it would set back these efforts by ceding USDA's already-limited authority and handing off power to the perpetrators. Specifically:

- It would maintain industry self-regulation, which has been a failure according to the USDA Inspector General in its 2010 audit pointing to extensive evidence of corruption and conflicts of interest.

- It would make the problem worse by giving the "bad apples" sole responsibility for setting the rules and managing inspections — and eliminating those Horse Industry Organizations (HIOs) that actually insist on only sound horses at shows they oversee now. The bill would establish a single HIO to serve all the inspection needs of the Walking Horse Industry, creating a federally-sanctioned monopoly on inspection services by industry insiders. (It's not clear if Hacking Horses and Spotted Saddle Horses, which also are known to be subjected to soring, would get inspections under the...
The proposal for the new EID to oversee enforcement of the Horse Protection Act (HPA) would give titular oversight to agricultural commissioners in the states of TN and KY. There are already laws prohibiting marking on the hooves in those two states, however they are enforced so rarely, and soring is so commonplace and even tolerated by officials there, that the overwhelming majority of violations of the HPA are in those two states. No real action to curb this cruelty has ever been taken by those states themselves. Other than two recent prosecutions driven by nonprofit undercover investigations, the TN agricultural commissioners have been photographed at state-sponsored functions applauding the success and efforts of repeat federal violations of the HPA and horses with a history of soring citations. The bill disregards the interests of those all over the country involved in the walking horse industry who have been adversely affected by the stigma caused by the subset of the industry that persists in perpetuating the practice of soring.

- S. B. 4099 would empower the Walking Horse Trainers’ Association (WHTA) to shape the EID board. A review of the history of members of the WHTA board demonstrates that most of them have been repeat violators of the HPA, often throughout their careers. Many of them have been found guilty of violating the HPA by federal administrative law judges, as well as receiving industry EID suspensions.

- S. B. 4099 does not address the use of pads and chains (action devices) and heavily weighted shoes – equipment directly associated with soring and the development and maintenance of the Big Lick gait of the “performance horse.” The American Veterinary Medical Association and the American Association of Equine Practitioners issued a joint statement back in 2012 calling for an end to the use of this equipment as a prerequisite to ending horse soring. 93% of HPA violations are in the padded performance segment and involve Big Lick horses.

- S. B. 4099 does not strengthen HPA penalties that are so weak they are routinely ignored by those engaged in soring, as noted by USDA’s Inspector General.

- The bill calls for scientific and peer reviewed inspection techniques while disregarding that objective science is already present in inspections. Digital palpation is currently used by inspectors and is considered by the veterinary community as a reliable indication of identifying pain responses in horses. The proposal also ignores the research of noted equine lameness expert Dr. Tracy Turner whose work for the USDA has shown that thermography studies used in the inspection process can detect inflammation indicative of soring in the pasterns of inspected show horses. Further, soring is detected by foreleg substance tests performed on horses’ legs and pasterns and examinations for patterns of scarring indicative of soring that can be seen...
by the naked eye but which also can be seen on thermographic images. Foreign substance testing is so advanced that it can break into chemical components the presence of illegal substances on the legs of horses, including agents designed to mask pain. Digital x-rays show the presence of techniques used "pressure shoe" horses as well as the insertion of foreign objects used to create pain or add illegal weight to shoes.

* E.S. 4096 expressly prohibits application of the PAPA (Federal Advisory Committee Act) to the single HIO. This is a blatant effort to shield discussions between the HIO and USDA, so they can be held in secret with no public records available. Years ago, HIO meetings became subject to the open government rules of PAPA, and there is no reason to return to an era of secrecy.

From: Mimi Brady
Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2016 9:09 AM
To: "Charlie Bartky"; Keith One
Cc: Wayne Yakalis; Cara Kremer; Michael Maksian; Sara Amundson; Jennifer Lomerger
Subject: Re: We have to immediately savage Blackburn’s bill. We should probably do it in both blogs. Who is writing up a critical analysis?

Thanks so much, Charlie. Wayne/Mike/et.al., I’m making edits to this now, and will send around a revised list. In my view, the crux of it is that the bill would hand off to the bad apples sole responsibility for setting the rules governing the whole industry – getting rid of the few HIOs who actually are trying to showcase only sound horses and truly enforce the law – while doing nothing to stop the use of devices known to be associated with causing or to strengthen penalties that are so weak they’re routinely ignored by the Big Link crowd.

Also, just as you have it quickly, here’s a short list that Marty put together back when her draft bill first surfaced:

Feedback from Cong. Whitfield’s office:

1) It does not appear to address the issue of stack/pads or chain/metal devices, which are all reactive methods of training in response to pain. ANWA/RASP issued a joint statement last year calling for an end to the use of pads and chains as a prerequisite to ending horse racing. RASP violations are in the pitched performance segment, so how does her bill stop sorting when pads and chains are not eliminated?

2) It makes no sense to allow the industry insiders to be on the board of an HIO, and continue with self-regulation. The CIG Audit has shown the evidence of the corrupt system. Why is one HIO with the same people any different than multiple HIOs? In fact, it would make the problem worse by getting rid of those HIOs that do actually insist on only sound horses.

3) If this "one HIO" is going to inspect all Tennessee Walking horses, what about the Racking and Spotted Saddle horses (which are also known to be
subjected to scrutiny?)

4) Walking Horse Trainers Association is comprised of many HBA violators (see attached list). Why should they be allowed to compete in anything?

5) Why is it fair for Tennessee and Kentucky AP Commissioners to appoint these people when inspections for USDA’s take place in nearly all 50 states? What about Florida, Georgia, California, etc.?

From: Chezie Beatty (mailto:squire@keithmcdonald.com)
To: Mimi Bradly, Keith Dana
Cc: Wayne Pacelle; Cece Kremer; Michael Merkitarian; Sara Amundson; Jennifer Lonergan
Subject: Re: We have to immediately savage Blackburn’s bill. We should probably do it in both blogs. Who is writing up a critical analysis?

Attached per your request.

Chezie Beatty

-----Original Message-----
From: Mimi Brady
To: Chezie Beatty
Cc: Wayne Pacelle; Cece Kremer; Michael Merkitarian; Sara Amundson; Jennifer Lonergan
Sent: Feb 27, 2014 8:05 am
Subject: Re: We have to immediately savage Blackburn’s bill. We should probably do it in both blogs. Who is writing up a critical analysis?

Chezie did a draft bullet point list. I’m going to review as soon as I can (still driving) and Keith’s reviewing it, too. But Chezie, why don’t you send your draft now to this list so Wayne/Mike can get a sense of it? Thanks!

Mimi

Sent from my iPhone

COE.WHITFIELD.050266
On Feb 13, 2014, at 8:55 AM, "Dave Anderson" wrote: 

Agreed. Nina had the start from Keith's department. We need a broad strategy--franchise, media, targeting her and her compensators.

On Feb 13, 2014, at 8:52 AM, "Wayne Pacelle" wrote: 

Wayne Pacelle  
President & CEO  
The Humane Society of the United States  

humane.org  
t 202-482-2155  f 202-250-3077  
humane.org  
WaynePacelle  
Facebook.com/WaynePacelle  
Twitter.com/Human Society 

Join our e-mail list: humane.org/subscribe  
Facebook: humane.org  
Twitter: humane.org  

To support the Humane Society of the United States, please make a monthly donation: humane.org/donate  

COE.WHITFIELD.DISC.050267
or give in another way: http://www.humanesociety.org/donate?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_medium=mailing_campaign=donate

via a gift donation: https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/donation2?formID=15001190

or memorial donation: https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/donation2?formID=15001195

or donating your vehicle: https://onecaratatimehumanes.com/?utm_campaign=ausstaffonly1&slg=2012&ut
m_source=mailing_campaign=volunteer

You can also volunteer: http://www.humanesociety.org/community/volunteers?utm_source=staff signature&utm_medium=mailing_campaign=volunteer

For the HSUS, and see our 55 ways you can help: http://www.humanesociety.org/action/55-actions-to-help-animals.html?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_medium=mailing_campaign=helpanimals

animals.

The HSUS is rated a 4-star charity (the highest possible) by Charity Navigator http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search_summary&orgid=3448,


experts as the #1 high-impact animal protection group, and named by North Magazine http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/about/north-top-10-financially-responsible-charities.pdf

as one of the 10 most financially responsible charities.

--Forwarded Message Attachment--
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EXHIBIT 51
I need to explain to you a clear idea why the race never stops in politics and fundraising. This is why we need you properly on the farm and their evengry.

For your files.

Stephen A. Henson

From: Conie Harris Walkerfield
To: Whitfield, J.
Cc: Gary Held, Gary.Held@humanesociety.org, Carey Schermeeyer, Carey.Schermeeyer@humanesociety.org
Subject: AIC Nightline "Torture of Tennessee Walking Horse"

I have a chance to plug something about a story that appeared in the Human Society of the United States' News Alert.

The story is about the Tennessee Walking Horse (THB) industry and its practices. The THB is a breed of horse known for its four-gaited gait, which is a combination of the walk, trot, canter, and gallop. The breed has been under scrutiny due to concerns about the physical abuse and mistreatment of the horses.

The story includes quotes from a Tennessee Walking Horse breeder and trainer, as well as a statement from the Humane Society of the United States. The breeder, who is a member of the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders Association, discusses the challenges of caring for these horses and the efforts being made to improve their welfare.

The trainer, who is a member of the Tennessee Walking Horse Riders Association, emphasizes the importance of public education and awareness about the proper care and handling of these horses.

The Humane Society of the United States highlights the need for stricter regulations and enforcement to prevent the mistreatment of Tennessee Walking Horses and other equines.

The story concludes with a call to action for readers to support organizations that advocate for animal welfare and to spread awareness about the proper care and handling of Tennessee Walking Horses.
EXHIBIT 52
Ok, I'll talk to Cory and John.

From: Carrie Hartman [mailto:carrie.hartman@humansecurity.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 11:44 AM
To: Melia, Cory
Subject: Re: Udall: Investigation Finds Disturbing Picture of Horse Racing Industry

I was just thinking that Ed is the lead in the House AND two more articles are coming AND people say the article may earn a Pulitzer award.

From: Melia, Cory [mailto:Cory.Melia@humansecurity.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 11:11 AM
To: Carrie Hartman[carrie.hartman@humansecurity.org]
Subject: Re: Udall: Investigation Finds Disturbing Picture of Horse Racing Industry

She's a good writer. I think Udall is in a difficult position for issuing a statement because the articles about CSU are valid. I don't think it makes as much sense for ED to do one, but I can ask our press secretary to work on one.

From: Carrie Hartman [mailto:carrie.hartman@humansecurity.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 11:57 AM
To: Melia, Cory
Subject: Re: Udall: Investigation Finds Disturbing Picture of Horse Racing Industry

Is ED a Press Secretary a good writer? If so, perhaps Ed should issue a statement.

From: Melia, Cory [mailto:Cory.Melia@humansecurity.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 12:03 PM
To: Carrie Hartman [mailto:carrie.hartman@humansecurity.org]
Subject: Re: Udall: Investigation Finds Disturbing Picture of Horse Racing Industry

Thanks, Wahnie Jones capemarsh.

From: Carrie Hartman [mailto:carrie.hartman@humansecurity.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 12:55 PM
To: Melia, Cory
Subject: FYI: Udall: Investigation Finds Disturbing Picture of Horse Racing Industry

FYI:


Regards,

Cory

From: Udall Press
Office of Sen. Tom Udall

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
March 26, 2013
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		
		

Udall: Investigation Finds Disturbing Picture of Horse Racing Industry

WASHINGTON— Following today’s report by The New York Times on the state of horseracing in the United States, U.S. Senator Tom Udall (DNM) issued the following statement:
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"The findings are vivid. In The New York Times investigation of the horseracing in the United States, and New Mexico in particular, paint a disturbing picture of the industry.

"In 2014, the Times exposed how the system is rigged in favor of the betting public. The high levels of corruption and gambling, along with an epidemic of animal abuse, have led to widespread violations of animal welfare laws and the neglect and death of their victims.

"The Times exposé shines a light on the need for national standards in a sport that is huge and creates gambling profits, but has lacked proper oversight for decades.

"I urge our leaders in Congress to advance our bipartisan legislation, the Integrity in Horseracing and Certification and Drug Reform Act, to ensure the integrity of the industry. The bill would strengthen standards for medication and drug testing, and increase penalties for violations.

"It is time to end the systemic corruption and growing addiction to horseracing, and ensure that it is done in a way that is just for the animals and the owners.

"Thank you."
EXHIBIT 53
Republican Congressman Ed Whitfield of Kentucky has sounded off on the first installment of the New York Times investigative report on equine fatalities in horse racing, and it’s no surprise Whitfield used the opportunity to call for support of federal legislation banning drugs from racehorses that he and New Mexico Democratic Sen. Tom Udall co-sponsored.

“I was disgusted, but not surprised, after reading the New York Times article, Mangled Horses, Maimed Jockeys, outlining its investigation into the horseracing industry,” said Whitfield, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Energy and Power that conducted a 2008 hearing on drugs and horse racing following the revelation that steroids — then legal — were given regularly to Kentucky Derby winner Big Brown and following the death of Eight Belles in that same Derby.

“This article further supports the need for legislation banning the doping of horses in horseracing.

“For too long, the safety of jockeys and equine athletes has been neglected for the pursuit of racing profits. The doping of injured horses and forcing them to compete is deplorable and must be stopped. Despite repeated promises from the racing industry to end this practice, voluntary meaningful action and oversight are not going to happen.

“Sen. Tom Udall (D-NM) and I introduced legislation, the Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act of 2011, that will set up national standards, implement fines, and put into place a “three strikes and you’re out” rule. This legislation will bring much-needed reforms to an industry that supports thousands of jobs and is enjoyed by spectators nationwide.
"For this important industry to survive, rules must be put into place to protect the jockeys, and protect the horses. This legislation does just that, and I will continue to work with my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pass this bill."

hitfield, whose First Congressional district encompasses Western Kentucky, is married to Connie Harriman-Whitfield, who served as vice chairman of the Kentucky Racing Commission under Republican Gov. Ernie Fletcher. Harriman-Whitfield also is employed as Senior Adviser of Presidential Initiatives for the Humane Society of the United States, an animal welfare organization that spent $36 million of its $126 million in expenditures on salaries in 2010. Harriman-Whitfield’s salary was not available on IRS Form 990, nor was the amount revealed on Rep. Whitfield’s financial disclosure papers that indicated she received a salary from HSUS for her advisory role.

No hearings have yet to be conducted on the Whitfield-Udall legislation.

New to the Paulick Report? Click here to sign up for our daily email newsletter to keep up on this and other stories happening in the Thoroughbred industry.
Copyright © 2016 Paulick Report.

This entry was posted in Ray's Paddock and tagged drugs in horse racing, ed whitfield, Horse Racing, Interstate Horse Racing Improvement Act, new york times, New York Times story on horse racing, thoroughbred by Ray Paulick. Bookmark the permalink.
The Tragic Toll of Horse Racing

March 26, 2012

It was 22 years ago that I wrote a cover story for The Animals’ Agenda magazine about problems in the horse-racing industry—an absence of any national regulatory authority, widespread doping to allow injured horses to race or to enhance their performance, racing of 2-year-olds before their bodies are mature enough to withstand the pounding from competitive racing, unsettling track surfaces, breeding practices that raise speed over physical soundness, and all-too-frequent breakdowns. Last Sunday, the New York Times reported a massive piece that demonstrates that horse racing has not cleaned up its act in the last two decades. In fact, they argue that the industry is worse than ever for horses, with 25 horses dying on the track every week. Jockeys are also being injured and killed at unsacceptably high rates.

All of this amounts to a kind of fraud; the people putting money down on horses have no idea what medication is being administered to the animals, and they have little comprehension of the terrible toll of injury and death involved.

One subject the story did not touch upon are the discarded from the racing industry, horses that end up in the slaughter pipeline. Thouscnds of thoroughbreds and quarter horses, no longer performing adequately on the track, are sold off to other buyers and shipped to cattle towns in Canada and Mexico. Then they are slaughtered, and their meat is exported to Europe and Asia for human consumption. The HSUS has repeatedly documented inhumane treatment and slaughter of horses that were perfectly healthy before the slaughter industry turned them into meat. This week, HSUS and Front Range Equine Rescue filed a legal petition with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to prevent former race horses and companion horses from being used as human food. The petition alleges that cattle given to these horses throughout their lives are banned by FDA and that potentially dangerous to humans.

The Times story also did not cover the massive overbreeding of horses, and how so few of these horses succeed on the track. The horse racing industry is producing more horses than people can take care of, and that’s providing an opening for the horse-slaughter industry.

U.S. Rep. Ed Whitfield, R-Ky., and Sen. Tom Udall, D-N.M., have introduced legislation in Congress to crack down on horse-racing abuses. “For too long, the safety of jockeys and equine athletes has been neglected in the pursuit of racing profits,” said Whitfield of the Interstate Horse Racing Improvement Act of 2011, H.R. 1722 and S. 886. “The doping of injured horses and forcing them to compete is deplorable and must be stopped. Despite repeated promises from the racing industry to end this practice, voluntary meaningful action and oversight are not going to happen.”

The HSUS’s public relations department has concentrated on ending horse slaughter, seeing that federal laws against using of Tennessee Walking horses for use in shows are enforced, and improving management of wild horses and burros. It’s now time for us to add the reform of horse racing to our positive agenda for horses, since the industry has failed to regulate itself after a series of high-profile incidents, such as breakdowns by Barbaro and Eight Belles. The New York Times story will be another step on the road. If we look to drive lasting change.

Categories
Equine, Public Policy (legal/legislator)

http://blog.humanesociety.org/wayne201203/horse-racing.html
EXHIBIT 55
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From: LF Whitfield
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2012 6:03 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Questions for Congressman Whitfield from Washington Post

Dear Congressman Whitfield,

The question posted to your email in response to the personal issues of
27 Congressmen and their families for the first time during this current Congress
in this kind of situation by the Washington Post is quite troubling.

We have family members that are employed in the Capitol in staff
27 affairs that

27 lobby

27 do not wish to disclose

27 but wish to volunteer nonpartisan or nonpolitical information about their

27 work for a

27 non-profit whose views are not in alignment with the member of Congress

27 from whom they work and

27 wish to volunteer their views without being identified with the member

27 of Congress.

Please let me know if you would be interested in receiving a detailed

27 report

27 with the corresponding lobbying reports included.

Thank you for your assistance, please feel free to contact me if you have

27 any questions.

Best,

[Name]

[Position]
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EXHIBIT 56
Dear Mr. Whifffield,

Thank you very much for your inquiry regarding the lobbying work of Conroe Harrison-Whifffield for the Humane Society Legislative Fund (HSLF). I am pleased to respond to your questions.

To answer your question: HSLF supports the following five (5) major objectives in the Humane Legislation Act of 2010: (1) 10% (proposed for the full range of dog ownership), (2) 10% (proposed for the full range of dog ownership), (3) 10% (proposed for the full range of cat ownership), (4) 10% (proposed for the full range of horse ownership), and (5) 10% (proposed for the full range of bird ownership).

We have a number of other goals that we have identified as priorities:

1. **Dog ownership:** To encourage responsible dog ownership and reduce the number of stray dogs.
2. **Cat ownership:** To promote responsible cat ownership and reduce the number of stray cats.
3. **Horse ownership:** To encourage responsible horse ownership and reduce the number of stray horses.
4. **Bird ownership:** To promote responsible bird ownership and reduce the number of stray birds.

Conroe Harrison-Whifffield is one of several lobbyists who work for HSLF. She has been with HSLF for 15 years, and has been active in the lobbying field for over 20 years. She is currently a senior lobbyist and has been with HSLF for 15 years.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,
[Your Name]
EXHIBIT 57
No, not currently. It's the same argument the Post tried to make. He was engaged in leadership on some of these issues long before his employment. Also, he hasn't supported House bills and votes of ours. Lots of House lobby Congress and then is easily more interested in them. I don't know that OOG for us has the votes. But Cisina has been careful to be in touch with House Ethics. This is TN wealth who are in town this week making a visit.

Sent from my iPad

On Dec 10, 2015, at 6:55 PM, "Michael Mandariz"@humanesociety.org wrote:

Why would that be a violation? Does the House have info on Legislation rules?

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 10, 2015, at 3:14 PM, "Heather Sullivan"@humanesociety.org wrote:

Hi Mike.

Would you like to talk to her, or would you like me to send her a statement?

From: Ann Palmer
Sent: Tuesday, December 15, 2015 4:58 PM
To: HSFL Heather Sullivan
Subject: Re: Anna Palmer Politico

Hi,

Hi, my name is Anna Palmer. I am working on a story regarding Rep. Whitfield and his wife Connie Hartman-Whitfield. The congressman has co-sponsored and sponsored legislation that Connie has specifically lobbied on for HSFL, according to Senate lobbying disclosure reports. This includes co-sponsoring HR 847, 1094, 366, 176 and sponsoring HR 1318. This would appear to be a violation of his ethics rules regarding spouses and members of Congress. I am interested to see if Connie has a comment and/or if someone at the Humane Society Legislative Fund can speak to this issue and whether HSFL sees this as a conflict of interest. I am on deadline for 2 pm Wednesday. The best number for me is 202-631-]

Thanks,

Anna

Ann Palmer
POLITICO

Cell: 202-631 []
Twitter: @apalmardo
EXHIBIT 58
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Bennett, Tate (McConnell) <Tate.Bennett@mccconnell.senate.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 9:11 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Is now a bad time?

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 9:09 AM
To: Bennett, Tate (McConnell)
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Hi Tate,

Sure, give me a call anytime. My direct is 6

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2318 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Bennett, Tate (McConnell) [mailto:Tate.Bennett@mccconnell.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 8:41 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Hey Melissa,

Your favorite topic- Caring for Coal Miners. Do you have a quick second for us to revisit this via phone?

Tate

Elizabeth Tate Bennett
The Office of U.S. Senator Mitch McConnell
Legislative Assistant
Agriculture, Energy & Environment
(202) 224-2541
450

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2013 9:32 AM
To: Bennett, Tate (McConnel)
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT COAL MINERS' HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Yes, the CARE Act (Rockefeller/Rahall bill) puts the retirees into the 1992 Plan. Only the coal companies who were signatories of that plan pay into it. By putting the retirees into the 1992 Plan, they are making Peabody and Arch directly liable for the retiree benefits. We felt their liability in Patriot's collapse should be settled in the courts (there are several pending lawsuits on the issue) not by changing the law retroactively. The CARE Act also transfers all of the unobligated interest from AML Funds to the UMWA pension plan (which along with the teamsters is on the verge of going under). The UMWA Pension plan has been in bad shape for awhile. The original version of the CARE Act only dealt with the pension issues. However, my boss sees the pension issues as separate from the healthcare benefits and unrelated to the Patriot Bankruptcy. Although, if Patriot stops paying into the pension fund it could collapse. It's a bad situation all the way around. Because of so many interested parties (mainly Bob Murray), our bill probably won't go anywhere without pension fix language. I've been working on this issue since last year. The most difficult challenge I've had is there isn't anyone around (except Jim Zola, Rahall's CoS) who worked on this issue the last time around. Everyone who did now works for one of the coal companies or UMWA, and their information is always biased. CRS and Leg Counsel aren't familiar with the issue either. Please let me know if I can help you, and I will try to answer any questions you have.

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2318 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3147

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

From: Bennett, Tate (McConnel) [mailto:Tate.Bennett@senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2013 9:22 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT COAL MINERS' HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Gotcha. The Rockefeller bill does touch the pension issue (makes them tax exempt right?) and is not the Senate counterpart, correct? It [Rockefeller bill] incorporates the 1992 Benefit Plan as well.

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2013 9:18 AM
To: Bennett, Tate (McConnel)
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT COAL MINERS' HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Hi Tate,
EXHIBIT 59
From: Hicks, Cory  
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 10:18 AM  
To: Buchanan, Melissa  
Subject: Re: UMWA

4.) UMWA has NEVER helped us when we needed it. We asked them to testify on several occasions last Congress and every time they said no despite having the same position as us.

----- Original Message -----  
From: Hicks, Cory  
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 10:15 AM  
To: Buchanan, Melissa  
Subject: Re: UMWA

I think there are three things FW needs to understand. There maybe others.

1.) Pension isn’t our immediate problem.
2.) Attacking Peabody and Arch isn’t our battle and won’t help a bill pass
3.) Rahall bill will never pass the House, which is why our bill is narrowed to the specific problem. We’re confident we can get several republicans on our bill.

----- Original Message -----  
From: Buchanan, Melissa  
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 10:08 AM  
To: Hicks, Cory  
Subject: RE: UMWA

Okay, I will work on it.

Melissa Buchanan  
Legislative Assistant  
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)  
2184 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
Phone: (202) 225-3115  
Fax: (202) 225-3587  
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

----- Original Message -----  
From: Hicks, Cory  
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 10:08 AM  
To: Buchanan, Melissa  
Subject: Re: UMWA
Yes. You should prepare a one pager on why the Rahall bill won’t move and why the Peabody/Arch battle isn’t our fight and won’t move either.

----- Original Message -----
From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 09:59 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: UMWA

Are they coming to talk about our bill?

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3155
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

----- Original Message -----
From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 9:58 AM
To: Heydliauff, Emma
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa; Pape, Michael
Subject: UMWA

Please set up a meeting with Bill at UMWA to discuss pension bill next week. Melissa has contact info. Let us know when the date is set. Thanks
EXHIBIT 60
From: Libell, Mark (Rockefeller) <Mark.Libell@rockefeller.senate.gov>
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa

Subject: RE: coal industry retiree issues

Works well, what's your office #?

---

From: Hicks, Cory <mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 1:24 PM
To: Libell, Mark (Rockefeller)
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa

Subject: RE: coal industry retiree issues

Monday afternoon works. Should we say 3?

---

From: Libell, Mark (Rockefeller) <mailto:Mark.Libell@rockefeller.senate.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 12:28 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa

Subject: RE: coal industry retiree issues

Thanks Cory, and completely understand the need for you guys to keep your focus to health only. We think positive action on the health side will only help us with our other effort on the pension issues down the road.

I'm out of the country tomorrow and Friday, so how's your Monday afternoon?

---

From: Hicks, Cory <mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 9:27 AM
To: Libell, Mark (Rockefeller)
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa

Subject: RE: coal industry retiree issues

Mark, thanks again for reaching out. I've cc'ding Melissa who has been working on this issue in more detail. We're interested in your views on the topic and seeing what we can work out. Just so you know before making the trip over, we're only interested in working on the health challenges, since that is the most pressing issue that our constituents have as a result of the Patriot bankruptcy. We understand that there are long-term challenges with the pension plan, but my boss is not interested in addressing that issue in conjunction with the Patriot bankruptcy at this time.

Melissa and I are available later this week or early next. Let me know what works for you.

Cory Hicks
Chief of Staff
Chairman Ed Whitfield
202-225-3115

Follow Rep. Whitefield on the web:
From: Libell, Mark (Rockefeller) [mailto:Mark.Libell@rockefeller.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 10, 2013 10:09 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: coal industry retiree issues

Cory, we worked together several years ago back in my Bart Gordon days on energy issues. Hope all’s well for you.

I’m wondering if you’d have a few minutes in the next couple of weeks for me to bring a couple of my leg folks over to talk to you and your relevant folks about the coal retiree health and pension challenges. We’ve been told ya’ll are taking a look at this given your constituency, and wanted to offer to help you in whatever way possible and talk strategy going forward.

Thanks for any time you guys can spare.

Mark

Mark Libell
Legislative Director
United States Senator John D. Rockefeller IV (WV)
202-224-6472
APPENDIX B
The Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics (the “Board”), by a vote of no less than four members, on May 29, 2014, adopted the following report and ordered it to be transmitted to the Committee on Ethics of the United States House of Representatives.

SUBJECT: Representative Ed Whitfield

NATURE OF THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS: From 2011 to 2014, Representative Ed Whitfield’s wife, who is a registered lobbyist, lobbyed on numerous bills, including bills that Representative Whitfield sponsored or co-sponsored. Representative Whitfield’s wife contacted his congressional staff in connection with her lobbying efforts. Representative Whitfield and his wife held joint meetings with other congressional offices related to legislation she lobbied.

If Representative Whitfield permitted his wife to lobby him or his congressional staff, then he may have violated House rules and standards of conduct.

If Representative Whitfield granted special favors or privileges to his wife, in her capacity as a lobbyist, and to her employer, then he may have violated House rules and standards of conduct.

RECOMMENDATION: The Board recommends that the Committee on Ethics further review the allegation concerning the lobbying contacts of Representative Whitfield’s wife because there is a substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield had lobbying contacts with his wife and permitted his wife to have lobbying contacts with his staff in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

The Board recommends that the Committee on Ethics further review the allegations concerning the granting of special favors or privileges because there is substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield permitted his wife to use his congressional office to advance and facilitate her lobbying activities and the lobbying activities of her employer in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

VOTES IN THE AFFIRMATIVE: 6

VOTES IN THE NEGATIVE: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 0

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OR STAFF DESIGNATED TO PRESENT THIS REPORT TO THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Omar S. Ashmawy, Staff Director and Chief Counsel.
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On May 29, 2014, the Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics (the “Board”) adopted the following findings of fact and accompanying citations to law, regulations, rules, and standards of conduct (in italics).

The Board notes that these findings do not constitute a determination that a violation actually occurred.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In 2011, Representative Whitfield’s wife became a registered lobbyist for the Humane Society Legislative Fund (“HSLF”) and began lobbying various bills concerning animal welfare issues.

2. From 2011 to 2014, Representative Whitfield’s wife contacted his congressional staff concerning legislation she lobbied on numerous occasions. These contacts included discussions of advocacy strategy, selection of potential co-sponsors, drafting of bills, and obtaining Representative Whitfield’s support for legislation.

3. During the same time period, Representative Whitfield’s congressional office provided HSLF with assistance related to its lobbying activities. The assistance included scheduling as many as 100 meetings with other congressional offices for Representative Whitfield’s wife and HSLF and conducting joint meetings with Representative Whitfield and his wife with Representatives and Senators to promote HSLF legislative priorities.

A. Summary of Allegations

4. Representative Whitfield may have violated House rules and standards of conduct by permitting his wife to lobby him and his staff.

5. Representative Whitfield may have violated House rules and standards of conduct by using his congressional office to provide special favors and privileges to advance and facilitate the lobbying activities of his wife and her employer.

6. The Board recommends that the Committee on Ethics further review the allegation concerning the lobbying contacts of Representative Whitfield’s wife because there is a substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield had lobbying contacts with his wife and permitted his wife to have lobbying contacts with his staff in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

7. The Board recommends that the Committee on Ethics further review the allegations concerning the granting of special favors or privileges because there is substantial reason
to believe that Representative Whitfield permitted his wife to use his congressional office to advance and facilitate her lobbying activities and the lobbying activities of her employer in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

B. Jurisdictional Statement

8. The allegations that are the subject of this review concern Representative Ed Whitfield, a Member of the United States House of Representatives for the 1st District of Kentucky. The Resolution the United States House of Representatives adopted creating the Office of Congressional Ethics ("OCE") directs that, "[n]o review shall be undertaken ... by the board of any alleged violation that occurred before the date of adoption of this resolution." The House adopted this Resolution on March 11, 2008. Because the conduct under review occurred after March 11, 2008, the OCE has jurisdiction in this matter.

C. Procedural History

9. The OCE received a written request for a preliminary review in this matter signed by at least two members of the Board on January 28, 2014. The preliminary review commenced on January 29, 2014. The preliminary review was scheduled to end on February 27, 2014.

10. At least three members of the Board voted to initiate a second-phase review in this matter on February 27, 2014. The second-phase review commenced on February 28, 2014. The second-phase review was scheduled to end on April 13, 2014.

11. The Board voted to extend the second-phase review for an additional period of fourteen days on March 28, 2014. The second-phase review ended on April 27, 2013.

12. Pursuant to Rule 9(B) of OCE Rules for the Conduct of Investigations, Representative Whitfield presented a statement to the Board on May 29, 2014.

13. The Board voted to refer the matter to the Committee on Ethics and adopted these findings on May 29, 2014.

14. This report and findings were transmitted to the Committee on Ethics on June 10, 2014.

D. Summary of Investigative Activity

15. The OCE requested and received documentary and, in some cases, testimonial information from the following sources:

---

1 H. Res. 895, 110th Cong. §1(e), as amended (the “Resolution”).
2 A preliminary review is “requested” in writing by members of the Board of the OCE. The request for a preliminary review is “received” by the OCE on a date certain. According to the Resolution, the time frame for conducting a preliminary review is thirty days from the date of receipt of the Board’s request.
3 According to the Resolution, the Board must vote on whether to conduct a second-phase review in a matter before the expiration of the thirty-day preliminary review. If the Board votes for a second-phase, the second-phase begins when the preliminary review ends. The second-phase review does not begin on the date of the Board vote.
(1) Representative Ed Whitfield;
(2) Representative Whitfield’s Wife;
(3) Representative Whitfield’s Chief of Staff (“Chief of Staff”);
(4) Representative Whitfield’s Congressional Aide (“Congressional Aide”);
(5) Representative Whitfield’s Former Staffer (“Former Staffer”);
(6) Representative Whitfield’s Scheduler (“Scheduler”);
(7) The Humane Society of the United States (“HSUS”);
(8) Humane Society Legislative Fund (“HSLF”);
(9) HSLF Lobbyist;
(10) HSUS Federal Affairs Director;
(11) HSUS President; and
(12) HSUS Vice President of Equine Protection (“HSUS Vice President”).

16. The OCE requested and received testimonial information from the following sources:

   (1) Representative 1;
   (2) Former Senator;
   (3) Senate Staffer 1; and
   (4) Senate Staffer 2

17. Representative Whitfield cooperated with the Review, but could not be interviewed for medical reasons.

II. REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD AND HIS STAFF HAD CONTACTS WITH HIS WIFE RELATED TO HER LOBBYING

   A. Laws, Regulations, Rules, and Standards of Conduct

18. House Rule 25, clause 7 provides that “[a] Member . . . shall prohibit all staff employed by that Member . . . (including staff in personal, committee, and leadership offices) from making any lobbying contact (as defined in section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995) with that individual’s spouse if that spouse is a lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 or is employed or retained by such a lobbyist for the purpose of influencing legislation.”
19. House Rule 23, clause 2 provides that “[a] Member . . . shall adhere to the spirit and the
letter of the Rules of the House and to the rules of duly constituted committees thereof.”

20. The House Ethics Manual instructs that “[s]pecial caution must be exercised when the
spouse of a Member or staff person, or any other immediate family member, is a lobbyist.
At a minimum, such an official should not permit the spouse to lobby either him- or
herself or any of his or her subordinates. . . . Furthermore, a recently enacted provision of
the House rules (House Rule 25, clause 7) requires that the Member prohibit his or her
staff from having any lobbying contacts with that spouse if such individual is a registered
lobbyist or is employed or retained by a registered lobbyist to influence legislation.”

21. The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, as amended, defines the term “lobbying contact,”
subject to certain enumerated exceptions, as “any oral or written communication
(including an electronic communication) to a covered executive branch official or a
covered legislative branch official that is made on behalf of a client with regard to -- (i)
the formulation, modification, or adoption of Federal legislation (including legislative
proposals); (ii) the formulation, modification, or adoption of a Federal rule, regulation,
Executive order, or any other program, policy, or position of the United States
Government; (iii) the administration or execution of a Federal program or policy
(including the negotiation, award, or administration of a Federal contract, grant, loan,
permit, or license); or (iv) the nomination or confirmation of a person for a position
subject to confirmation by the Senate.”

B. Representative Whitfield’s Wife is a Registered Lobbyist for the Humane
Society Legislative Fund

22. On January 1, 2011, Representative Whitfield’s Wife became a registered lobbyist
according to HSLF’s lobbyist registration statement filed with the Clerk of the House.

23. Representative Whitfield’s Wife is registered to lobby on various issues related to
animals.

24. From 2011 to 2014, Representative Whitfield’s Wife reported lobbying the following
bills that Representative Whitfield sponsored or co-sponsored:

---

4 The Lobbying Disclosure Act Guidance provides that “[i]f a communication is limited to routine information
gathering questions and there is not an attempt to influence a covered official, the exception of Section 3(8)(d)(v)
for “any other similar administrative request” would normally apply. In determining whether there is an attempt to
influence a covered official, the identity of the person asking the questions and her relationship to the covered
official obviously will be important factors.” Lobbying Disclosure Act Guidance at 7 (last revised February 15,
2013).

5 HSLF LDA Lobbying Registration Statement (Exhibit 1 at 14-2940_0001-04). Although the effective date of the
registration is January 1, 2011, HSLF Lobbyist told the OCE that Representative Whitfield’s Wife did not begin
lobbying until approximately October 2011. The employment records of Representative Whitfield’s Wife indicate
that she transferred from the HSUS payroll to the HSLF payroll in October 2011.

6 Id.
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- Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act of 2011 (H.R. 2492);
- American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act of 2011 (H.R. 2966);
- Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act of 2011 (H.R. 1513);
- Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act of 2011 (H.R. 1733);
- Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act of 2011 (H.R. 198);
- Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act of 2011 (“Puppy Mill Bill”) (H.R. 835);
- To Amend the Horse Protection Act of 2012 (H.R. 6388);
- Safeguard American Food Exports Act of 2013 (H.R. 1094);
- Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act of 2013 (H.R. 183);
- Prevent All Soring Tactics Act of 2013 (“PAST Act”) (H.R. 1518);
- Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act of 2013 (H.R. 847); and

25. Representative Whitfield’s Wife and HSLF reported lobbying additional bills during the time period.\

C. Representative Whitfield’s Wife Had Contacts with His Staff in Her Capacity as a Registered Lobbyist

26. Representative Whitfield’s Wife, HSLF, and HSUS relied on Representative Whitfield’s congressional office for assistance with their lobbying activities.

---

1 HSLF LDA Quarterly Lobbying Reports (2011-2014) (Exhibit 2 at 14-2940_0006-58).
2 Id.
Subject to the Nondisclosure Provisions of H. Res. 895 of the 110th Congress as Amended

27. For example, Representative Whitfield’s wife noted that for the PAST Act, “neither HSUS or HSLF will be able to do well setting up meetings with Republican offices . . . . That is why Ed’s office was so crucial in setting up meetings between Republicans and third parties.”

28. She stated that HSUS needed Representative Whitfield’s congressional office to gain Republican support for the PAST Act because “HSUS is anathema to the majority of them.” With Republicans, Ed and I emphasize that it is an industry backed bill . . . . we don’t even mention animal welfare groups . . . .

29. HSUS and HSLF also relied on Representative Whitfield’s congressional office to introduce bills.

30. In another email, HSUS Federal Affairs Director asked Representative Whitfield’s wife “any chance we could get the HPA bill introduced in time so it might be possible to try to

---

9 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Congressional Aide, dated January 28, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940.0064).
10 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Holly Hazard, dated October 19, 2013 (Exhibit 4 at 14-2940.0093).
11 Id.
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add it to the Farm Bill during House floor debate?!? She responded, “Yes! Working with Ed and [Chief of Staff] on it today.”

31. HSUS also assisted other organizations with gaining the support of Representative Whitfield’s congressional office.

32. In the email below, HSUS Federal Affairs Director requested that Representative Whitfield’s Wife ask Representative Whitfield whether he would co-sponsor a bill that the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine was lobbying.

33. From 2011 to 2014, as part of these lobbying activities that involved Representative Whitfield’s congressional office, Representative Whitfield’s Wife had numerous contacts with his congressional staff.

34. The contacts were related to drafting language for bills, scheduling meetings to discuss legislation with congressional offices, and directing Representative Whitfield to support or oppose legislation.

35. Representative Whitfield’s Wife had multiple contacts with those members of Representative Whitfield’s staff who were responsible for animal welfare issues, including: Chief of Staff, Congressional Aide, and Scheduler.

---

12 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated June 21, 2012 (Exhibit 5 at 14-2940_0095).
13 Id.
14 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated May 9, 2013 (Exhibit 6 at 14-2940_0097).
Contacts with Chief of Staff

36. Chief of Staff told the OCE that he communicated with Representative Whitfield’s Wife concerning legislation. The contacts with Representative Whitfield’s Wife included discussions about the PAST Act related to strategy, potential co-sponsors, and drafting of the bill. Representative Whitfield’s Wife also contacted him about having Representative Whitfield support legislation that the congressional office previously refused to support.  

37. Representative Whitfield’s Wife emailed Chief of Staff on numerous occasions concerning legislation. The following are examples of such emails:

- “Since you are working with Chris on the [Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act] bill, can you have him delete the two words ‘if appropriate’ after the mention of shelter dogs as an option? I can understand why he removed ‘preferred’ before ‘option’ but the added two words create too big of an out.”  
  (1/7/11)

- “Could you mention the [Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act] bill to any of the LDs on your hallway or do you know any of them? If not, I can try to have Melissa set up 10 min meetings for me with the members.”  
  (7/14/11)

- “If Ed’s Press Secretary a good writer? If so, perhaps Ed should issue a statement [about an investigation of Horseracing Industry].”  
  (3/27/12)

- “Please be sure Ed votes FOR the Peters amendment [to the Sportsmen’s Heritage Act] today (banning polar bear imports and hunting in Natl Parks). Ed voted this way last time.”  
  (4/17/12)

- “Ed just decided to sign on to the Egg Bill. I advised against it . . . .”  
  (9/12/12)

- “That means Ed and I need to talk to him [about the Horse Protection Act]. Can you set up an apt for us/Ed to talk to Pitts on April 9 and plan to move the intro date by a day or two?”  
  (4/4/13)

---

11 Transcript of Interview of Chief of Staff, April 24, 2014 (“Chief of Staff Transcript”) (Exhibit 7 at 14-2940_0111).
12 Chief of Staff Transcript (Exhibit 7 at 14-2940_0120-121).
13 Id. at 14-2940_0123.
14 Id. at 14-2940_0156.
15 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Chief of Staff, dated January 7, 2011 (Exhibit 8 at 14-2940_0168).
16 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Chief of Staff, dated July 14, 2011 (Exhibit 9 at 14-2940_0172).
17 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Chief of Staff, dated March 27, 2012 (Exhibit 10 at 14-2940_0175).
18 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Chief of Staff, dated April 17, 2012 (Exhibit 11 at 14-2940_0178).
19 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Chief of Staff, dated September 12, 2012 (Exhibit 12 at 14-2940_0181).
20 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Chief of Staff, dated April 4, 2013 (Exhibit 13 at 14-2940_0184).
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- “Could you put together a group Congressional letter requesting an estimate of what USDA currently spends on the HIO/DQP arrangement [for the Horse Protection Act]?” 25 (4/16/13)

- “Ed is now focused on PAST. We discussed it this morning and have come up with the following checklist that needs to be implemented ASAP.” 26 (6/16/13)

- “Please read [HSUS Vice President’s] email in full. They would like a statement clarifying the weighted shoe provision [of the PAST Act] from Ed’s office and the sooner the better.” 27 (9/26/13)

- “Can you set up a meeting with [Representative] Yarmouth [about the PAST Act]?” 28 (10/14/13)

- “I gave Ed the draft Dear Colleague for Royce to reach out to Conservation Caucus and hopefully CA delegation. Ed also wants Schakowsky and Kinzinger to send one to the Illinois delegation. In both cases, should we give them a list of their delegation members missing from PAST or will they figure that out themselves?” 29 (10/15/13)

- “Did you talk to Gary about the bills being considered together... Ed said you can only do it at markup... PLEASE stand firm on this.” 30 (10/31/13)

---

25 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to HSUS Vice President, dated April 16, 2013 (Exhibit 14 at 14-2940_0186).
26 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Chief of Staff and Justin Fareed, dated June 16, 2013 (Exhibit 15 at 14-2940_0189).
27 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Chief of Staff, dated September 26, 2013 (Exhibit 16 at 14-2940_0191).
28 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Chief of Staff and Former Staffer, dated October 14, 2013 (Exhibit 17 at 14-2940_0194).
29 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Chief of Staff, dated October 15, 2013 (Exhibit 18 at 14-2940_0198).
30 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Chief of Staff, dated October 31, 2013 (Exhibit 19 at 14-2940_0200).
38. In addition to the contacts listed above, Representative Whitfield’s Wife contacted Chief of Staff in an effort to get Representative Whitfield to co-sponsor legislation that she lobbied. She requested that Chief of Staff have Representative Whitfield co-sponsor the Puppy Mill Bill in 2011.31

```
From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Friday, December 02, 2011 3:40 PM
To: Sparkman, John
Subject: Puppy Mill Bill

Connie wants us ON the PUGEN MILL BILL. NSA won’t like it, but I think it’s fine. We’ve been on it every year.

H.R.335 [112TH]
Latest Title: Puppy Uniform Proection and Safety Act
Committee: House Agriculture
Related Bills: S.747

Cory Hicks
Legislative Director/Policy Coordinator
Rep. Ed Whitfield
```

39. When the OCE asked Chief of Staff about the Puppy Mill Bill, he stated that he added Representative Whitfield as a co-sponsor after his wife mentioned it, but “it wasn’t because she told me to or anything like that, it was more of, you know, I noticed we weren’t a co-sponsor, we had been a co-sponsor since 2001 and it was sort of, it was an oversight to begin with.”32

---

31 Email from Chief of Staff to John Sparkman, dated December 2, 2011 (Exhibit 20 at 14-2940_0205).
32 Chief of Staff Transcript (Exhibit 7 at 14-2940_0142).
40. On another occasion, HSUS Federal Affairs asked Representative Whitfield’s Wife for help to “get Cong. Whitfield on the FY13 animal welfare enforcement funding letter.” Representative Whitfield’s Wife forwarded the request to Chief of Staff who agreed to “add the Congressman to the letter.”

From: Danita Cody <Danita.Cody@hsus.org>
To: Veciha Hammar Whitefield <veciha.hammarwhitefield@hsus.org>
Subject: FY13 Cong. Whitfield animal funding letter again before tomorrow’s deadline

Date: Monday, March 19, 2012 2:20 PM

Dear Veciha,

I just checked my conference call. It seems that our call clearly did not happen. I will call you this afternoon. We can also talk tomorrow before lunch.

As a reminder, we are planning to schedule a call for Wednesday to discuss the animal welfare enforcement funding letter. I am assuming that you and your office will have the text of the letter to me by then. I would be happy to provide any guidance or feedback on the letter.

Best,

Danita Cody

41. Chief of Staff told the OCE that Representative Whitfield’s Wife “may have mentioned that we were not on the [letter], but it was a similar situation where we had always signed onto the letter in the past.”

Contacts with Congressional Aide

42. Congressional Aide, a staff member with Representative Whitfield’s congressional office responsible for animal welfare issues, told the OCE that Representative Whitfield’s Wife contacted him on numerous occasions concerning the PAST Act. The nature of the contacts included discussions related to strategy, identifying potential co-sponsors, and scheduling meetings with other congressional offices. He told the OCE that as of...
April 2014, he continued to have communications with Representative Whitfield’s Wife concerning the PAST Act approximately once per week. 39

43. Representative Whitfield’s Wife emailed Congressional Aide on numerous occasions concerning the PAST Act. The following are examples of her emails to Congressional Aide:

- “Maybe we should try to get Ed to call [Rep.] Yoho.” 40 (12/9/13)
- “Perhaps you (as Whitfield office) can let McCaskill’s and Wagner’s offices know that [Friends of Sound Horses] is trying to contact them, the importance of FOSH etc. That way, Teresa is apt to receive the reception she deserves.” 41 (1/7/14)
- “I talked to Ed about Emma. He understands that she must set up appointments for out-of-town advocates and that you and I can tag along.” 42 (1/9/14)
- “Can Ed back-channel a request to CBO?” 43 (1/14/14)
- “We need to use the story (not the Op-ed) with members of the Ohio delegation.” 44 (1/19/14)

39 Id. at 14-2940_0240.
40 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Congressional Aide, dated December 9, 2013 (Exhibit 25 at 14-2940_0265).
41 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Congressional Aide, dated January 7, 2014 (Exhibit 26 at 14-2940_0268).
42 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Congressional Aide, dated January 9, 2014 (Exhibit 27 at 14-2940_0270).
43 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Congressional Aide, dated January 14, 2014 (Exhibit 28 at 14-2940_0273).
44 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Congressional Aide, dated January 19, 2014 (Exhibit 29 at 14-2940_0276).
Contacts with Representative Whitfield’s Schedulers

44. Scheduler has been employed with Representative Whitfield since August 2012. She told the OCE that she communicated with Representative Whitfield’s Wife concerning the scheduling of 50 to 70 meetings related to the PAST Act. She told the OCE that at the request of Representative Whitfield and his wife, she routinely emailed Representative Whitfield’s Wife the schedules for meetings she arranged with congressional offices about the PAST Act.

From: Cristie Hammar-Whitfield
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 5:08 PM
To: Haydn’s Enemies
Subject: [n]eeting
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png, image003.png, image004.png, image005.png

Let’s try the last four on the list plus Greg Walden.

Thanks,
Cristie
sent from my iPhone

On Oct 9, 2013, at 1:59 PM, ‘Haydn’s Enemies’<hahn@hammarwhitfield.com> wrote:

Mrs. Whitfield,

Since we are scheduling meetings for next week, I went through the list of Republican & SC members that we have not met with yet. The list is below. Please let me know if you would like me to reach out to them about a meeting.

Barton
Walden
Shibik
Calisse
Humphrey
Billy Long
Cassidy
Claymore

Thanks,
Cristie

45. After arranging certain meetings, Scheduler informed congressional offices that “[m]y boss’s wife... will be joining them in the meeting as well.”

Transcript of Interview of Scheduler, April 24, 2014 (“Scheduler Transcript”) (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940-0279).

Id. at 14-2940-0284-85.

Id. See also, Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Scheduler, dated October 15, 2013 (Exhibit 31 at 14-2940-0325); email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Scheduler, dated October 19, 2013 (Exhibit 32 at 14-2940-0328); email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Scheduler, dated October 9, 2013 (Exhibit 69 at 14-2940-0380).

Email from Scheduler to Amanda Stevens, dated October 4, 2013 (Exhibit 33 at 14-2940-0331); email from Scheduler to Kristin Thomson, dated October 17, 2013 (Exhibit 34 at 14-2940-0335). See also Scheduler Transcript (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940-0286-88).
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46. Scheduler told the OCE that she did not have first-hand knowledge of who attended the meetings because she did not attend.49

47. Prior to August 2012, Representative Whitfield’s Wife emailed his then-scheduler on numerous occasions to schedule meetings related to bills she lobbied, including the following examples:

- “Ed and I need to meet with Senator Scott Brown sometime tomorrow to mention the bill Landrieu is introducing [on horse slaughter]. Can you please set something up?” 50 (6/7/11)
- “Any luck with any of my appointments?” 51 (7/14/11)
- “Would you please try to set up a meeting with the Senator some time next week? The subject is Tennessee Walking Horses.” 52 (5/21/12)

Explanation of Representative Whitfield’s Wife

48. Representative Whitfield’s Wife told the OCE that she has contacted Representative Whitfield’s staff about issues related to the PAST Act and other legislation, including scheduling meetings and having Representative Whitfield support bills.53 However, she told the OCE that she had many contacts at the request of Representative Whitfield who used her as a messenger to contact the staff.54

49. The OCE showed Representative Whitfield’s Wife her December 12, 2013 email and asked why she told Congressional Aide, “I am not to contact you or [Scheduler] directly in support of Ed’s bill.” 55 She responded “Okay, well, it’s wrong – it’s not wrong – I mean it’s not right, because that’s not true . . . . But I mean it’s not true that I am not supposed to contact them in support of Ed’s [b]ill, that’s not true. If I am – I am if I am trying to include them [sic] information about something we are all working on together, is nothing wrong with that.” 56

50. The OCE showed Representative Whitfield’s Wife her December 17, 2013 email and asked about her statement that “[Congressional Aide] and I communicate hourly on

49 Scheduler Transcript (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940, 0286).
50 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Melissa Buchanan, dated June 7, 2011 (Exhibit 35 at 14-2940_0338).
51 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Melissa Buchanan, dated July 14, 2011 (Exhibit 36 at 14-2940_0340).
52 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Melissa Buchanan, dated May 21, 2012 (Exhibit 37 at 14-2940_0343).
53 Transcript of Interview Representative Whitfield’s Wife, April 25, 2014 (“Representative Whitfield’s Wife Transcript”) (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0379-80, 14-2940_0401-04, 14-2940_0406-07, 14-2940_0418-19).
54 Representative Whitfield’s Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0379-80, 14-2940_0406-07, 14-2940_0418-19).
55 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Congressional Aide, dated December 11, 2013 (EW4_005262) (Exhibit 39 at 14-2940_0436).
56 Representative Whitfield’s Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0393).
PAST and I was hoping to take Fri off.” She responded “Well, clearly that’s an embellishment exaggeration, obviously he and I do not communicate hourly on PAST. That’s a – how do I say it, it’s – it’s an impossibility.”

51. When asked whether she contacted Congressional Aide daily during the December 2013 time period, Representative Whitfield’s Wife said “No.” When asked whether she contacted the Congressional Aide weekly during the December 2013 time period, Representative Whitfield’s Wife stated “If I did speak to [Congressional Aide], it was part of a group of people who were trying to advance legislation.”

52. The OCE showed Representative Whitfield’s Wife her January 1, 2014 email and asked about her statement that “[Congressional Aide] and I met all day yesterday re strategy . . .” She responded, “I don’t know what that means. I don’t know how we can meet all day RE: Strategy, seems like an exaggeration.”

53. Overall, Representative Whitfield’s Wife acknowledged that she has contacts with Representative Whitfield’s staff concerning the PAST Act and other legislation. She did not describe the frequency of the contacts, but the documentary evidence established that she had consistent contacts with the staff from 2011 to 2014.

D. Representative Whitfield Did Not Prohibit His Staff from Having Contacts with His Wife Related to Her Lobbying

54. Representative Whitfield, his wife, and his staff have been contacted about potential ethics issues related to her lobbying since at least 2012.

- November 11, 2012: The Washington Post contacted Representative Whitfield’s Wife concerning “a story about lawmakers who have family members that are registered to lobby Congress or work for firms that lobby.” Among other questions, she was asked “Have you ever lobbied your husband on these or other bills and issues?”

- June 20, 2013: Representative Whitfield’s Wife and Chief of Staff received a Press Release where the Performance Show Horse Association alleged that Representative Whitfield did not disclose that “he is sponsoring this amendment

---

57 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to HSUS Federal Affairs Director, dated December 17, 2013 (Exhibit 40 at 14-2940_0438).
58 Representative Whitfield’s Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0377).
59 Id. at 14-2940_0378.
60 Id.
61 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to HSLF Lobbyist, dated January 1, 2014 (Exhibit 46 at 14-2940_0455).
62 Representative Whitfield’s Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0374).
63 Email from David S. Falls to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated November 21, 2012 (Exhibit 41 at 14-2940_0441-42).
64 Id. See also Email from HSLF Lobbyist to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated December 4, 2012 (Exhibit 42 at 14-2940_0444-445).
because his wife is a paid lobbyist for the Humane Society Legislative Fund, one of the main advocates for this amendment. This action by Mr. Whitfield would appear to be a violation of the House Code of Official Conduct and a violation of House Rule 25, Clause 7.  

- October 21, 2013: Chief of Staff emailed Representative Whitfield after a congressional office expressed concerns about the scheduling of meetings related to the PAST Act. He told Representative Whitfield: “Since people are starting to hear about these meetings on the Hill and their effectiveness, I think we need to be careful about [Representative Whitfield’s Wife] attending these meetings. What do you think?”  


55. Despite being on notice of the potential ethics issues, Representative Whitfield’s staff continued to have contacts with Representative Whitfield’s Wife related to her lobbying.  

56. For example, as recently as April 24, 2014, the week the OCE’s investigative period for this review ended, Congressional Aide told the OCE that he continued to have weekly contacts with Representative Whitfield’s Wife on the PAST Act.  

Ethics Advice  

57. In October 2013, Chief of Staff and Representative Whitfield’s Wife contacted the Committee on Ethics to seek advice about her interactions with Representative Whitfield’s Congressional office.  

---

63 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Chief of Staff, dated June 21, 2013 (Exhibit 43 at 14-2940_0448).  
64 Email from Chief of Staff to Representative Whitfield, dated October 21, 2013 (Exhibit 44 at 14-2940_0451).  
65 Email from Anna Palmer to Heather Sullivan, dated December 10, 2013 (Exhibit 45 at 14-2940_0453).  
66 Congressional Aide Transcript (Exhibit 22 at 14-2940_0239-40).  
67 Email from Chief of Staff to Representative Whitfield, dated October 21, 2013 (Exhibit 44 at 14-2940_0450-51).
58. On October 21, 2013, Chief of Staff emailed Representative Whitfield that he contacted the Committee on Ethics about the office scheduling meetings for a registered lobbyist, but Chief of Staff said, “I did not inform them that [Representative Whitfield’s Wife] was attending these meetings as I suspected that they would have expressed concerns since she’s married to you and a registered lobbyist.”

59. When asked why he did not tell the Committee on Ethics that Representative Whitfield’s Wife was attending the meetings, Chief of Staff told the OCE “Well, first of all, I wasn’t exactly sure if she was attending the - all of these meetings . . .”

60. When asked whether the Committee on Ethics discussed Representative Whitfield’s Wife with him, Chief of Staff stated “They may have said something to the effect of you can’t set these meetings up for Mrs. Whitfield but we weren’t setting them up for Mrs. Whitfield anyway.”

61. Representative Whitfield’s Wife told the OCE that the Committee on Ethics advised her that she could not “lobby” Representative Whitfield’s staff. She told the OCE that “I am not supposed to try to influence them to take a position on legislation on behalf of my client, my employer, HSLF.”

62. Representative Whitfield’s Wife stated that the Committee on Ethics told her orally that it was “entirely okay” for her to attend meetings that Scheduler arranged for advocates of the PAST Act.

70 Id. at 14-2940_0451.
71 Chief of Staff Transcript (Exhibit 7 at 14-2940_0135).
72 Id. at 14-2940_0136.
73 Representative Whitfield’s Wife Transcript (Exhibit 18 at 14-2940_0419).
74 Id. at 14-2940_0420.
75 Id. at 14-2940_0390-91.
63. On December 11, 2013 she emailed Congressional Aide: “I am not to contact you or [Scheduler] directly in support of Ed’s bill.”

64. However, less than one week later, she emailed HSUS Federal Affairs Director that “[Congressional Aide] and I communicate hourly on PAST . . . .”

65. Approximately one month later, she told HSLF Lobbyist that “[Congressional Aide] and I met all day yesterday re strategy . . . .”

66. Approximately two months after telling Congressional Aide that she could not communicate with him “in support of Ed’s bill,” Representative Whitfield’s Wife told HSUS Vice President “[Congressional Aide] and I met on Friday and developed a list of Texas members who are candidates for co-sponsorship.”

67. Representative Whitfield’s staff told the OCE that the congressional office does not have any rule or policy prohibiting contacts with Representative Whitfield’s Wife related to her lobbying for the HSLF.

68. In conclusion, Representative Whitfield’s congressional staff acknowledged that they had contacts with Representative Whitfield’s Wife concerning legislation that she lobbied from 2011 to 2014. She also confirmed that she contacted the staff. Representative Whitfield and his staff knew of the potential ethics issues related to the contacts and received informal advice from the Committee on Ethics that Representative Whitfield’s Wife could not lobby the staff. Nevertheless, Representative Whitfield’s staff continued to have contacts with Representative Whitfield’s Wife related to her lobbying activities for HSLF.

---

73 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Congressional Aide, dated December 11, 2013 (Exhibit 39 at 14-2940_0436).
74 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to HSUS Federal Affairs Director, dated December 17, 2013 (Exhibit 40 at 14-2940_0438).
75 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to HSLF Lobbyist, dated January 1, 2014 (Exhibit 46 at 14-2940_0455).
76 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to HSUS Vice President, dated February 2, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0078).
77 Congressional Aide Transcript (Exhibit 22 at 14-2940_0247-48); Chief of Staff Transcript (Exhibit 7 at 14-2940_0122-33); Scheduler Transcript (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940_0303-04). Transcript of Interview of Former Staffer, April 25, 2014 (“Former Staffer Transcript”) (Exhibit 47 at 14-2940_0474-45).
69. Based on the evidence before the OCE, there is a substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield permitted his wife to lobby his congressional staff in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

III. REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD MAY HAVE PROVIDED SPECIAL FAVORS OR PRIVILEGES TO HIS WIFE AND HER EMPLOYER

A. Laws, Regulations, Rules, and Standards of Conduct

70. The Code of Ethics for Government Service provides that, "[a]ny person in Government service should: . . . Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not . . . ." 81

71. The House Ethics Manual specifically states that this prohibition applies "to the employment activities of one's spouse or any other family member" and states that "[t]he prohibition against doing any special favors for anyone in one's official capacity is a fundamental standard of conduct, and it applies to an official's conduct with regard to not only his or her spouse or other family members, but more broadly to any person." 82

B. Representative Whitfield's Congressional Office Assisted the Lobbying Activities of His Wife and Her Employer

72. Representative Whitfield and his congressional office provided significant assistance to the lobbying of Representative Whitfield's Wife and her employer.

73. In particular, Representative Whitfield: (1) permitted his office to schedule numerous meetings for HSLF and HSUS at the request of his wife; (2) attended joint meetings with his wife and other lawmakers; and (3) permitted his office to perform numerous official actions for HSLF and HSUS at the request of his wife.

Congressional Meetings Scheduled for HSLF and HSUS

74. Scheduler told the OCE that she arranged 50 to 70 meetings with congressional offices for the PAST Act in October and November 2013. 83 Congressional Aide, who attended most of these meetings, estimated that there were 75 to 100 meetings. 84

75. Although Scheduler told the OCE that she arranged the meetings at the request of Representative Whitfield, emails from HSUS Vice President and Representative Whitfield's Wife indicate that many meetings were scheduled at the request of HSUS. 85

81 Code of Ethics for Government Service § 5.
82 House Ethics Manual 245.
83 Scheduler Transcript (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940_0291).
84 Congressional Aide (Exhibit 22 at 14-2940_0216).
76. For example, HSUS Vice President asked Scheduler, “Could you work on setting up member meetings next week from Tuesday through Friday for Marty and Donna? Connie says that those with asterisks below are more likely to agree to a meeting if they know she’s going to be attending.” He also asked Representative Whitfield’s Wife, “Can [Chief of Staff] try to get a meeting with Corker’s office for Marty and Donna?”

```
From: Keith Davis (humanityinc.org)
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 3:40 PM
To: NoydBaill, Emma
Subject: merit agreement meetings

Emma,

Could you work on setting up member meetings next week from Tuesday through Friday for Marty and Donna? Connie says that those with asterisks below are more likely to agree to a meeting if they know she’s going to be attending.

Thanks so much.

Keith

Sessions*
Shelby
Cochran
Young
Boozman*
Blunt*
Heller
Coats
Scott
Hischoir
Johnson, Ron
Corker
Hunt*
Cuban*
Merkowski
```

77. Scheduler told the OCE that she could not think of any other group for which she arranged as many meetings.

78. In January 2014, Congressional Aide asked Scheduler to arrange additional meetings with congressional offices for advocates of the PAST Act. Scheduler initially declined to arrange more meetings due to the difficulty of arranging the meetings. Chief of Staff noted that “[i]t seems that we’ve asked a lot of [Scheduler] lately on these meetings.”

---

83 Email from HSUS Vice President to Scheduler, dated October 29, 2013 (Exhibit 48 at 14-2940_0491); email from HSUS Vice President to Representative Whitfield’s Wife dated October 13, 2013 (Exhibit 49 at 14-2940_0493).
84 Email from HSUS Vice President to Scheduler, dated October 29, 2013 (Exhibit 48 at 14-2940_0491).
85 Email from HSUS Vice President to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated October 15, 2013 (Exhibit 49 at 14-2940_0493).
86 Scheduler Transcript (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940_0291).
87 Email from Congressional Aide to Scheduler, dated January 24, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0061).
88 Email from Scheduler to Congressional Aide, dated January 27, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0061).
89 Email from Chief of Staff to Congressional Aide, dated January 27, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0061).
Chief of Staff told Congressional Aide, who had been recently hired, “[i]t is out of the ordinary for us to be handling folks schedule this much. This precedence [sic] was started at a time when we thought it would only be a hand full of meetings.”

79. Congressional Aide informed Representative Whitfield’s Wife that Scheduler declined to arrange the meetings. In response, Representative Whitfield’s Wife instructed Congressional Aide to “tell [Chief of Staff] that these [PAST Act advocates] have NOT been to DC before and that we are talking about passing Ed’s bill not [Scheduler’s] feelings of effectiveness . . . Compromise: Have her call offices she hasn’t called before.”

80. Scheduler told the OCE that she arranged approximately 15 more meetings with congressional offices for PAST Act advocates around January 2014.

81. Representative Whitfield’s Wife told Congressional Aide and PAST Act advocates that Representative Whitfield’s office was “crucial in setting up meetings between Republicans and third parties.”

Joint Meetings with Members of Congress

82. On several occasions, HSLF and HSUS determined that Representative Whitfield needed to meet with certain Members of Congress to help gain support for their lobbying efforts. Representative Whitfield attended these meetings with his wife where they discussed legislation that she lobbied.

Meeting with Representative 1

83. On May 9, 2012, HSUS Federal Affairs Director informed Representative Whitfield’s Wife that Representative I had not responded to HSUS President. She asked, “Do you think Cong. Whitfield (or you) might be willing to approach him personally about helping lead on [the Horse Protection Act]?" Representative Whitfield’s Wife responded, “I will talk to Ed tonight in-between votes.”

---

92 Email from Chief of Staff to Congressional Aide, dated January 27, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0060).
93 Email from Congressional Aide to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated January 28, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0060).
94 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated January 28, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0060).
95 Scheduler Transcript (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940_00296).
96 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Congressional Aide, dated January 28, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_00064).
97 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to HSUS Federal Affairs Director, dated May 9, 2012 (Exhibit 50 at 14-2940_0497).
98 Id.
99 Id.
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84. On July 18, 2012, Representative Whitfield’s then-scheduler emailed Representative Whitfield and his wife, “I just set up a meeting for you both with [Representative 1] regarding the Tennessee Walking Horse Issue.”

85. When the OCE showed Representative Whitfield’s Wife the email to her and Representative Whitfield from the then-scheduler concerning “the meeting for you both with [Representative 1],” she stated, “I don’t ever remember Ed being in a meeting with me and [Representative 1].”

86. Representative 1 told the OCE that he recalled Representative Whitfield and his wife coming to meet with him in July 2012 to ask him to co-sponsor horse soring legislation. He described the role of Representative Whitfield’s Wife in the meeting as being “just there with him advocating for this.” Representative 1 considered the meeting to be with Representative Whitfield and not Representative Whitfield’s Wife or the Humane Society.

Meeting with Senator Lamar Alexander

87. On May 21, 2012, an HSUS staffer told Representative Whitfield’s Wife that a meeting was scheduled with Senator Alexander and HSUS for May 23, 2012. The staffer stated, “We could expand meeting to include TWI Horse issue or set up a separate meeting.” After arranging a separate meeting, the HSUS staffer asked who would attend the meeting and Representative Whitfield’s Wife replied, “I believe I would be more effective talking to Alexander directly - along with Ed if Ed is available.”

88. Senate Staffer 1, who was Senator Alexander’s lead staffer for the meeting in May 2012, told the OCE that Senator Alexander, Representative Whitfield, and Representative Whitfield’s Wife attended the meeting about legislation to prevent the abuse of Tennessee Walking Horses. He stated that Representative Whitfield’s Wife spoke

---

105 Email from Melissa Buchanan to Representative Whitfield and Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated July 18, 2012 (Exhibit 51 at 14-2940_0090).
106 Representative Whitfield’s Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0385).
107 Transcript of Interview of Representative 1, April 25, 2014 (“Representative 1 Transcript”) (Exhibit 52 at 14-2940_0503).
108 Id. at 14-2940_0505.
109 Id.
110 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Representative Whitfield, dated May 22, 2012 (Exhibit 53 at 14-2940_0514).
111 Id.
112 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Ceci Kremer, dated May 21, 2012 (Exhibit 53 at 14-2940_0514).
113 Memorandum of Interview of Senate Staffer 1, April 25, 2014 (Exhibit 54 at 14-2940_0517).
about horse abuse and the legislation. Representative Whitfield made similar comments during the meeting.

89. At the time the meeting occurred, Senate Staffer 1 considered the meeting to be with Representative Whitfield. However, he knew that Representative Whitfield’s Wife was an advocate for the Humane Society. He had additional follow-up meetings with Representative Whitfield’s Wife and the Humane Society after the meeting.

90. When the OCE asked Representative Whitfield’s Wife about the meeting, she stated, “I can’t remember why we went. But I know that Ed wanted to talk to Lamar about the bill . . . so Ed said come with me. I never opened my mouth the entire meeting, and I don’t think Lamar Alexander even knew I worked for the Humane Society Legislative Fund, he saw me as Ed’s wife.”

Meeting with Former Senator

91. On June 7, 2011, Representative Whitfield’s Wife told his then-scheduler, “Ed and I need to meet with [Former Senator] sometime tomorrow to mention a bill Landrieu is introducing. Can you please set something up.” The same day, the scheduler confirmed a meeting with Former Senator for June 8, 2011 for Representative Whitfield and his wife.

92. Former Senator told the OCE that he recalled meeting with Representative Whitfield and Representative Whitfield’s Wife in his office to discuss horse slaughter legislation. He stated, “I recall setting it up as a courtesy because he was member of Congress.”

93. He described Representative Whitfield and his wife as being both actively involved in the discussion of horse slaughter. He saw the role of Representative Whitfield’s Wife “as a spouse sort of at that point . . . they were working on this issue together, you know,

---

109 Id. at 14-2940_0518.
110 Id.
111 Id.
112 Id.
113 Id.
114 Representative Whitfield’s Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0383).
115 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to Melissa Buchanan, dated June 7, 2011 (Exhibit 55 at 14-2940_0520).
116 Id.
117 Transcript of Interview of Former Senator, April 22, 2014, (“Former Senator Transcript”) (Exhibit 56 at 14-2940_0330).
118 Id. at 14-2940_0525.
119 Id. at 14-2940_0531.
because of an interest in horses. At the time, he considered the meeting to be with Representative Whitfield and not the Humane Society.

94. When the OCE asked Representative Whitfield’s Wife about the meeting with Former Senator, she stated, “It may have been the horse slaughter legislation but I remember Ed wanted Brown to get on as a co-sponsor on the Senate bill... I sat and listened...”

**HSLF and HSUS Requests for Official Action**

95. HSLF and HSUS frequently asked Representative Whitfield’s Wife to have Representative Whitfield or his staff perform a significant amount of official actions. These included requests for co-sponsoring of bills, signing letters, and making floor speeches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>HSLF/HSUS Requests for Representative Whitfield’s Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/24/11</td>
<td>“Would you be willing to reach out to them on the HPA funding – requesting a meeting perhaps or just talking more with them about it informally? I know that you and Cong. Whitfield will have their ear in a way the rest of us here don’t.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17/11</td>
<td>“It would be great to have a quote or two from Rep. Whitfield. Do you want me to just go through the office?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/11</td>
<td>“Would be great if we could get Ed to sign on to this.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/12</td>
<td>“[Can you help get Cong. Whitfield on the FY13 animal welfare enforcement funding letter?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23/12</td>
<td>“[HSUS Vice President] and I reviewed these talking points and they're all set for you to pass on to Ed (see below). Thanks for your help!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/23/12</td>
<td>“[Representative Whitfield’s Wife is] all over it (she’s working hard behind the scenes to find the witnesses). Earlier today she was checking with Cong. Whitfield to see what might be helpful in terms of HSUS/HSLF press, blog, crowd of PA activists, etc.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

120 Id. at 14-2940_0528.
121 Id. at 14-2940_0530.
122 Representative Whitfield’s Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0384).
123 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated March 24, 2011 (Exhibit 57 at 14-2940_0542).
124 Email from HSLF Lobbyist to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated May 17, 2011 (Exhibit 58 at 14-2940_0548).
125 Email from Lauren Silverman to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated October 26, 2011 (Exhibit 59 at 14-2940_0550).
126 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated March 19, 2012 (Exhibit 21 at 14-2940_0207).
127 Email from Tracie Letterman to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated March 23, 2012 (Exhibit 60 at 14-2940_0555).
128 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to HSUS Vice President, HSUS President, Representative Whitfield’s Wife, and Jessica Feingold-Lieberson, dated April 23, 2012 (Exhibit 61 at 14-2940_0558).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>BSLF/HSUS Requests for Representative Whitfield’s Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5/9/12  | "[Representative’s] staff hasn’t responded to [HSUS President’s] initial effort, but I wonder if we need to throw in the towel yet on him? He did send his own letter to Ag Appropriates the past two years seeking enforcement funding. Do you think Cong. Whitfield (or you) might be willing to approach him personally about helping lead on this?"  
128 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated May 9, 2012 (Exhibit 50 at 14-2940_0497). |
| 6/21/12 | "[A]ny chance we could get the HPA bill introduced in time so it might be possible to try to add it to the Farm bill during House floor debate . . . it would be sweet to get it done in the wake of all the media attention."  
129 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated June 21, 2012 (Exhibit 5 at 14-2940_0065). |
| 9/14/12 | "I think [Representative Whitfield’s Wife] may want to intervene to make sure it happens, if staff is resisting. Let’s see how we do reaching out to [Chief of Staff] ourselves, first though."  
130 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated September 14, 2012 (Exhibit 6 at 14-2940_0560). |
| 12/12/12 | "What do you think about asking Ed to give a floor speech on this poll?"  
132 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated December 12, 2012 (Exhibit 63 at 14-2940_0563). |
| 5/9/13  | "[The Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine] would like our help getting Cong. Whitfield to agree to be an original cosponsor of the reintroduced BEST Practices Act, to phase out use of live animal in military trauma."  
133 Email from Michael Markarian to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated December 12, 2012 (Exhibit 63 at 14-2940_0563). |
134 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated May 9, 2013 (Exhibit 6 at 14-2940_0097). |
| 9/17/13 | "Cong. Whitfield could say he’s on the fence about Thursday’s vote because he feels it’s not enough of a cut to SNAP. Bottom line, though, is to signal to leadership that he’s really determined to PAST to the floor this year . . . Thank you for considering this idea and discussing it with him!"  
136 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated September 17, 2013 (Exhibit 65 at 14-2940_0569). |
| 9/26/13 | "The Myths/Facts document is on Congressional Stationery and is Cong. Whitfield’s document (though you drafted text for him last year). It doesn’t have his name on it, but it would come from his office and be referred to as his document."  
137 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to HSUS Vice President and Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated September 25, 2013 (Exhibit 66 at 14-2940_0571). |
Subject to the Nondisclosure Provisions of H. Res. 895 of the 110th Congress as Amended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>HSLF/HSUS Requests for Representative Whitfield’s Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/15/13</td>
<td>“Can [Chief of Staff] try to get a meeting with Corker’s office for [PAST Act advocates]?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6/14</td>
<td>“I had thought that [HSLF Lobbyist] felt (and we collectively have felt all along) that it would be best coming from [Congressional Aide]/Mr. Whitfield’s office, rather than HSUS . . .”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96. In response to the requests, Representative Whitfield’s Wife usually agreed to contact her husband or send the request to his staff. Her responses included the following:

- “I will talk to Ed tonight in-between votes.”
- “I will talk to Ed after he gets out of his Health Subcommittee hearing.”
- “I have already talked to Ed about this.”
- “Yes! Working with Ed and [Chief of Staff] on it today.”
- “I will ask him.”
- “I don’t need to tell YOU that going through a spouse is usually more efficient than going through the office. I will get a couple of quotes from him.”

97. The OCE did not find any evidence that the volume of assistance that Representative Whitfield’s staff provided to Representative Whitfield’s Wife and her employer from 2011 to 2014 was comparable to assistance provided to other individuals or organizations.

---

118 Email from HSUS Vice President to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated October 15, 2013 (Exhibit 67 at 14-2940_0573).
119 Email from HSUS Vice President to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated January 6, 2014 (Exhibit 68 at 14-2940_0577).
120 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated January 6, 2014 (Exhibit 50 at 14-2940_0497).
121 Email from Lauren Silverman to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated October 26, 2011 (Exhibit 59 at 14-2940_0550).
122 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated March 24, 2011 (Exhibit 57 at 14-2940_0542).
123 Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated June 21, 2012 (Exhibit 5 at 14-2940_0095).
124 Email from Michael Markarian to Representative Whitfield’s Wife, dated December 12, 2012 (Exhibit 63 at 14-2940_0563).
125 Email from Representative Whitfield’s Wife to HSLF Lobbyist, dated May 17, 2011 (Exhibit 58 at 14-2940_0548).
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Subject to the Nondisclosure Provisions of H. Res. 895 of the 110th Congress as Amended

98. In sum, HSLF and HSUS used Representative Whitfield and his staff to support their lobbying activities. Representative Whitfield’s Wife appeared to act as a liaison for HSLF, making frequent requests of Representative Whitfield and his staff.

99. Based on the evidence before the OCE, there is a substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield provided special favors or privileges to his wife, in her capacity as a lobbyist, and to her employer in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

IV. CONCLUSION

100. Representative Whitfield’s Wife has been a registered lobbyist for HSLF since 2011. Since 2011, she has reported lobbying on numerous bills, including bills that Representative Whitfield sponsored or co-sponsored.

101. Based on evidence before the OCE, Representative Whitfield’s Wife contacted Representative Whitfield and his staff about bills she lobbied. The contacts included discussions about drafting bills, selecting potential bill co-sponsors, and scheduling meetings with congressional offices.

102. During the same time period, Representative Whitfield’s office provided direct assistant to the lobbying efforts of HSUS and HSLF at the request of Representative Whitfield’s Wife. In particular, HSUS and HSLF had Representative Whitfield’s Wife assist with attempts to have Representative Whitfield schedule congressional meetings, introduce legislation and support certain legislation.

103. The Board recommends that the Committee on Ethics further review the allegation concerning the lobbying contacts of Representative Whitfield’s wife because there is a substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield had lobbying contacts with his wife and permitted his wife to have lobbying contacts with his staff in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

104. The Board recommends that the Committee on Ethics further review the allegations concerning the granting of special favors or privileges because there is substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield permitted his wife to use his congressional office to advance and facilitate her lobbying activities and the lobbying activities of her employer in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.
EXHIBIT 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOBBYING REGISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. House Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>601971559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4. Effective Date of Registration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5. Registrant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Client Name</th>
<th>Human Society Legislative Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**6. Client**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Name</th>
<th>Human Society Legislative Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**7. Lobbyists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Amos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see page 3 for list of positions held.
LOBBYING ISSUES

11. General lobbying issue areas (Select all applicable codes).

12. Specific lobbying issues (current and anticipates)
   - H.R. 830 - Dugway Protection and Safety Act - Dugway Mills
   - H.R. 728, Veterans Eng Training Therapy Act, Veterans and service dogs
   - H.R. 2492, Animal Fighting Specimen Prohibition Act, Animal Fighting
   - H.R. 1539, Guest Age Protection and Cost Savings Act, Chimps in research

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

13. Is there an entity other than the client that contributes more than $5,000 to the lobbying activities of the registrant in a quarterly period and either actively participates in and/or in whole or in part plans, supervises or controls, the registrant's lobbying activities?

   ☐ No → Go to line 14.  ☐ Yes → Complete the rest of this section for each entity matching the criteria above, then proceed to line 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOREIGN ENTITIES

14. Is there any foreign entity
   a) holds at least 20% of the equity in the client or any organization identified on line 13 or
   b) directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, plans, supervises, controls, directs, finances or subcontracts activities of the client or any organization identified on line 13 or
   c) an affiliate of the client or any organization identified on line 13 and has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity?

   ☐ No → Sign and date the registration.  ☐ Yes → Complete the rest of this section for each entity matching the criteria above, then sign the registration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 02/28/2012
Printed Name and Title: [Redacted], Executive Director

<xsl:attribute> Page 2 of 3</xsl:attribute>
### ADDITIONAL LOBBYISTS

10. Supplemental: List any additional lobbyists for this client not listed on page 1, number 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last/Initials</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Justice—Attorney Advisor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Interior—Special Asst to Solicitor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Solicitor Energy &amp; Natural Resources, Asst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary Fish, Wildlife and Parks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-Import-Export Bank—Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADDITIONAL LOBBYING ISSUES

11. Supplemental: General lobbying issue here. Enter any additional codes for issues not listed on page 2, number 11.

### ADDITIONAL AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

13. Supplemental: List any other affiliated organizations that meet the criteria specified and is not listed on page 2, number 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADDITIONAL FOREIGN ENTITIES

14. Supplemental: List any other foreign entity that meets the criteria specified and is not listed on page 2, number 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Percent of Business (City and State or Country)</th>
<th>Amount of Contribution (City and State or Country)</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT 2
### LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. **Registrant Name**
   - Organized/lobbying firm
   - Self-employed individual

2. Address
   - Check if different than previously reported
   - Address: 2500 L St Sw, Suite 310
   - City: Washington
   - State: DC
   - Zip Code: 20557

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)
   - City: 
   - State: 
   - Zip Code: 

4. **Client Name**
   - Senate ID
   - House ID

5. **Telephone Number**
   - 40873559-12

6. **E-mail**
   - controversial@controversial.com

7. **Type of Report**
   - Year: 2011
   - Q1 (1/1 - 3/31)
   - Q2 (4/1 - 6/30)
   - Q3 (7/1-9/30)
   - Q4 (10/1 - 12/31)

8. **I certify that the information on this report is true and correct**

9. **Statement**
   - I certify that the information on this report is true and correct

10. **Incorporated/lobbying firm**
    - Organized/lobbying firm
    - Self-employed individual

11. **Income or Expenditures**
    - Income: $0.00
    - Expenditures: $0.00

12. **Expense relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period**
    - Less than $1,000

13. **Expenditures relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period**
    - Less than $1,000

   **Method A.** Reporting amounts under section 152(i)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code
   - Reporting amounts under section 152(i)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code

   **Method B.** Reporting amounts under section 152(i)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code
   - Reporting amounts under section 152(i)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code

   **Method C.** Reporting amounts under section 152(i)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code
   - Reporting amounts under section 152(i)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code

**Signature**

**Date**

Printed Name and Title: Sara Armand, Executive Director

Page 1 of 7
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional pages if needed.

15. General issue area code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANM</td>
<td>Animals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Specific lobbying issues

- H.R. 835 & S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders
- H.R. 1513 & S. 810, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimps in research

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal Agencies

- House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>コンモム</td>
<td>ハースバーグホワイトフィールド</td>
<td>常従官員</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

- [ ] Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amendment, Executive Director

Page 2 of 7
Addendum for General Lobbying Issue Area:  
ANIMALS - Animals

H.R. 2452 & S. 1447, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged or lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional pages as needed.

15. General issue area code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Specific lobbying issues

1. H.R. 108, Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy
2. 2038, Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

[Blank]

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrison-Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

[Blank]

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amussen, Executive Director
### LOBBYING ACTIVITY

Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUE</td>
<td>Budget/Appropriations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Specific lobbying issues

- H.R. 2584, Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012, agency prioritization and funding for alternatives to animal testing
- S. 1399, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012, agency

#### House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

Check if None

#### Name(s) of individual(s) who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Council Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Amundson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item(s) of each foreign entity: in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sue Amundson, Executive Director
ABRIDGED for General Lobbying Issues

BUD - Budget/Appropriation


H.R. 2112: Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act 2013, related to increased for animal care, Horse Protection Act, and USDA Investigative and Enforcement Services and veterinary fees forgiveness

Printed Name and Title
Sara Ann Adams, Executive Director
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### Lobbyist Update

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Patch</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issue Update

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains.

---

### Affiliated Organizations

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Foreign Entities

27. Add the following foreign entities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amato, Executive Director
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# LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 2) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

## 1. Registration Name
- [ ] Organization lobbying firm
- [ ] Self-employed individual
- [ ] Human Society Legislative Fund

## 2. Address
- Check if different than previously reported
- Address: 2500 L Street, N.W., Suite 310
- City: Washington
- State: DC
- Zip Code: 20557
- Country: USA

## 3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)
- City: 
- State: 
- Zip Code: 
- Country: 

## 4a. Contact Name
- Ms. Sara Anderson
- Telephone Number: (202) 674-1606
- E-mail: 401973569-12

## 5. Senate ID#:
- 419410000

## TYPE OF REPORT
- Year: 2012
- Q1: (01-31) [ ]
- Q2: (04-30) [ ]
- Q3: (07-31) [ ]
- Q4: (10-31) [ ]

## 9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report [ ]

## 10. Check if this is a Termination Report [ ]

## 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity [ ]

## INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

### 12. Lobbying

- INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
  - Less than $5,000 [ ]
  - $5,000 or more [ ]
- Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

### 13. Organizations

- EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
  - Less than $5,000 [ ]
  - $5,000 or more [ ]
  - $10,000 or more [ ]

## 14. REPORTING

- Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.
  - Method A: Reporting amounts using Lobbying Disclosure Act only
  - Method B: Reporting amounts under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code
  - Method C: Reporting amounts under section 101(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

## 15. Signature

- Signature: ___________________________  
- Date: 04/12/2012

Printed Name and Title: Sara Anderson, Executive Director
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area Code</th>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANI</td>
<td>Animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**16. Specific lobbying issues**

- H.R. 835 & S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders
- H.R. 1513 & S. 810, Great Ape Protection and Cloning Ban Act, relating to the use of chimpanzees in research

**17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies**

- [ ] Check if None

**18. Names of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commons</td>
<td>Hardiman Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorens</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue</td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**19. Interests of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above**

- [ ] Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sabrina Amardou, Executive Director

S. 1501, Smart Transportation Safety Act, to prohibit transporting a horse in interstate commerce in a motor vehicle (except a vehicle operated exclusively on rail or rail) containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another.


H.R. 1713 & S. 886, Interstate Horse Racing Improvement Act, would amend the Interstate Horse Racing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horse racing.
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 1064, “Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act,” to create a pilot program on dog training therapy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check if None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Current Officer Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Harrison-Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check if None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printed Name and Title: Sara Anderson, Executive Director
15. General issue area code  BUD Budget/Appropriations

16. Specific lobbying issues

No bill yet, various appropriations strategies, including House Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations, related to alternatives to animal testing

No bill yet, various appropriations issues, including Animal Welfare Act funding, Horse Protection Act funding, Chiz B dealer, and

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies  

Check if None

House of Representatives, Environment/Transportation Agency (PT)

18. Name of each individual who acted in a lobbying in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>General/Office Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Hartzman-Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above  

Check if None

Printed Name and Title  Sara Amendment, Executive Director
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOREIGN ENTITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printed Name and Title:  

Submitted:  
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LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Fileres Are Required to Complete This Page

1. Registrant Name  
   Organization Lobbying Filer  
   Self-Employed Individual  
   
   Human Society Legislative Fund

2. Address  
   ☐ Check if different than previously reported  
   
   Address 1  
   2301 L Street, N.W., Suite 330  
   City  
   Washington State  
   DC  
   Zip Code 20017  
   Country  USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)  
   
   City  
   State  
   Zip Code  
   Country

4a. Contract Name  
4b. Telephone Number  
4c. E-Mail  
5. Senate ID#  
   
   40872559-12

6. Client Name  
   ☐ Self  
   ☐ Check if eligible for a state or local government or instrumentality  
   
   Human Society Legislative Fund

Type of Report  
1. Year 2012  
   Q1 (01-0313)  
   Q2 (04-0630)  
   Q3 (07-0930)  
   Q4 (10-1230)  
   ☐

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report  
10. Check if this is a Termination Report  
11. No Lobbying Income Activity  

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST COMPLETE EITHER LINE 12 OR LINE 13

12. Lobbying  
13. Organizations  

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:  

☐ Less than $1,000  
☐ $1,000 or more  

$0  
Provided a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:  

☐ Less than $1,000  
☐ $1,000 or more  

$10,000  
1A. REPORTING  
   Method A. Reporting amounts using LDA definition only  
   Method B. Reporting amounts under section 4410(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code  
   Method C. Reporting amounts under section 4410(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature  

Printed Name and Title  Sara Amato, Executive Director  

Date 07/26/2013  
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16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill and Title</th>
<th>Check of None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 821 &amp; S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial dog breeders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1793 &amp; S. 910, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the use of chimpanzees in research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2866 &amp; S. 1179, American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, to prohibit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sales, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Name(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House/Senate</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>General (Official Position if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harriman-Whitefield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ammonides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest of Each Foreign Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printed Name and Title

Sara Ammon, Executive Director
ADDITIONALclarifications:

S. 281, Horse Transportation Safety Act, to prohibit transporting a horse in interstate commerce in a motor vehicle (except a vehicle operated multifunctionally as a trailer): containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another.

H.R. 3799, Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2021, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions.

H.R. 1720 & S. 196, Intracranial Hemorrhage Improvement Act, would amend the Intracranial Hemorrhage Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in humanizing.

H.R. 4103 & S. 3131, Cosmetic Members of the Armed Services Act, relating to retiring military working dogs.

H.R. 2467 & S. 1841, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, relating to increasing penalties for animal fighting.

Printed Name and Title: [Signature]
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code
   [VET] Veterans

16. Specific lobbying issues
   [H.R. 158, Veterans' Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy]

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies
   No

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of any foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above
   No

Printed Name and Title: [Your Name, Your Title]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Second Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Humes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen.</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issue listed on line 6 above [ ] Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sam Amundson, Executive Director
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Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address
   Address
   City
   State Zip Code Country

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)
   City
   State Zip Code Country

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client
   
   

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issues that no longer remain
   

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

   Internet Address:
   
   Name
   Street
   City
   State
   Country

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client
   

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities

   Name
   Street
   City
   State
   Country

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that is no longer owned, controlled, or is affiliated with the registrant, that is affiliated organization:
   

Printed Name and Title:

Sara Armstrong, Executive Director
## LOBBYING REPORT

### Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. **Registrant Name**
   - [ ] Organized Lobbying Firm
   - [ ] Self-Employed Individual
   - [ ] Corporation
   - [ ] Partnership
   - [ ] Association
   - [ ] Labor Union
   - [ ] Other (Specify):

   **Human Society Legislative Fund**

2. **Address**
   - [ ] Check if different than previously reported

   **Address 1**
   - 200 L Street, N.W., Suite 310
   - **City**: Washington
   - **State**: DC
   - **Zip Code**: 20001
   - **Country**: USA

3. **Principal place of business (if different than line 2)**
   - **City**:
   - **State**:
   - **Zip Code**:
   - **Country**:

4. **Contact Name**
   - [ ] No change
   - [ ] New contact

   **Name**:
   - [ ] First Name
   - [ ] Middle Initial
   - [ ] Last Name

   **Phone Number**
   - [ ] [555] 123-4567

5. **Senate (Exterior address) or Exterior address in Hawaii (Interior address)**
   - **State**:
   - **Zip Code**:
   - **Country**:

   **Address**:
   - 4015 Senate Exterior Building

6. **House (Exterior address) or Exterior address in Hawaii (Interior address)**
   - **State**:
   - **Zip Code**:
   - **Country**:

   **Address**:
   - 4154 House Exterior Building

### TYPE OF REPORT

- **Q1 (Jan - Mar)**
- **Q2 (Apr - Jun)**
- **Q3 (Jul - Sep)**
- **Q4 (Oct - Dec)**

- **Check if this is a Termination Report**

### INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST COMPLETE EITHER LINE 12 OR LINE 13

#### 12. Lobbying

- **Income** relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period:
  - Less than $5,000

- **Expense** relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period:
  - Less than $5,000

**Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $5,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).**

#### 13. Organizations

- **RECORDING accounting method. See instructions for description of options.**
  - Method A: Reporting amount using UDA definitions only
  - Method B: Reporting amount under section 203(h)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code
  - Method C: Reporting amount under section 203(h)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code

**Signature**: [ ]

**Printed Name and Title**
- Sara Annals, Executive Director

**Date**: 10/18/2012
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LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of this client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General issue area code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANI</td>
<td>Animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Specific lobbying issues

- H.R. 835 & S. 707, Puppy Mill Prevention and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders
- H.R. 1535 & S. 810, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimpanzees in research
- H.R. 2966 & S. 1179, American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

- [ ] Check if None
- [ ] House of Representatives
- [ ] Senate
- [ ] Federal agencies

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>General Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Harman-Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Argentino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Winters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 18 above

- [ ] Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amendola, Executive Director
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### ABBREVIATIONS for General Lobbying Issues Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. 1287</td>
<td>Interstate Transportation Safety Act to prohibit transporting a horse in interstate commerce in a motor vehicle (except a vehicle operated exclusively on rail or rail) containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1575 &amp; S. 486</td>
<td>Horseracing Improvement Act, would amend the Intergovernmental Horse Racing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horse racing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 4109 &amp; S. 2174</td>
<td>Center: Members of the Armed Services Act, relating to retiring military working dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2492 &amp; S. 947</td>
<td>Animal Fighting Operator Prohibition Act, relating to increasing penalties for animal fighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 6387</td>
<td>To amend the Horse Protection Act to, among other things, designate additional stallions with which the Act, strengthens penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Printed Name and Title**

[Name]
[Title]
### LOBBYING ACTIVITY

Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional pages as needed.

#### 15. General issue area code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 16. Specific lobbying issues

- **H.R. 188, Veteran's Dog Telling Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy**

#### 17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

- Check if None

#### 18. Name of individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

- Check if None

---

**Printed Name and Title**  
Sara Anderson, Executive Director
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code
   - Budget/Appropriations

16. Specific lobbying issues
   - 61001, various appropriations, including House Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations, related to alternatives to animal testing
   - 61073B, 2379, various appropriations issues, including House and Senate Animal Welfare Act funding, Horse Protection Act funding, Class B dealers, and House Agriculture Appropriations

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies
   - Check if None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>General Office Position of Applicant</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craven</td>
<td>Harriman</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above
   - Check if None

Printed Name and Title: Sara Amundson, Executive Director
Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address
   Address: ____________________________
   City: ____________________________ State: ________ Zip Code: ________ Country: __________

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)
   City: ____________________________ State: ________ Zip Code: ________ Country: __________

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>State Address</th>
<th>POC</th>
<th>Amount of services or interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that is no longer owns, controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>State Address</th>
<th>POC</th>
<th>Amount of services or interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Registrant Name</td>
<td>Organization/Lobbying Firm</td>
<td>Self Employed Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Society Legislative Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Address</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address 1</td>
<td>2100 L St. N.W., Suite 310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>20060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a. Contact Name</th>
<th>b. Telephone Number</th>
<th>c. E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Client Name</th>
<th>a. Self</th>
<th>b. Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R Year 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 (01-31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 (04-03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 (07-03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 (10-03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Check if filing amends a previously filed version of this report</th>
<th>10. Check if this is a Termination Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from lobbying activities for this reporting period was:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a good faith estimate rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income from the client (excluding payments to the recipient by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 13. Organizations                                              |
| Expenses relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were: |
| Less than $5,000                                                |
| $5,000 or more                                                 |
| $10,000 or more                                                |

| 14. REPORTING                                                   |
| Check here to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options. |
| Method A: Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only          |
| Method B: Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code |
| Method C: Reporting amounts under section 162(a) of the Internal Revenue Code |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Digitally Signed By: Sara Armandi, Executive Director</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>01/01/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
15. General issue area codes: ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 287 &amp; S. 509</td>
<td>Pugly: Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to spaying and neutering H.R. 1571 &amp; S. 410, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimpanzees in research H.R. 2966 &amp; S. 1176, American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1248</td>
<td>Animal Fighting spectator Protection Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2492 &amp; S. 1985</td>
<td>Horse Transportation Safety Act, to prohibit transporting a horse in interstate commerce in a motor vehicle (except a vehicle operated exclusively on road or rail) containing two or more horses stacked on top of one another H.R. 3294, Egg Products Inspection Act Amendment of 2012, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions H.R. 1733 &amp; S. 886, Interstate Horse Racing Improvement Act, would amend the Interstate Horse Racing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horse racing H.R. 450 &amp; S. 2134, Canine Members of the Armed Services Act, relating to training military working dogs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Harrison-Wetzel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Check if None
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies</td>
<td>Check if None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constans</td>
<td>Harris-Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above | Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. Name General description of client’s business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer reported to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issues that no longer pertain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client.

| 1 | 2 | 3 |

**FOREIGN ENTITIES**

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organizations.

| 1 | 2 | 3 |

| 4 | 5 | 6 |
LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page

1. Registrant Name: [Organization/Lobbying Firm] - Self Employed Individual

Human Society Legislative Fund

2. Address

Address1: 1201 L Street N.W., Suite 310
Address2: 
City: Washington
State: DC
Zip Code: 20510
Country: USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)

City: 
State: 
Zip Code: 
Country: 

4a. Contact Name: [Name]
b. Telephone Number: [Number]
c. E-mail: [Email]

5. Senate ID#: 609072000-12

6. House ID#: 4284560-92

TYPE OF REPORT

8. Year: 2011
9. Check if this filing is a previously filed version of this report: [ ]
10. Check if this is a Termination Report: [ ]
11. No Lobbying Issue Activity: [ ]

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:

Less than $5,000 [ ]

$5,000 or more [ ] $_____

Provide a good faith estimate rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (excluding any payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Less than $5,000 [ ]

$5,000 or more [ ] $50,000 or more [ ]

14. REPORTING: Check here to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

[ ] Method A: Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

[ ] Method B: Reporting amounts under section 6012(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code

[ ] Method C: Reporting amounts under section 1526(a) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature: [Digitally Signed By: [Name]], Executive Director

Date: 06/19/2013
10. **LOBBYING ACTIVITY.** Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue area in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>LOBBYING ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 847 &amp; S. 395, Poultry Animal Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial egg industry lobbying relating to the use of chicks in research and permanent retirement in sanctuary H.R. 1094 &amp; S. 541, Safeguard American Food Exports Act, to prohibit sales, transport, etc., of horses for slaughter for human consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1086 &amp; S. 669, Animal Fighting Spectacle Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of laying hens and related enforcement provisions. H.R. 713 &amp; S. 886, Inhumane Farming Improvement Act, would amend the Inhumane Farming Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horticulture and related to upgrading the Horse Protection Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies  

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Whifield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above  

Check if None
523

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issue

H.R. 183. Veterans Dog Training Act. To create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agency: ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plummer, Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above: ☐ Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address
City ___________________________ State ______ Zip Code ______ Country ______

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City ___________________________ State ______ Zip Code ______ Country ______

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBIIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issues that no longer pertain


AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOREIGN ENTITIES**

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal place of business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of contribution for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Firms Are Required to Complete This Page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Registrant Name</th>
<th>Organization/Lobbying Firm</th>
<th>Self-Employed Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Society Legislative Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Address</th>
<th>Address1: 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310</th>
<th>Address2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City: Washington</td>
<td>State: DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Contact Name</th>
<th>a. Last Name:</th>
<th>b. Telephone Number</th>
<th>c. E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5. States ID# | 4202155555.12 |

| 6. House ID# | 4202155555.12 |

**TYPE OF REPORT**
- 8 Year 2013: Q1 (01 - 04) [ ] Q2 (05 - 06) [ ] Q3 (07 - 09) [ ] Q4 (10 - 12) [ ] Q1 (13 - 15) [ ]
- 9 Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report: [ ]
- 10 Check if this is a Termination Report: [ ]
- 11 No Lobbying Issue Activity: [ ]

**INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13**

**12. Lobbying**

- INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
  - Less than $5,000: [ ]
  - $5,000 or more: [ ] $5,000 or more:

- EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
  - Less than $5,000: [ ]
  - $5,000 or more: [ ] $10,000.00:

**13. Organizations**

- Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related expenses from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying services on behalf of the client)

- EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
  - Less than $5,000: [ ]
  - $5,000 or more: [ ] $10,000.00:

**14. REPORTING**
- Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options
  - Method A: Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only
  - Method B: Reporting amounts under section 6032(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code
  - Method C: Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

**Signature**
- Required to be signed by, Sara Amashon, Executive Director

**Date**
- 07/16/2013
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code: ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 347 &amp; S. 395, Puppy, Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to the sale of dogs in research and treatment facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. R. 416 &amp; S. 666, Animal Fighting Spectator Protection Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of laying hens and related enforcement provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Bill 333 &amp; S. 886, Interspecies Humane Improvement Act, would amend the Interspecies Humane Protection Act of 1978 to prohibit the sale of performance-enhancing drugs to humans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Bill 221, Animal Protection Act, to prohibit the use of certain drugs in animal facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1,158, Prevent All Soring Tactics Act, to strengthen penalties and make the sale of horses illegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2,442, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and add egg bill language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2,450, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and add egg bill language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 934, Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act, to add animal fighting bill language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 2410, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food, and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to restore adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defend the inspection of horse slaughter facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies: Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE, Health and Human Services - Dept of (HHS), Labor - Dept of (DOL), Education - Dept of

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current or Former Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Morehead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above: Check if None
527

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code: VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues:

R.C. 183: Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act; to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies **Check if None**

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrison-Whitefield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issue listed on line 16 above **Check if None**

**Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.**

20. Client new address:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. New General description of client's business or activities:

**LOBBYIST UPDATE**

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer reported to act as a lobbyist for this client:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ISSUE UPDATE**

24. General lobbying issues that no longer pertain:

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

**AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS**

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s):

Internet Address:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(city and state or country)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City, State, Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(city and state or country)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City, State, Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization
### LOBBYING REPORT

**Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Fills Are Required to Complete This Page**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Registrant Name</th>
<th>Organization/Lobbying Firm</th>
<th>Self Employed Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Address</th>
<th>Address1</th>
<th>Washington, D.C. 20515</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principal place of business (if different than line 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4a. Contact Name**

5. Senate ID: 42787

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Year</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 (01 - 31)</td>
<td>Q2 (01 - 031)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE OF REPORT**

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report

10. Check if this is a Termination Report

11. No Lobbying Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Lobbying</th>
<th>13. Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13**

- **Income** related to lobbying activities for the reporting period was
  - Less than $5,000
  - $5,000 or more

- Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client)

- **Expense** related to lobbying activities for the reporting period were
  - Less than $5,000
  - $5,000 or more

14. **REVENUE:** Check box to indicate revenue accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

- Method A: Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only
- Method B: Reporting amounts under section 603(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code
- Method C: Reporting amounts under section 162(a) of the Internal Revenue Code

**Signature**

Physically Signed By: Sara Amadore, Executive Director

Date: 10/21/2013
LOBBYING ACTIVITY: Select as many codes as necessary to reflect general issues covered in this report or issue a separate page if necessary.

13. General issues are

**14. Specific lobbying issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| H.R. 345 & S. 395 | Pagg's Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeding
| H.R. 1044 & S. 541 | Safeguard American Food Imports Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption
| H.R. 1044 & S. 541 | Safeguard American Food Imports Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption
| H.R. 1044 & S. 541 | Animal Fighting-Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures
| Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to remove housing and treatment of eggs by states and related enforcement provisions.
| H.R. 1753 & S. 886 | Humane Horseracing Improvement Act, would amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horse racing.
| Lobbying related to upgrading the Beaver Protection Act H.R. 1518, Prevent All Soring Tactics Act, to strengthen penalties and make the earring of horses illegal
| Lobbying related to a proposed MMPA rule that would prohibit state and territorial statutes on shark finning
| Lobbying to lift the cap on shares of retirement savings H.R. 2442, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and add bill language
| H.R. 1947, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and add bill language
| Add horse-slaughter bill language S. 954, Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act, to add animal fighting bill language

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Former Official Position (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interests of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

- [ ] Check if None
15. General issue area code: BUD BUDGET/APPROPRIATIONS

16. Specific lobbying issues

| H.R. 2410, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal-welfare laws and defend the inspection of humane slaughter facilities. S. 1244, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal-welfare laws and defend the inspection of humane slaughter facilities |

17. Houseers of Congress and Federal agencies

- [ ] VA, GF

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Harrison-Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of such foreign entity in the specific issues listed on lines 14 above

- [ ] VA, GF

- [ ] Check if None
The text on the page is a form related to lobbying activity, including sections for general issues, specific lobbying issues, and contact information. The form is part of a larger document, with sections for specific lobbying issues and notes on lobbying activity. The form includes fields for names, addresses, and contact information, as well as sections for checking off items as applicable. The form is intended for submission to regulatory or legislative bodies, likely in a format that can be scanned or digitized.
## AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internet Address:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client:

| 1    | 2    | 3     |

## FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal place of business</th>
<th>Amount of contributions for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal place of business</th>
<th>Amount of contributions for lobbying activities</th>
<th>Ownership percentage in client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that is no longer owned, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization:

| 4    | 5    | 6     |

| 4    | 5    | 6     |

| 12   | 13   | 14    |

| 12   | 13   | 14    |
Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Fields Are Required to Complete This Page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Registrant Name</th>
<th>Organization/Lobbying Firm</th>
<th>Self Employed Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Society Legislative Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Address</th>
<th>200 E Street, N.W., Suite 315</th>
<th>Address2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Principal place of business (of different than line 2)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a. Contact Name</th>
<th>b. Telephone Number</th>
<th>c. E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Senate EDW</th>
<th>6. House EDW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4087X3556-12</td>
<td>4446351884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Year 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 (1/1 - 3/31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report</th>
<th>10. Check if this is a Termination Report</th>
<th>11. No Lobbying Issue Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method A: Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method B: Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method C: Reporting amounts under section 302(e) of the Internal Revenue Code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. REPORTING Check here to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>⬗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digitally Signed by Sara Aronson, Executive Director</td>
<td>06/12/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code(s)

16. Specific lobbying issues

- H.R. 1711 & S. 820, Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions. S. 252, PREEMIE Act Reauthorization, to lift the cap on funding for retiring commercial Lobsters relating to proposed MNTExacts that would preempt state and territorial statutes on shark finning Farm Bill, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and maintain the animal fighting language.

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

- Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

- First Name | Last Name | Suffix | Current Official Position (if applicable) | Now
- [Name] | [Name] | [Suffix] | [Position] | [Check]

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

- Check if None
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code BUDGET/APPROPRIATIONS

16. Specific lobby interest

R.R. 2010. Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defend the inspection of horse slaughter facilities

S. 1244. Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defend the inspection of horse slaughter facilities. Appropriations for Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies to lift the cap on chimpanzee retirement funding

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agency  
Check if None

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Harrison-Whitfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issue listed on line 14 above  
Check if None
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue area in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area(s) and VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agency □  Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>General Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Parno</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Jurisdiction of each foreign entity in this issue area listed on line 18 above □  Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address

City ___________________________ State _______ Zip Code _______ Country _______

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City ___________________________ State _______ Zip Code _______ Country _______

22. New General description of client’s business or activities

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer required to act as a lobbyist for the client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:
### FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)</th>
<th>Amount of Contribution for Lobbying Activities</th>
<th>Ownership Percentage in Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**LOBBYING REPORT**

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - All Firms Are Required to Complete This Page

1. **Registrant Name**
   - Organization/Lobbying Firm: Human Society Legislative Fund
   - Self-Employed Individual: Yes

2. **Address**
   - Address1: 2100 L St, N.W., Suite 310
   - Address2: 
   - City: Washington
   - State: DC
   - Zip Code: 20037
   - Country: USA

3. **Principal place of business (if different than last 2)**
   - City: 
   - State: 
   - Zip Code: 
   - Country: 

4. **Contact Name**
   - Telephone Number: 
   - E-mail: 

5. **Other Identifiers**
   - Other ID #: 4087399-12

**TYPE OF REPORT**

- Type of Report: 8 Year 2014
- Q1 (01 - 31) ✔
- Q2 (01 - 60) ☐
- Q3 (07 - 90) ☐
- Q4 (09 - 12) ☐
- Q5 (01 - 12) ☐

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report:
   - Yes ☐ No ❌

10. Check if this is a Termination Report:
    - Yes ☐ No ❌

11. **Lobbying**
    - Income relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
      - Less than $3,000 ☐
      - $10,000 or more ☐
    - Expenses relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
      - Less than $3,000 ☐
      - $5,000 or more ☐

12. **Organizations**
    - Income relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
      - Less than $3,000 ☐
      - $10,000 or more ☐
    - Expenses relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
      - Less than $3,000 ☐
      - $5,000 or more ☐

14. **Reporting**
    - Please provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying-related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).
    - Expenses for lobbying activities for this reporting period were:
      - Less than $3,000 ☐
      - $10,000 or more ☐

15. **Method A**
    - Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

16. **Method B**
    - Reporting amounts under section 6013(b)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code

17. **Method C**
    - Reporting amounts under section 162(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code

**Signature**

Sign here: [Signature]

Printed Name: Sara Amsterdam, Executive Director

Date: 04/24/2014
15. General issue area code: ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 396 &amp; S. 686, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting venues H.R. 1318 &amp; S. 1406 Prevent All Sectors Act, to strengthen penalties and make the mistreatment of horses illegal. Lobbying relating to a proposed NMS rule that would impose state and territorial statutes on shark finning. Lobbying to prioritize funding for alternatives to traditional animal tests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies  
☐ Check if None

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Covered Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Amadon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above  
☐ Check if None
LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area codes: AGRI AGRICULTURE

16. Specific lobbying issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal agencies or programs</th>
<th>Specific lobbying issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.R. 1931 &amp; S. 820, Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg laying hens and related enforcement provisions. Lobbying related to a proposed USDA rule that would regulate the importation of eggs. fadeIn(97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies: [ ] Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Current Official Position (if applicable)</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above: [ ] Check if None

| Foreign entity | Interest | |
|----------------|----------|
Lobbying Activity:

Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code FOOD FOOD INDUSTRY (SAFETY, LABELING, ETC.)

16. Specific lobbying issues

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above

Check if None
543

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue area in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

S.R. 187, Voter's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agency

☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name Last Name Suffix Covered Official Position (if applicable) New

Constance Kornman Whelpley

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issue listed on line 16 above

☐ Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client's new address

Address
City State Zip Code Country

21. Client's new principal place of business (if different from line 20)

City State Zip Code Country

22. New general description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer required to act as a lobbyist for the client

[Table with rows for entries]

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobby issues that no longer pertain

AIR

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:
## FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Place of Business</th>
<th>Amount of Contributions for Lobbying Activities</th>
<th>Ownership Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>City State Province Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
EXHIBIT 3
Outlook Print Message

Page 2 of 32

547

VerDate Sep 11 2014 23:34 Jul 18, 2016 Jkt 020740 PO 00000 Frm 00555 Fmt 6659 Sfmt 6602 E:\HR\OC\HR687.XXX HR687

Insert offset folio 554 here 20740.539

rfrederick on DSK6VPTVN1PROD with HEARING

547

https://b1180.mail.live.com/mail/PrintMessages.aspx?qpid=aecefac5b-8844-d-11e3-ae57-000000000000_2/8/2014
Outlook Print Message

Page 3 of 32

Sent: Friday, July 18, 2014 10:13 AM
To: Frederick

Subject: Re: FAST Advocates - Confidential

Hi Frederick,

Attached is a draft version of the spreadsheet that Emma asked for. I'm sending it to you for your review. Please let me know if you have any comments or suggestions.

From: Frederick

Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 10:58 AM
To: [redacted]

Hi,

I'm sending you the spreadsheet that Emma requested. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

Frederick
Outlook Print Message

Sent: January 18, 2016, at 9:54 PM "[Redacted]" [Redacted] writes

I wanted to provide you with some updates on the advocacy efforts and the dates that have been officially set for the PFTPA for February.

February 5: Senator Bob Casey (D-PA), President of the Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers and President of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
February 12: Ed Martin, President & CEO of PFTPA, and Pennsylvania Education Association (PEA) President Andrew Dismore
February 12 & 13: Patricia Frey, head of City Teacher and Dyess Elementary School, President of AFSCME
February 16: Dr. Nelson Hochstein, Senior Vice President for Veterinary Medicine, University of Pennsylvania
February 16, 17 & 18: Michael Hagan, Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Teachers Association and Baltimore School for the Arts

Because the list is long, and you can see the importance of providing some help in recruiting staff, please look carefully at the dates and the days that are available.

Please let me know if there are any changes needed on the email.

All the best,

[Name]

Congressional Arts

Office of Congressman Bill Whิตfield (D-VT)

This is a House of Representatives Office. I am not a member of Congress, nor served as an officer of Congress in a former capacity.

RE: FAST Advocates - Confidential

From: [Redacted] [Redacted]

To: [Redacted] [Redacted]

https://b1b180.mail.live.com/mail/9/PrintMessages.aspx?tid=94e6fac5b-884d-11e3-ae37-002... 2/8/2014
Outlook Print Message

Date: 3/12/13, 3:40 PM
From: LC in DC (LC in DC) LC in DC (LC in DC)
To: [Redacted]
Subject: [Redacted]

Dear [Redacted],

I have attached a draft of the memo. I have taken it to [Redacted] and he has approved it. I have also shared it with [Redacted] and he has given his feedback. I hope you find it useful. Please let me know if you have any comments or suggestions.

Best regards,

[Redacted]
Outlook Print Message

Henry Jay
Congressional Aide
Office of Congressional Aides, Room 631
205 Bayside House Office Building
Tel: 202-225-2644
Fax: 202-225-8749

verajay3991@juno.com

Follow-up: Worked on the 212

RE: F.A.S.T. Advocates - Confidential

From: [REDACTED] Date: 1/21/09 3:37 PM
To: [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

Henry, surprise - and thanks for the long hours and weekend work. I would love to see a memo for you and your team to distribute to Committees. The paperwork is due on Tuesday. Let me know if you need any assistance. No worries. -

Best,

[REDACTED]
Outlook Print Message
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RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

From: Mary H. [mailto:MaryH@myState.org] To: Bill Grant [mailto:BillG myState.org], Re: Advocates [mailto:Advocates@myState.org]

Re: Advocates

Bill, Grant, and I were talking today. We are interested in trying to help promote Republican meetings. One thing I think is getting representation to the local Republican committee in our areas and getting the help of some other local people who visit the local meetings and try to help.

In the past, the Republican Club did not meet regularly, and they were not a popular with the population, and that changed over time. I think there is a need for local meetings and that the population is interested in local meetings.

We need to work on this group of people who are trying to promote some discussion and moderation to fight the fear of some who have been involved in activism.

I am happy to provide any help we can. If you need any help with scheduling or anything else, please let me know.

Mary H.

P.S. Jeff, please add me to your list. Thanks.

---

Outlook Print Message

EWI 0000311

https://bls180.mail.live.com/mail/PrintMessage.aspx?cidp=rnbc0c3b-8846-d1e3-ac37-002... 2/6/2014
On Jan 30, 2016, at 2:45 PM, [Name] wrote:

I wanted to provide you with a summarized list of the advocates coming and the dates they have kindly offered to help on the PSS Act in Tennessee.

February 9: Jeff Hulbert, President and CEO President of the Tennessee State Association
February 10: Tim McDaniel, Executive Director of the Tennessee Association for Ecological and Natural Areas
February 10: Dan Mitchell, Executive Director of the Tennessee Association for Ecological and Natural Areas
February 12: Bruce Thompson, Executive Director of the Tennessee Association for Ecological and Natural Areas
February 14: Joe Moreland, President of the Tennessee Association for Ecological and Natural Areas

Because the list is a group, and you can see the names, we are still keeping some loose ends of scheduling and haven't set formal meeting dates with these advocates. Those dates will be a big help for us, so we appreciate any help you can provide!

Please keep this list between the two of us on email.

At the least,

Name

House Spokesman

Department of the Interior

Office of the House Speaker

State of Tennessee

Washington, DC 20515

March 19, 2014

This email and any file transmitted with it are confidential and privileged for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended addressee, you should not disclose, copy, or distribute this email or its contents. If you are not the intended addressee, please reply to the sender and delete this email.

Please share this email with all House Advocates to assist with scheduling.

FSAFAST Advocates - Confidential

https://bls180.mail.live.com/mail/PrintMessages.aspx?cid=ae6f4e9b-8846-11c3-9577-002... 2/5/2014
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From: [name] (ex@machine.com)  
To: [name] (ex@machine.com)  
Subject: Re: [subject]

Just a quick reminder to let you know that if you need help, you should call my phone number. I'm always here to help.

I understand you're busy, but I just want to remind you that you have a meeting coming up.

It's going to be important for you to be there. It's going to be important for everyone to be there. It's going to be important for us all to be there.

Please make sure you're prepared. Please make sure you're ready. Please make sure you're going to be there.

Best,

[Name]
Outlook Print Message
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Mary Mill
Congressional Staff

firstname.lastname@whitedrive.com

255 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515
Fax: (202) 225-7417

Phone: (202) 225-8204
Fax: (202) 225-9022

Mary.Mill@stableton.com

Mary.Mill@whitehouse.com

Re: FAS/D Advocates - Confidential

From: Create DangerousWhiteMail (confidential@stableton.com)
To: Kaiser Frank (confidential@stableton.com)
Cc: Nancy向下 (confidential@stableton.com)
Date: December 13, 2014 at 02:47 PM

Hi again.

I just wanted to give you a quick update on the negotiations for the legislation.

Keep me informed, and let me know if you have any questions.

Mary Mill

Kaiser Frank
Outlook Print Message

From: cdemotte@state.ny.us
To: cmcmurty@state.ny.us
CC: drey@state.ny.us
Subject: Ms. HERMANN - Confidential

Date: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 11:40 AM

Page 13 of 32

I need to try on my #2 spelling? Will you be able to do your eye surgery with it? It is just an alternative plan. That is why I am on it. I am not going to cut up meetings between Department and office action.

Sent from my iPhone

01/28/2014 11:40 AM: Today, Marty Gherity (Marty.Gherity@state.ny.us) cc'd me on a draft letter that was sent to the NYS AFB. I have already reviewed the letter and have signed it.

Re: Review of DRAFT letter for agreement with the letter I sent to the NYS AFB.

I sent the letter to the NYS AFB on January 28, 2014. The draft letter we are referring to was sent in December 2013. I reviewed the draft letter and made some edits to it before sending it to the NYS AFB.

The draft letter was sent to the NYS AFB as a proposal for a new regulation. The letter outlines the proposed regulation and the rationale behind it. The NYS AFB has not yet responded to the letter.

I would like to continue working on the letter with you and the NYS AFB. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Marty Gherity

Congressional Staff
Office of Rep. Richard N. Cappelli (R-42)
227 House Office Building Washington, D.C. 20515-2005 Phone: 202-225-5677

https://beta180.mail.live.com/whl/PrintMessages.aspx?cpid=ac0faac5b884d11c3ae17002.../28/2014
Dear Val

I'm not sure what I think about the idea of us not being able to have a say in our own affairs. It seems...unfair. I know it's been a difficult year for everyone, but I think we need to find a way to make our voices heard. What do you think?

Best,
[Your Name]
Outlook Print Message

FW: Another Big Lick show bites the dust

From: Fred Brown (FredBrown@House.gov)
To: Chuck Broy (Ch broy@House.gov), Debbie Largay (DebbieLargay@House.gov), Marc Emory (MarcEmory@House.gov), Sara Arntzen (SArntzen@House.gov), Cindy Ensor (CindyEnsor@House.gov), Isabelle Leonard (IsabelleLeonard@House.gov)

Sent: Thursday, 10/29/2015 11:17 PM

Subject: Another Big Lick show bites the dust

Lord of the flies

The Big Lick shows will not be held this fall in both Northern Virginia, due to low attendance, lack of funds, and scheduling conflicts.

FW: Condol, for your feedback on suggested edits to PAST/HP letter

From: Cindy Ensor (CindyEnsor@House.gov)
To: Fred Brown (FredBrown@House.gov)

Sent: Monday, 11/16/2015 11:13 AM

Subject: FW: Condol, for your feedback on suggested edits to PAST/HP letter

https://bls140.mail.live.com/mail/PrintMessage.aspx?msgId=ae06ac5b-8846-11e3-a97d-000220440000... 11/16/2015
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From: Paul Kennedy
To: [name]
CC: [name]

Subject: Re: Review for feedback upon requested edits to MD/US Letter

Date: February 21, 2016 9:53 AM

Dear [name],

I am following up on your request to review the draft MD/US Letter for feedback. As you may recall, the letter was originally drafted by [name] to emphasize the importance of maintaining a positive relationship with [partner]. However, I've received some concerns about the tone and messaging of the letter, and I believe it's important to address these issues.

I have made some suggested edits to the draft letter, which I've attached below. I hope these changes will help to clarify the message and address any concerns. Please review the letter and provide your feedback.

Thank you,

Best,
Paul

---

[Date and Time]

[Signature]

PS: Please let me know if you have any questions or need further clarification. I am available to discuss the letter at any time.

---

[View attachment]

[File Name]

[File Size]

[File Type]

[Document Text]
Outlook Print Message

Data

Dear Senator Smith and Senator White,

I am writing to voice my strong support of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) efforts to ensure compliance with the Act's ratepayer-focused principles. Our company has invested significantly in providing safe and reliable electricity to millions of consumers across the nation. The FERC's role in overseeing the implementation of the Act is crucial, as it ensures that ratepayers are protected from unjust and unfairly discriminatory practices.

However, we have observed a concerning trend regarding the Fair Treatment of Ratepayers Act (FTR) waivers. These waivers have been granted to large industrial customers, which places an undue burden on our smaller customers. This is not in line with the Act's objective of ensuring fair treatment for all ratepayers.

We urge the FERC to reconsider the criteria for granting FTR waivers, ensuring that they are only used in extraordinary circumstances to benefit large industrial customers and not to the detriment of average consumers. We are committed to working closely with the FERC to develop a fair and balanced approach to ratepayer protection.

Thank you for your continued support of the ratepayer-focused principles of the Act. We look forward to working with you to ensure that these principles are upheld.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Company Name]
Outlook Print Message

From: rebecca@...   Subject: interesting article

Hi Fred:

Please read this article. It is quite interesting.

http://www.greatmexico.org

Best,
Rebecca
Outlook Print Message

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 9/9/2014 2:54 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: [Redacted]

565

I can't without will be so much to schedule back to DC.

Best from my iPhone.

On Sep 7, 2014, at 10:50 AM, [Redacted] wrote:

...I can't chat that day...

...I am on the 7th, at 1:00 PM, "Gervais Review 4th Floor" [Redacted] written...to share.

In case we talk.

In case we talk.

Best from my iPhone.

On Sep 7, 2014, at 12:37 PM, "Terrelle Lawrence" [Redacted] written...

...All.

...I have to be there so you'll be available Tuesday, January 4th at 1:00 PM for a review of the F32 Act task force. I will circulate an updated task list to everyone.

...Re: F32 Task List Review/Update

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Jan 17, 2014 1:11 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: [Redacted]

Some O/T work we should move...to when we have a party...over—can everyone do this Thursday 12:10 or 2:00 Thursday?

PS: Let's meet for lunch on Tuesday, January 21st at 12:00 PM for a review of the F32 Act task list. I will circulate an updated task list to everyone.

Call or comment as others may find this to be more convenient. I

Re: F32 Task List Review/Update

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Jan 17, 2014 1:11 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: [Redacted]

I can....make that.

Best from my iPhone.

On Jan 9, 2014, at 1:51 AM, "Terrelle Lawrence" [Redacted] written...
Re: PAST Task List Review/Updates

From: Frederick Dharma (dharma@harnesscanyon.com)
To: Frederick Dharma
Cc: Frederick Dharma, Frederick Dharma, Frederick Dharma

Dear Frederick,

The task list is due today. Any changes? I am happy to accommodate.

Best,

Frederick Dharma

Accepted: PAST Task List Review/Updates

From: Frederick Dharma (dharma@harnesscanyon.com)
To: Frederick Dharma
Cc: Frederick Dharma, Frederick Dharma, Frederick Dharma

I have uploaded the updated task list. Please review it and let me know if any changes are necessary.

Best,

Frederick Dharma

Outlook Print Message

From: Mike Bean (mbean@homefree.org)
To: Shelby Hany (shany@homefree.org)
CC: Ruth Leger (rleger@homefree.org)
Subject: Prevent All Sorting Tactics - Poll Shelbyville Now

Re: Prevent All Sorting Tactics - Poll Shelbyville Now

From: Shelby Hany (shany@homefree.org)
To: Mike Bean (mbean@homefree.org)
CC: Ruth Leger (rleger@homefree.org)

Re: Prevent All Sorting Tactics - Poll Shelbyville Now

From: Shelby Hany (shany@homefree.org)
To: Mike Bean (mbean@homefree.org)
CC: Ruth Leger (rleger@homefree.org)

Re: Prevent All Sorting Tactics - Poll Shelbyville Now

From: Shelby Hany (shany@homefree.org)
To: Mike Bean (mbean@homefree.org)
CC: Ruth Leger (rleger@homefree.org)

Re: Prevent All Sorting Tactics - Poll Shelbyville Now

From: Shelby Hany (shany@homefree.org)
To: Mike Bean (mbean@homefree.org)
CC: Ruth Leger (rleger@homefree.org)

Re: Prevent All Sorting Tactics - Poll Shelbyville Now

From: Shelby Hany (shany@homefree.org)
To: Mike Bean (mbean@homefree.org)
CC: Ruth Leger (rleger@homefree.org)

http://www.homefree.org/shanypoll.htm

Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: Frederick Date
To: Verizon Home Fibe (fibre@verizon.com)

I can't believe how close we are to getting done with all of this. We really need to get this done in the next week. I think we have enough time to finish this up. Let me know what you think.

Fred
Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: [Redacted] (redacted@redacted.com)

The two agendas that we met about were:
1. The one on May 9th which we are currently
2. The one for May 10th which we have not yet scheduled.

Regarding the May 9th agenda, we have a meeting scheduled for 10 AM, and we need to ensure that the attendees are notified.

Regarding the May 10th agenda, we need to schedule it as soon as possible.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Best regards,

[Redacted]
RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: [Email Address]
To: [Email Address]

Subject: Re: AB677

Your email, which was received by the Speaker's Office, was also forwarded to me. I appreciate the notice of the hearing on AB677.

Sincerely,

[FH]

~

From: [Email Address]
To: [Email Address]

Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

I'm sorry for the confusion. The hearing on AB677 has been rescheduled to next week.

Sincerely,

[FH]

~

From: [Email Address]
To: [Email Address]

Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

I'm happy to confirm that the hearing on AB677 has been rescheduled to the new date.

Sincerely,

[FH]
Outlook Print Message

Page 28 of 32

Subject:

Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: [Redacted]

Date: [Redacted]

To: [Redacted]

Cc: [Redacted]

Body:

Dear All,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to follow up on our recent discussion to re-schedule the DA meetings.

As we discussed, I understand that the current schedule has been causing issues for some attendees. In order to accommodate everyone's availability, I propose the following changes:

1. Move the meeting for [Date] to [New Date]
2. Move the meeting for [Date] to [New Date]
3. Move the meeting for [Date] to [New Date]

I believe these changes will help in minimizing conflicts and ensuring smoother workflow. Please let me know if you have any objections or suggestions for further adjustments.

Thank you for your understanding and cooperation.

Best regards,

[Your Name]
Outlook Print Message

From: Nancy Miller (nancy.miller@mail.house.gov)
Sent: Tue, Oct 11, 13:10PM
To: [Redacted] (nancy.miller@mail.house.gov)

I would like to set up a meeting this week to discuss IT related matters. Is there a time that you will be available? Please reply to this email. Thank you.

Nancy Miller

Session on any phone

Begin forwarded message:

Subject: Re: Scheduling Days

From: Nancy Miller (nancy.miller@mail.house.gov)
Sent: Tue, Oct 11, 13:10PM
To: [Redacted] (nancy.miller@mail.house.gov)

Can we meet Tuesday at 11am or Wednesday at 3pm? I would like to go forward with the meeting and I am available both of those days. Let me know what works for you.

Thanks,

Nancy Miller

Session on any phone

https://blu180.mail.live.com/mail/PrintMessage.aspx?cid=7ef46c59-884d-11c3-ad37-002... 2/10/2014
Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

To: [Name]  
Cc: [Name]

Subject: Re: Rescheduling DAs

Hi [Name],

As we discussed on our call, we will be rescheduling the DAs for the next few weeks. The new dates are as follows:

- DA 1: [New Date]
- DA 2: [New Date]
- DA 3: [New Date]
- DA 4: [New Date]

Please make sure to mark your calendar accordingly.

Thanks,

[Your Name]
RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: Frederick, Michael [mailto:michael.frederick@osdbu.osha.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2014 10:44 AM
To: Michael, Frederick

Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

Hi Michael,

I've reviewed the schedule and there are a number of changes I'd like to make. Here are the details:

1. We need to adjust the dates for the meetings scheduled for February 13. The new dates will be February 14 and February 15.
2. The meeting on February 14 will be held at 9:00 AM instead of 8:30 AM.
3. The meeting on February 15 will be held at 10:00 AM instead of 11:00 AM.
4. The meeting on February 16 will be held at 2:00 PM instead of 1:00 PM.

Let me know if these changes are acceptable. We can finalize the schedule and send out the new invitations.

Thanks,

Michael
Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: Claude Farrar 
To: Claude Farrar 

Date: Feb 9, 2016, 1:12 PM

Hi, I'm in 516.

Best, 
Claude
Subject: 586

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield

Sent: Saturday, October 15, 2016 10 PM

To: Holly Haaland

Cc: [Redacted]

Re: [Redacted]

I was at the Press conference in New Orleans yesterday in opposition to the climate talks. Let me know if you need anything.

Often, it's difficult to find the right words to express our views. Sometimes, it's even more challenging to find the right people to listen to us. Yet, our voices persist, and our actions speak louder than words. We must continue to stand up for what is right, and never give up on the fight for a better future. Together, we can make a difference. Let's keep fighting for a sustainable and just world.
EXHIBIT 5
From: Connie Harman-Whitfield, connie@humansecurity.org
To: Mansi Bandy, mansi@humansecurity.org
Cc: Nora Akers, nora@humansecurity.org, Casi Johnson, casi@humansecurity.org
Subject: Re: We need to get the Wading Home bill going! We can get that on the House bill

Date: Friday, June 22, 2012 3:43 PM

Sent from iPhone

Dear Mansi and Nora,

Connie, I know you've been thinking about this issue for a while. I was at the SHAAC hearing today, and I thought you might be interested in my notes on the hearing. I heard some powerful testimony from survivors and advocates, and I believe this is an issue that we can address at the federal level. The Wading Home bill is currently pending in Congress, and I think it's important that we get it passed before the end of the year.

Best,

From: Mansi Bandy
Date: Wednesday, June 13, 2012 3:48 PM

To: Werner Budde
Cc: Wanda Mariam, wanda@humansecurity.org

Subject: Re: Werner, can we get the Wading Home bill going?

Hi Werner,

I'm glad to see that you're interested in the Wading Home bill. I think it's an important issue, and I believe we can get it passed with your support. Let's work together to make it happen.

Best,

From: Werner Budde
Date: June 22, 2012 3:14 PM

To: Mansi Bandy

Subject: Werner, we need to get the Wading Home bill going! We can get that on the House bill.

Hi Mansi,

I'm excited to hear that you're interested in the Wading Home bill. Let's make it happen!

Best,

Werner
EXHIBIT 6
Thanks – good info, Connie. We’ll definitely pass this on.

Are you able to dig up something on Cong. Whitfield to see if he’s complicit again? If so, is there a way he handles that communications to have the info someone else here reach out to Cong. Whitfield?

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Date: Thursday, May 19, 2016 2:14 PM
To: Fred Branch
CC: Lara Amaranth, Joe Farmer, Kate Wolf, Jessica Nagelkal-Lakeman, Thomas Brown
Subject: Cong. Whitfield as original co-sponsor of reinstituted SEET Practice Act (re: DOD Trauma Training)

Even if it does, you should ask L.B. Brandon too because he was on Armed Forces Committee and postmasters.

Sent from my iPhone

May 9, 2016, at 12:29 PM

From: Fred Branch

Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 1:27 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield, Sara Amaranth, Joe Farmer, Kate Wolf, Jessica Nagelkal-Lakeman, Thomas Brown
Subject: Cong. Whitfield as original co-sponsor of reinstituted SEET Practice Act (re: DOD Trauma Training)

PMH would love to help get Cong. Whitfield to agree to be an original co-sponsor of the reinstituted SEET Practice Act so we can use his office activities to immediately promote training. He expressed the bill last Congress, though he wasn’t an official sponsor (I planted his name as sponsor late in the 113th session, FY14). If Cong. Whitfield agrees, then Cong. Grimm will join him, and presumably Cong. Walorski (mine) will also be part of this issue of original sponsors.

This bill isn’t a top priority for us, but we do support it. Connie, what do you think?

Best,

Fred

From: Fred Branch

Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 1:25 PM
To: Fred Branch
Subject: Cong. Grimm will join us (Ned’s) (CONFIDENTIAL)

Hi Fred,

That’s great, thank you! PMH priority, give her a call.

It looks like both Congress will be reintroducing this bill, but we are bringing up a small bipartisan team of original co-sponsors. I meet with Grimm’s and Whitfield’s offices today. Grimm will be back on the left PMH side, and Whitfield’s new defense is that he was too busy to get to it, but he will want to back with everything first because he is closer to the issue.

It strikes me now that Whitfield’s support is very crucial if we lose Grimm and Whitfield, there is only 1 Republican from the 1st to support, Walter Jones.

I know that the PMH bill is a good relationship with Whitfield’s office. Would you be willing to contact Adam (or better yet, Taylor Jones) and let them know that the PMH is behind this bill?

Ned

From: Fred Branch

Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2016 3:44 PM
To: Fred Branch
CC: Joe Farmer, Kate Wolf, Jessica Nagelkal-Lakeman, Sara Amaranth

Subject: Cong. Grimm will join our DOD Trauma Training side

Fred,

I talked with Connie Cochran in Rep. Adam Smith’s personal staff. She is very happy to help – was somewhat familiar with the issue. Recognizes the issue (which may, though not the details of how it’s included in the 2016 budget), given her past summary of what things stood with. Now we’re trying to have PMH maintain language that will pass OGA without a fight. The Joe knows that you, and PMH needs to work this one in advance of budget. We have the PMH debt match into, with you. Ned, is your colleague with her, and she’ll be glad to connect you.
with the right staff on the Senate side of the committee. Her info is:

Counsel-Clerk [Name Redacted]
205-524-2937 (direct line)

Are you trying to get Annette to be lead sponsor of the GST Prevention Act, as well as pushing the report language? If not, I guess you could push the bill to Courtney & I didn’t see it with her, not knowing your strategy.

Good luck, and let me know if you have any trouble reaching her. Thanks.

Yours,

[Signature]

Press: Josh [Redacted]
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2013 4:11 PM
To: [Redacted], [Redacted], [Redacted]
Subject: Refugee [Redacted] - Legislative Help - Tsarna Training

Fantastic. Thanks.

Press: [Redacted]
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2013 9:11 PM
To: [Redacted], [Redacted]
Subject: Legislative Help - Tsarna Training

Hi, Josh. The staff I worked with in Rep. Smith’s office on another issue in the 2012 DOD reauthorization is now his Political Director liaising in his district office. I just left a message with Courtney Leslie, who picked up the annual workforce portfolio for her. I can give her background and let you know how we connect, so you can follow-up with her.

Yours,

[Signature]

Press: Kam Wall
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2013 11:38 PM
To: [Redacted], [Redacted], [Redacted]
Subject: Legislative Help - Tsarna Training

Hi, Him,

Have you been in touch with McGurk’s office as of? If not, we might be able to be helpful with introduction there.

Best,

[Signature]

Press: Jessica [Redacted]
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2013 11:38 PM
To: [Redacted], [Redacted], [Redacted]
Subject: Legislative Help - Tsarna Training

Hi, Him,

I’ll be more than happy to hook you up with [Redacted] or [Redacted]. I don’t know how Smith’s staff very well, but I have [Redacted] a relationship there.

Best,

[Signature]

Confidential Treatment Under the Nondisclosure Provisions of H.Res. 895 of the 110th Congress as Amended Requested
EXHIBIT 7

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW
OF REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD’S
CHIEF OF STAFF
INTERVIEW OF [REDACTED]

April 24, 2014

Present:

Kedric Payne
Bryson Morgan
[REDACTED]
Stefan Passatino
Benjamin Keane

Transcribed by:
Stephanie Lyn Rahn, CSR
License No. XI01717

**PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of the transcript are phonetic**
QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

Q. This is Kedric Payne and Bryson Morgan with the Office of Congressional Ethics, and we are here with [REDACTED] and his attorneys Stefan Passatino and Benjamin Keane. It is April 24, 2014. We want to just begin with a little bit of background and somewhat obvious information but can you give us your current job title?

A. Chief of Staff.

Q. Chief of Staff and for whom?

A. Congressman Ed Whitfield.

Q. And for how long have you been Chief of Staff?

A. Since January of 2013.

Q. And what was your title prior to that?

A. Legislative Director.

Q. How long were you Legislative Director?

A. For, let's see, so for about four years, so probably January 2009 until January of 2013 roughly.

Q. And as Chief of Staff, what are your
duties?

A. I oversee the office and, you know, management of the office and, you know, generally advise the staff on a variation of issues and, you know, I work with schedulers on various meeting stuff, I work with the legislative staff on whatever is going on with the legislative issues, and then also work with constituents and district staff on issues dealing with constituents, so pretty much jack of all trades I guess you could say.

Q. Okay. And how are your duties different as Legislative Director, what were you responsible for as Legislative Director?

A. Well, so the Legislative Director I would say oversees closely the legislative staff, maybe more so than the Chief of Staff, but, you know, the Chief of Staff obviously has the final say -- final say unless it's one of those issues that you bring to the Congressman's attention on a lot of things. You know, as you know, working on the hill, you can't bring every decision to the Congressman's attention, so the Legislative Director works with the legislative staff organizing those efforts but the Legislative Director then talks to the Chief of Staff as to what is going on in the legislative shop
and, you know, then the Legislative Director and the legislative staff may make a decision based on what the issue is.

Q. And as the Legislative Director, were you responsible for animal welfare issues?

A. Yes.

Q. And are you currently responsible for such issues?

A. No.

Q. And that changed when you changed your position?

A. So whenever I was Legislative Director, a guy by the name of Justin Fareed came into the office, and he handled animal issues, and then at that point, I took on more of an overseeing role rather than a, you know, hands on role. But since Justin was a new staffer and had not worked on the hill that much, it was probably a little more hands on for me since I was sort of his supervisor as the Legislative Director. And then when Justin left, Chris Pack handled our animal issues for a period there, short period, and then Marty started, and then Marty handles the animal issues now, and so -- you know, Marty, he's a little older than Justin, more professionally developed, I guess you could
say, so, you know, I haven't had to coach him as much as I have coached the previous people.

Q. Are you familiar with the PAST Act?

A. Yes.

Q. What is that?

A. Well, the PAST Act deals with soring of horses. You have this issue where some people in the Tennessee walking horse industry, they sore the bottom of the horse, the hoof of the horse or around the legs in order to force that horse to jerk their legs up, and it's really an issue because it's already illegal as a result of the 1976 law -- or 1970 law and then there were some amendments in 1976, and even though it's already illegal, the enforcement of the act really hasn't gone that well, and there is still a lot of abuse out there, and we actually contacted the USDA, because the USDA did an Office of the Inspector General report on the issue, and they issued a report talking about some of the problems that was associated with the act, and as a result of that, that's what guided our efforts to introduce the PAST Act, and that that Inspector General Report models the PAST Act, in fact I was the one that drafted the PAST Act and worked with legislative counsel on the PAST Act whenever I was
Legislative Director in the last Congress.

Q. So when did you first start working on the legislation?

A. Well, I started working on the legislation probably, let's see, so this is 2014, I probably started working on this early in 2012, the legislation, I worked on early in 2012 but there was a lot of stuff that led up to the legislation that got us to the point of actually drafting legislation, for example, I think it was in 2010, we sent a letter to USDA urging them to implement the findings of the Inspector General Report. So that -- that letter in 2010 was sort of our efforts to get the administration to address the issue separately of legislation so we didn't have to do anything legislatively. And unfortunately USDA hasn't decided to do anything to implement the findings of the Inspector General Report which is what prompted us to introduce the legislation.

Now, prior to the Inspector General Report, you know, we -- before 2010 we were urging USDA to finish the Inspector General Report, and we had previously -- you know, I have worked in the office since 2004 and you know, I have handled animal issues since 2004 up until, you know, Justin
came to the office, and I have handled horse issues on and off since then, and you know, during that whole period of time, we -- we knew that this abuse occurred, we were trying to get funding for the Horse Protection Act in the appropriation process, and you know, over the course of that amount of time, we were, you know, trying to figure out how to get USDA to implement this law that is already on the books better.

Q. You are saying we, what do you mean when you are saying we?

A. Oh, me and the Congressman and you know, our Chief of Staff -- you know, so whenever I was Legislative Director we obviously had a Chief of Staff, his name was John Sparkman. I would obviously have to get sign off from him on things, and I just mean the office in general whenever I say we.

Q. Sounds like you are heavily involved in the legislation?

A. I was, I am not as involved anymore.

Q. When did you change your involvement?

A. Oh, whenever Marty started in the office.

Q. So was that around December of 2013?
A. Right, because Marty took on these issues, and Marty has a lot of experience in, you know, animal issues.

Q. Were you involved with finding co-sponsors for the legislation?

A. Yes.

Q. What else were you involved in with the legislation?

A. I mean I drafted the legislation, worked with legislative counsel to get it drafted, we kicked off the legislation, we issued dear colleagues, we met with people, we met with a variation of stakeholders to get the legislation drafted, we worked with American Horse Council, the American Equine Practitioners, we worked with American Veterinary Medical Association, we worked with the Humane Society, we worked with the ASPCA, American Society of Prevention of Animal Abuse, we worked with all of these organizations to get the legislation drafted and then we continued to work with the organization to urge them to go meet with people, urge them to get us co-sponsors and everything of that nature, so, you know, I worked on all of that, and -- prior to Marty starting and then whenever Marty started, they sort of took the bulk
of everything that was going on, but he still periodically comes to me and asks for advice, hey, what did you do on -- to try to urge people to co-sponsor in previous situations, so we used some of my background information having worked in the office and on this issue for awhile to try to, you know, further his efforts.

Q. And when you have been doing all that, the drafting and then the co-sponsoring and the strategy, what has been your interaction with Mrs. Whitfield?

A. Well, I mean Mrs. Whitfield has been involved in, you know, building coalitions and stuff like that, and, you know, whenever we were drafting the legislation, I worked with Keith Dane, and Keith, you know, he serves on the board, or one of the boards of the Tennessee Walking Horse, you know, they have these horse industry organizations and he's on one of those, so he had a lot of background knowledge as far as working with that, so, you know, my interaction with Mrs. Whitfield was more of she was on some of the calls that I was on. But, you know, that was kind the extent of it.

Q. When you say some of the calls, some of the calls --
A. We had various conference calls with all of the stakeholders discussing, like, you know, okay, you know, during the drafting process, you know, okay, what would be the best way to handle this particular circumstance in the legislation and, you know, we already made the decision to do the legislation, we just needed to figure out the details on exactly how to do it so, you know, we were able to get it past the finish line. So, you know, she was on those type of calls just sort of figuring out, you know, what would be the best course, I guess, to get to the finish line which is to ultimately get it signed into law.

Q. These were calls to discuss strategy dealing with the FAST Act?

A. Right.

Q. And she participated in those. Anyone else on those phone calls other than the stakeholders?

A. Oh, yeah -- oh, besides the stakeholders? So the stakeholders were all of the ones that I mentioned.

Q. Other members of Congress or staff of Congress other than --

A. Well, so Congressman Cohen's office
sometimes participated, he's our democratic lead,
you know, they weren't as involved as we were, and
then at one point we also included our Senate
sponsors, so, you know, we introduced the bill on
the house side first and then several months passed
by and then the Senate introduced their bills, so we
had some strategy meetings or strategy calls once we
were working to try to get the Senate introduced and
sometimes the Senate participated.

Q. So when did these calls take place,
they started when, what year?
A. Well, we started drafting the
legislation in 2012, so, you know, it took us
probably from about May to October, and May is a
rough start time to actually draft the legislation,
because this is -- I mean I am sure you know, this
has been somewhat of a controversial issue and we
have made some people mad as a result of introducing
this legislation, because you know, we feel there
are some bad activities out there, a lot of bad
activities in fact, and you know, we wanted to make
sure we had all of our I's dotted and all of our T's
crossed and so it took us awhile to get it drafted
but prior to that, we were working on a lot of the
administrative stuff but that didn't really involve
that much conference calls and just planning and
stuff like that.

Q. So I am okay with the timeline, I understand it, from May to October you were
drafting. During that time, were there conference
calls?

A. Yes.

Q. These were the same type of conference
calls you described earlier where Connie was
present?

A. She was present on some of them, she
wasn’t present on all of them, and it wasn’t like we
were planning around her. You know, I would say we
were more planning around Keith because Keith was an
expert, and also Jay Hickey with the American Horse
Council, that was very helpful because he was a
group that we identified that wanted to support our
efforts that had not previously supported some of
the animal issues that we had been involved in, so,
you know, I would say Jay was probably one of the
most important players and also Ronda Haven with the
American Veterinary Medical Association was one of
the more important players.

MR. MORGAN: I want to step back a
little bit. Do you remember when it was first
decided that you would draft the PAST Act? Can you
tell me a little bit about how that decision was
made in the office?
A. Oh, you know, I told you we sent this
letter in 2010 about urging USDA to implement the
findings of the Inspector General Report. So USDA
responded to that letter and basically it was a
vanilla response that said, you know, we are -- we
are in the process of, you know, trying to implement
the findings. One of the things that we were urging
USDA to do was to eliminate the self policing
provisions and also to ban the use of the action
devices. And those two things are really important
and it became clear that they weren't going to do
that.

So not long after we received that
USDA letter back in 2010 we decided that the only
course of action we have here is to introduce
legislation.

MR. MORGAN: When you say we decided?
A. The Congressman, the Congressman and I
decided that we needed to introduce the legislation.

MR. MORGAN: Was Mrs. Whitfield
involved in those decisions?
A. Not whenever me and the Congressman
were talking about it.

Q. Was she there any other time?

A. Not whenever I was there, I can't speak to, you know, the conversations that they may or may not have had at home.

Q. Well, did she have communications with you about, yes, we should pursue this legislation?

A. Well, she made her views known on the conference calls with, you know, various people after we had decided to introduce the legislation.

Q. You understood his question was before that decision was made, was she participating in that decision making? I think I am characterizing your question right?

A. I mean I don't recall a situation where Mrs. Whitfield said you need to do this or you don't need to do this. Now, you know, Mrs. Whitfield has a very assertive personality, and a very, you know, she makes very declarative statements and even if she would have said that, she, you know, I would have -- I would have made sure that this was the Congressman's and I's discussions, so whenever Mrs. Whitfield calls the office on various issues, people come to me and they talk to me, about how do we handle this situation,
and you know, just because she's asking about a
particular situation, doesn't mean that she, you
know, gets what she wants. We always bring these
types of things to the Congressman's attention and
it's the Congressman's decision.

MR. MORGAN: Was she involved in the
back and forth with the USDA? You sent a letter in
2010, they responded, was she involved?

A. No, actually how that 2010 letter or
the idea of the 2010 letter came to our attention
was former Senator Joe Tidings who was the original
drafter of the Horse Protection Act I think in 1976,
not the original act but the amendments in 1976, he
works at the law firm called Dickstein Shapiro.
They came to us and was like, hey, these problems
are still taking place, we think it would be good
for you to take a look at this letter that we have
prepared as a potential draft, and we think it would
be helpful to, you know, send this letter to USDA,
so that's how, you know, that whole process got
started.

Now, you know, at some point, because
whenever we sent that letter, we had a few other
people sign onto the letter, and so, you know, at
some point Mrs. Whitfield may have been involved in
getting other people to sign onto that letter. But, you know, we already made the decision to do the letter as a result of having this meeting with Senator Tidings and some of the people from Dickstein Shapiro.

Q. Approximately when did that happen with Senator Tidings?

A. Well, it would have been a month or two before the letter went, and I don't remember the exact month that the letter -- that we sent the letter. I think we provided a copy of the letter, I didn't bring a copy with me, but, you know, it took a couple of months to get -- because we had Senator Mary Landrieu on there and Steve Cohen who is our lead on the PAST Act --

Q. This is all during 2013?

A. No, this was 2010.

Q. 2010?

A. Yeah, this was 2010. I mean it may have been the end of 2009 -- or 2009 because I don't know exactly when the letter was sent in 2010, I don't remember that.

Q. Earlier you mentioned that during May and October 2013 is when --

A. Right, we drafted the bill.
Q. I have an email I want to take a look at, EW401271. Feel free to read the entire email but I want to draw your attention to the email from Mrs. Whitfield to you at the bottom of page one. I'm sorry, take a look at the email from Mrs. Whitfield to you on page two.
A. Okay.
Q. So in this --
A. So these are documents that we already had, these are just resources that we had prepared, when I say we, I mean our office collectively gathered this information working with our stakeholders, so the OIG report is a USDA document, American Horse Council press release is one of our stakeholders, AVMA AAP, that's another stakeholder, list of endorsers is just a list of everybody and see here Connie suggested we move the American Quarter Horse Association up to number four which the American Quarter Horse Association had never introduced -- never supported any of our horse legislation so that was a win, and the reason why she wanted to move it up to number four is because we wanted to make sure we had them at the top, which I think is a great suggestion.
Q. What I am trying to understand --
A. Text of the amendment, that is the bill I drafted, the text of the amendment is the bill that I drafted. So did you see the list of endorsers --

Q. No, I'll frame -- I am trying to understand why is Mrs. Whitfield sending to you an email that says we discussed it this morning and have come up with the following checklist that needs to be implemented ASAP.

A. Well, this was right around the time that we were planning on introducing the legislation, so I don't remember exactly when we introduced this legislation, but I would suspect that, those are some things that she felt like needed to happen before we introduced the legislation.

Q. You said she feels like it begins with A -- Ed is now focused on PAST, is it your understanding this was simply coming from Mrs. Whitfield or was it coming from Mrs. Whitfield and the Congressman?

A. No, I just -- I took this as Mrs. Whitfield was sending this email.

Q. And what conversation did you have with her concerning the checklist that she sent?
A. Like a verbal conversation?
Q. Or email communication.

A. Well, we may have gone over the various checklist and items that are there but there really wasn't that much of a conversation. I mean the only reason why we were getting this information together to begin with so we had all of our, you know, facts together before we introduced the legislation. We were obviously going to get a lot of questions, we were trying to build co-sponsors and she played a role in building those coalitions, so.

Q. What role did she play in building the co-sponsors, did she assist you in any way, did you work with her?

A. She met with other offices, and there was, you know, she didn't assist me, she may have made suggestions on who we should meet -- like who would be easy targets for us to get to co-sponsor the legislation, but that was really her role.

Q. And what was her role?

A. She, you know, worked -- she met with -- she met with people separately of us, because she -- the Humane Society supports this legislation, and you know, they obviously want to see this get done
too, so, you know, you have to ask her as to what
she did for the Humane Society to further the cause.

Q. I am following up on you said it was
her role to do the co-sponsor, so did she contact
you communicate with you about finding co-sponsors?

A. I mean we talked about the -- the
people that she met with and, you know, the
cosponsors that she got, the people that said no.

So, you know, she was telling us that information
because, you know, she went in and talked to people.

We didn't -- we wanted to make sure we went in, if
they said no because of a particular reason, if it
was a veterinary reason, we wanted to make sure and
send in the American Veterinary Medical Association.

It was more information sharing than anything.

Q. Was she involved in deciding or
talking about or recommending to you about which
cosponsors to approach?

A. Yeah, she recommended some people that
she thought would be easy targets. But, you know,
we obviously wanted that input, to ensure that we
were able to get as many co-sponsors as possible.

At this point, we had already introduced the bill
and we were moving forward full steam ahead, so we
were trying to build as much stakeholder support as
possible. And you know, Mrs. Whitfield is very
experienced in the law, she's been around DC awhile,
and she knows how to build coalitions real well.
Q. Okay.
A. So it would be -- we wanted to use
that.
Q. Did she also discuss with you any of
the text of the bill, any possible changes to that?
A. You know, most of my conversations on
the text of the bill primarily dealt with Keith
Dane. I worked with him, because he was a subject
matter expert. I don't recall whether Connie made
specific, you know, asks as a result of the text of
the bill.
Q. I guess would you say that would fit
in her role though, so you described before this
idea of her role, would that fall into her role to
be involved in what the actual language of the bill
is?
A. Well, first of all, I wouldn't really
say that her role was a defined -- it wasn't
defined. But, you know, if she had suggestions and
if she, you know, had a good reason to -- good
reasons to back that up, then we would have
definitely taken, when I say we, the office and the
Congress -- we would have taken that into consideration.

MR. MORGAN: If she did have a suggestion, what would be the process by which she would communicate that to the office?

A. She would -- well, during the drafting process, whenever I was working on the issue, she would either email or call me.

MR. MORGAN: Was that sometime -- did she speak with Representative Whitfield directly about those issues?

A. Well, you would have to ask her that.

MR. MORGAN: But not to your knowledge?

A. Yeah. I mean this email here -- yeah.

MR. MORGAN: Would she also reach out directly to another staffer in the office that you are aware of to talk about the substance of the bill?

A. Yeah.

MR. MORGAN: Who do you -- who are you aware of that she would also reach out to?

A. You mean whenever I handled the issue or whenever other people handled the issue? When Justin handled the issue, there was a little overlap
between me and him. When I handled the issue before
Justin showed up, I was the primary contact on the
legislation, and she would have had no reason to
call anybody else other than me.

MR. MORGAN: Her standard procedure
would be to contact whoever was the point person on
the legislation at that time?

A. Right, right.

Q. During October 2013, there were
meetings that were -- do you recall those meetings?

A. Yes, they were very effective and
there were a lot of them.

Q. Yes. So my question was related to
the scheduling of those meetings that was done by
Representative Whitfield's office. Correct?

A. Right.

Q. Did there come a time when some
offices were concerned about Representative
Whitfield scheduling meetings that involved Mrs.
Whitfield?

A. Nobody expressed concern that involved
Mrs. Whitfield. One office expressed concern that
we were setting up meetings for people that cared
about our legislation, so I called the House Ethics
Committee, they advised me to call House
Administration. House Administration told me that if we couldn't set up meetings for our bill, that we decided to do and that we cared about, that the boss, you know, when I say we, I mean the office and the Congressman and I, we all wanted this to happen, if we couldn't set up meetings for something that was on our bill, for advocates that were going to potentially co-sponsor our bill, then there was no reason for the Congressman to be in Congress. That's what House Administration told us.

MR. MORGAN: Do you recall who you spoke with at House Administration?

A. Kelly Kravens I believe was the person. Now, these meetings were set up for -- they were set up because Marty Irby and Donna Bennefield were in town. They were not -- you know, Marty at the time did not work for our office, and he's the past president of the Tennessee Walking Horse Exhibitors Breeders Association. And he took a position to support the legislation as a past president which was a huge win for the cause.

So, you know, he brought a lot of experience to what was going on, he and Donna both, Donna was the President of the International Walking Horse Association. So we were setting the meetings
up for Marty and Donna to go and meet with people to
urge them to co-sponsor the legislation. So
whenever one office expressed concern about us
setting up the meetings, they were expressing
cconcerns just generally setting up meetings for
people that cared about this issue.

Q. Who else was attending those meetings
with Marty and Donna?
A. Keith Dane attended a lot of them, the
-- Sara Amundson attended a lot of them, and Connie
may have attended some of them, but I don't think
she attended as many as Keith and Sara and I don't
even know which ones she attended and which ones she
didn't attend.

Q. Did you attend any of the meetings?
A. I may have attended one or two.

Because we were really working hard to get
Congressman Roe from Tennessee onto the legislation,
and may have attended that meeting, but that would
have probably been one of the very few. Because
there was no reason for me to really attend them,
the point was we were getting these meetings for
Marty and Donna who were the subject matter experts.

Q. The meeting with Congressman Roe, who
attended that meeting?
A. I did, and, you know, we met with Congressman Roe on several occasions. So I don't recall -- I don't know -- I don't recall whether I was in the meeting with Marty and Donna and the Congressman Roe meeting.

Q. Who do you recall me being at the meeting with Congressman Roe?

A. Connie was at a meeting -- Mrs. Whitfield was at a meeting with Congressman Roe and it was either -- I think it was Congressman Roe's staff, and Mrs. Whitfield and I were at a meeting once, I believe.

Q. When did that happen?

A. That probably would have happened sometime after the introduction of the bill in the last Congress, so sometime after October, sometime between October and December.

Q. In 2012?

A. Right.

Q. Did you have any meetings with Congressman Roe in this Congress?

A. I did not, because it became pretty clear that he wasn't going to co-sponsor the bill. I want to make sure I understand about the contact you had with the Committee on Ethics.
You called the Committee on Ethics after there was concern about the meetings, and what did you tell the Committee on Ethics?

A. I told the Committee on Ethics that we were setting up meetings for advocates, Marty and Donna, lobbying our efforts. They said -- they -- I believe what they said was I would need to contact the House Administration committee to get a final determination on that, because it dealt with the expenditure of, you know, federal funds.

Q. Did you tell them that Mrs. Whitfield was -- could possibly attend meetings?

A. I don't believe that I told them that.

Q. Was there a particular reason why you did not?

A. Well, that wasn't the point of setting up the meetings, we weren't setting up the meetings for Mrs. Whitfield, and so, you know, frankly I didn't know which ones she was going to and which ones she wasn't going to.

Q. Did you have concern about the fact she was a lobbyist and the Congressman's wife, and that's why you didn't mention it to committee?

A. Well, we -- I contacted the Ethics Committee pretty regularly to make sure -- because
obviously this is a touchy issue for our office. We
have to be very careful because the house rules
state what it does, that, you know, she can't
influence the office. So I mean I talk pretty
regularly to make sure that we are walking as far
away from the line as possible. So --
Q. So had you received advice from the
committee on this line, what did they advise you
about dealing with Mrs. Whitfield and the office?
A. Pretty specific to the meetings?
Q. Specific to any information --
A. The advice that we got was she can't
lobby our office, so, you know, she can't urge us to
do something legislatively for her. But as far as
like coalition building and, you know, because the
Humane Society cares about this issue too, she
obviously was well within her rights to go meet with
other members as well and do her job.
Q. And when did you receive that advice
about the -- the first advice you mentioned?
A. About where --
Q. About she can't lobby the office.
A. Well, we have had several
conversations with House Ethics, since I think she
started lobbying sometime in 2011, and you know, we
periodically do a check on specific situations with regard to her lobbying. So I mean I am probably on the phone with House Ethics, you know, once or twice a month just asking about case by case situations.

Q. Involving Mrs. Whitfield?
A. Not involve -- all involving -- you know, maybe once a month involving Mrs. Whitfield.

Q. And overall, you are saying the advice -- one bit of advice is related to the lobbying, but what other advice have you received from the Committee of Ethics related to Mrs. Whitfield?
A. I don't think I understand what you are asking?

Q. You mentioned multiple times you talked to the Ethics Committee --
A. Right, right, right.

Q. I am trying to get the --
A. Oh, the different things. You know, I don't recall, it was -- it wasn't related to the PAST Act, it was, just -- yeah, I don't recall what other things.

MR. PASSATINO: You might not have understood his question, and I'll let you ask it again, but you were asking subject matter, you were asking House Ethics. I am not sure you guys were
answering the same question.

MR. PAYNE: If that helps, if the way
he describes it helps, if you remember based more on
the subject matter or any more specific, it's just
very important for us to understand what advice you
received.

A. Well, I mean, you know, I know I had a
specific conversation about the PAST Act, and you
know, because I knew that the Humane Society, and I
told you about that but I don't recall, you know,
Mrs. Whitfield contacts the office on various things
throughout the week, and every time she calls about
an issue or something like that, you know, the staff
comes and talk to me about it. But I don't remember
the exact --

Q. Can you give me examples, what type of
issues are coming up, Mrs. Whitfield wants to do
what?

A. Well, I mean like, you know, there is
a lot of overlap between the Congressman's schedule
and her schedule, so there is a lot of events, you
know, outside of the Humane Society, because she
does a lot of, like, non profit stuff, I mean she's
on a few boards here in town beyond -- completely
outside of the Humane Society, so there would be
some interaction there that I would want to make
sure, like, you know, if the Congressman goes to
this and he receives a meal and is that appropriate,
and you know, those types of things. You know, it
was more, I think, just making the logistics of her
life as a lobbyist, and his life as a member of
Congress, a lot of those things -- well, her life as
a lobbyist never really overlapped with him, but,
you know, some of the other outside stuff that she
does overlaps with some of the stuff that he -- like
she attends, you know, she is a member of Congress'
spouse, like, she attends or allowed to attend
congressional delegation trips, and you know, he's
invited to various things and she attends those
things, so, you know, it's just a matter of figuring
out can they attend those things together, how does
that process work, what type of paperwork do we have
to fill out, you know, do we need to declare on the
front end that she's a lobbyist if she's attending
these type of things, there are just a lot of
questions that come about, and I am not a lawyer, so
we have to get peoples' advice on these things, and
we try to follow the letter of the house rules as
closely as possible.

Q. Well, what is the policy in the office
currently, because it sounds like you are the person who tells it to everyone else, when it comes to her contacts with the office, you mentioned generally she's not supposed to lobby. But what does that mean on a day-to-day, what are your marching orders to staff?

A. Well, the staff knows -- the staff knows if Connie asks for something, then they have to bring it to me and then we talk about it and then we will get the Congressman's ultimate decision on that. The Congressman is the ultimate decision maker, and you know, frankly whenever she's involved, there is an extra level of scrutiny just because she is a registered lobbyist, and that is part of the reason I am frequently calling the Ethics Committee. So, you know, the Congressman makes a decision on things, you know, involving her, unless it's one of those situations where we have always been involved in this issue, and you know, this is something -- like for example the Puppy Mill Bill.

We have been involved in the Puppy Mill Bill since 2001 whenever the Congressman first introduced that legislation. If she were to contact me on the Puppy Mill Bill, then, you know, I
wouldn't feel the need to ask the Congressman
because he -- he's always been involved in this
issue, he's already made a decision like this is
something I support, this is something we are going
to work towards.

Q. Okay. Okay. So the situation where
she's contacting you and you have already worked on
it before, you handle that differently as opposed to
something you haven't dealt with before, and then if
it's something new, you bring it to the
Congressman's attention?

A. Right.

Q. Okay. Did you have a question?

I wanted to ask about this email Bate
stamped HSLFOCE15759. And you can read the entire
thing but I really want to ask you about your email
on the second page to Mrs. Whitfield.

A. Yeah, this was the Renee Elmer's
conversation.

Q. Okay. Here you said you did not
inform them that Connie was attending these meetings
as I suppose they would be -- have expressed concern
since she's married to you and a registered
lobbyist.

A. Right.
Q. Can you just explain --
A. Well, first of all, I wasn't exactly sure if she was attending the -- all of these meetings, so, and also going back to the point of the meetings was to set up the meetings for Marty and Donna and so that was the reason why I didn't really want to get into that point with the Ethics Committee but I wanted the Congressman to know that we were getting push back from Renee Elmer's office.
Q. Okay. And then on the first -- on the first page, you did say that the Committee changed their mind. What did they --
A. They told us to contact the House Administration Committee, which I did, so the person at the Ethics Committee told me, well, whenever you find out -- whenever you hear from the House Administration Committee, I'd be interested to hear what they have to say, and so whenever I called them back to tell them what that House Administration Committee told me, they said that -- they said that -- wait a minute, okay.
So I am trying to recall all of this. Because this was back in October. So I contacted the Ethics Committee, they told me to contact House Administration, and then I think what happened was
the House Ethics Committee called me back and said
you can't set up the meetings, so I still went ahead
and contacted House Administration, they said we
could set up the meetings. So I contacted the House
Ethics Committee and told them that House
Administration told me I could do the meetings.
Then House Ethics says if House Administration says
you can do it, then you can do it.

At that point I was thoroughly
confused as to what should be going on and shouldn't
be doing -- shouldn't be going on and hence, why I
am bringing this to the Congressman's attention, and
I think -- yeah, that's how things transpired.

Q. Did the Committee on Ethics on any of
those exchanges bring up any issues with Mrs.
Whitfield?

A. I don't -- they may have said
something to the effect of you can't set these
meetings up for Mrs. Whitfield but we weren't
setting them up for Mrs. Whitfield anyway. We were
setting them up for Marty and Donna.

MR. MORGAN: Going to that, I think
you listed various organizations that were
stakeholders of the PAST Act, HC, AGP -- ASPCA?

A. Yeah, we set up meetings.
MR. MORGAN: Did the office,
  Representative Whitfield's office set up meetings
  for those --
  A. We set up a few meetings for the
  American Horse Council, we advised the American
  Horse Council on, hey, we got this response on this
  stakeholder, can you go meet with them. So we set
  up meetings for them and suggested meetings for them
  and the AVMA as well. So the AVMA and the American
  Horse Council were our two other go-to
  organizations.

  MR. MORGAN: How many meetings would
  you say you set up for AVMA if you were to estimate?
  A. Probably only like five or ten at
  most. We obviously set up a lot more with Marty and
  Donna and, you know, the Humane Society was involved
  in those because they were -- they were one of the
  people that -- the Humane Society brought Marty and
  Donna to town. Well, they didn't -- I don't know
  the logistics as far as who paid for them to come to
  town and stuff like that, but, you know, they helped
  identify those people, so.

  MR. MORGAN: But you viewed the office
  as setting up the meetings for Marty and Donna not
  for the Humane Society?
A. No, not for the Humane Society.

Q. Were any of the other stakeholders invited or --

A. Yeah.

MR. MORGAN: -- participated in those meetings?

A. Yeah, absolutely the other stakeholders knew we were doing these meetings, they knew Marty and Donna were being effective, so none of them really asked to attend but, you know, we did send them in sort of as a follow-up to try to seal the deal but there wouldn't have been a problem had they wanted to attend.

MR. MORGAN: Why didn't the Humane Society set those meetings up directly?

A. Well, you know, this issue is something the Congressman cared about very -- this one was one of his biggest priorities, this was something he wanted done, he decided to introduce the legislation, so the Congressman wanted us to facilitate these meetings because, you know, he felt like that by bringing in these subject matter experts, Marty and Donna, then, you know, that would be more effective, you know, if they knew the Congressman cared about this legislation.
MR. MORGAN: So that was a specific request from Representative Whitfield?

A. Uh-huh, yeah, he asked us to set up those meetings.

MR. MORGAN: Do you recall if he specifically requested that the office set up meetings on behalf of the other stakeholders as well?

A. Yeah, he asked us to set up meetings with the American Horse Council and AVMA.

You know, every one of the meetings he didn't ask us to set up, but there were occasions -- I mean there were -- he doesn't need to be involved in every situation, you know, I as the Chief of Staff and even the person that handled the animal issues can see, okay this person needs to hear from the veterinarians and that will help seal the deal as far as getting co-sponsors, so he wasn't involved in every one of those, but there were a couple of occasions where the Congressman said I want AVMA to go meet with these people, can you set that up.

Congressman Ted Yoho, for example, was a large veterinarian or was before he came to Congress, so it was more important for the American Veterinary Medical Association to get his
co-sponsorship, so he asked us to set up a meeting
between AVMA and Congressman Ted Yoho.

Q. I want to quickly move onto other
legislation. Did you have anymore questions about
the PAST Act?

MR. MORGAN: Yeah, so who was the
point person in Representative Whitfield's office
for setting up the meetings for Marty or -- and
Donna?

A. Emma.

MR. MORGAN: Did she at any point --
A. During the shut down, we had to
furlough -- we decided to furlough half of our
staff. So on a couple of days, Emma was furloughed.
So on a few occasions I reached out to staff and
asked for meetings for Marty and Donna. But I would
say Emma did most of the asking.

MR. MORGAN: Are you -- to your
knowledge, was there any discussion of
Representative Whitfield's office setting up those
meetings as opposed to the Humane Society setting
them up for a strategic purpose, like you might have
more success getting the meetings if it was the
member's office requesting them as opposed to the
Humane Society, was there a discussion along those
lines?

A. What do you mean, was there a discussion with the Congressman --

MR. MORGAN: In your office, or between you and the Humane Society.

A. Yeah, I mean because the people we were reaching out to knew the Congressman, there was a greater success of us getting the meetings, and there was also a greater success that they would co-sponsor the legislation as a result of us asking for the meetings, so, yeah, it was effective. We have 270 co-sponsors as a result of it, so, you know, obviously our people that are fighting us on this cause have reason to be scared and that's probably the reason we are sitting here today.

Q. So we will talk about other legislation.

A. Okay.

Q. I want to quickly ask you about a few pieces of legislation and get an idea of your role. With the Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act?

A. Right.

Q. Of 2013, did you work on it?

A. I worked on it in the sense of I added the Congressman as a co-sponsor and I may have
worked on signing onto dear colleagues. But I
wasn't as involved in that legislation as some of
the other legislation that the Congressman was
taking the lead on. That bill was first introduced
in 2001 and the Congressman was the original sponsor
of that legislation, that was prior to me coming to
the office so I didn't play a role in drafting that
legislation.

Q. Is that the Puppy Mill Bill that you
referred to earlier?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And did Mrs. Whitfield discuss with
you anything about him sponsoring the puppy mill
ban?

A. You know, I don't remember if it was
this Congress or last Congress, but she may have
brought it to my attention that we were not listed
on -- as a co-sponsor for this particular Congress.
And I think I -- I then added her -- added the
Congressman as a co-sponsor, but it wasn't -- I mean
it wasn't because she told me to or anything like
that, it was more of, you know, I noticed we weren't
a co-sponsor, we had been a co-sponsor since 2001
and it was sort of, it was an oversight on my part
to begin with. We should have been a co-sponsor
since the very get-go.

Q. The Animal Welfare Enforcement Funding of 2012, there is a letter, do you recall that?

A. Right, right.

Q. And what was your role with that?

A. So, we were -- we had co-sponsored or co-signed that letter in the past. So, you know, they get a number of signers onto that letter and I think it was a similar situation with the Puppy Mill Bill where, you know, there is a lot of these spending letters that go around the hill at the time of the appropriations taking place and it's sort of easy to sort of not recognize every email that comes into your email box. So I think we signed onto that a little bit late, and -- but we did, we may have signed onto it.

Q. And did Mrs. Whitfield communicate with you about signing on?

A. She may have mentioned that we were not on that one, but it was a similar situation where we had always signed onto that letter in the past.

Q. Did you have any concern about signing onto it in 2012 because of any --

A. Yeah, I mean there was a concern of
signing onto all spending letters, not just this
one, but all spending letters after the financial
bail out and everything that happened as a result of
that, and then the stimulus bills, our district
became very concerned about federal spending, which
they were always concerned but more so after the
bail out and the stimulus bills, and I -- we ended
up signing onto the animal welfare letter, and I
think we ended up signing onto one or two others but
we didn't sign onto as many as we had in the past.
And I am pretty sure I communicated to Connie, Mrs.
Whitfield, that, you know, that these spending
issues are, you know, more challenging than they
used to been -- used to be because of the public
perception that you are signing onto a letter
results in government spending.
Q. And just so I am clear, you decided
to sign onto it that year despite those concerns,
why?
A. Because there was an issue that the
Congressman had been involved in in the past, and
the letter specifically talks about funding for, you
know, the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act, I think
one of the other funds it wanted to provide funding
for was the Tennessee Walking Horse issue, it also
talks about the animal welfare laws, you know, all
of these are issues that he's been involved in in
the past and he really, you know, passionately
believes in the humane treatment of animals, so
that's something that has always been a
long-standing position in our office, so that was
the reason we decided that that would meet the
exception of going ahead and signing him onto the
letter.

Q. Did Mrs. Whitfield's communication to
you concerning him signing on impact the decision at
all to have him sign on?

A. No, I mean we were going to sign onto
the letter, and, you know, like I said, it's
something we have always been involved in.

Q. The Safeguard American Food Export Act
of 2013?

A. Is that the horse slaughter?

Q. Yes, different names.

A. Right.

Q. So you know it as the Horse Slaughter
Bill of --

A. Right.

Q. -- of which Congress was that?

A. Well, it's introduced to every
Congress and they come up with a new name every Congress.

Q. So you have worked on the Horse Slaughter Bill for 2013?

A. Yes.

Q. And have you had contacts with Mrs. Whitfield concerning that?

A. I may have communicated with her on that bill as well.

Q. Do you recall any --

A. I don't recall any details. I mean -- yeah, go ahead.

Q. Well, I am just understanding it seems as though you described the FAST Act, certain things you may discuss with her was strategy, co-sponsors or signing onto something, is that similar for --

A. Yeah.

Q. The SAFE Act? Okay.

A. We weren't as involved in the Horse Slaughter Bill this Congress as we have been in previous Congresses, mainly because we were focusing -- we are prioritizing our efforts.

Q. Did you have more contacts with her then regarding the Horse Slaughter Bill of 2011?

A. No, 2011 -- you know, we tried to push
forward this legislation and we actually got it passed through the house in 2008 or nine. And then the Senate didn't take it up, and it was -- maybe it was even before 2008, it might have been 2006, but anyway, we got it passed through the house sometime during that timeframe and the Senate didn't take it up, and the Congressman just realized that this is something that is probably not going to get done, so let's focus our priorities on other things that we stand a better chance of getting done. But, you know, the Congressman has been involved in that issue since 2001 or sooner as well.

Q. The Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act of 2013, did you have any involvement with that?

A. Not really -- no, I didn't really have involvement in that.

Q. Who is the person over that?

A. The person that handled our Veteran's affairs issues would have been the person that would have handled that issue, I believe.

Q. Do you know who that is?

A. What year was it?

Q. 2013.

A. 2013, I think Adam Moore. Adam no longer works in our office and the only thing -- I
was Chief of Staff at that time, and the only thing
that we would have done with regard to that
legislation is sign the Congressman onto the
legislation. We didn't really participate in
anything else other than signing onto the
legislation.

Q. Did you have any contacts with --
communication with Mrs. Whitfield concerning that?
A. I didn't. I don't think that I did.

And I don't think that Adam did either but, you
know, that's -- that's going complete off my memory
on that one.

Q. And the Animal Fighting Spectator
Prohibition Act?
A. Right.

Q. So you are familiar with that?
A. Yes.

Q. And what was your role with that
legislation?
A. We co-sponsored it.

Q. And did Mrs. Whitfield have similar
communications with you on this, as you described
earlier, with the PAST Act and the other
legislation?
A. I don't -- I mean I don't think so.
Q. You don't recall any?
A. I don't recall any.
Q. Communications?
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. And the Best Practices Act, are you familiar with that?
A. Best Practices Act, no.
Q. Okay.
A. Which one is that?
Q. It's not -- if you don't recall --
A. I don't recall it by name but I may know it if you tell me what the issue is.
Q. That's fine. Were you involved in the hiring of Marty Irby?
A. Yes, I was the Chief of Staff at the time and we were looking for someone to, you know, we had Justin left our office and Adam left our office, so we had two open slots, and we were looking for somebody and the Congressman called me and asked me to interview Marty, so I interviewed him.
Q. Did you have any conversation with Mrs. Whitfield about the interview or the hiring of Marty?
A. No.
Q. Did you have any conversation with anybody at the Humane Society concerning the hiring of Marty?
A. No.
Q. How many people interviewed for the position?
A. We -- we didn't like openly or like open the position to the public. We did word of mouth. But I probably got, you know, like I said, we were trying to fill two positions. And I probably got eight or ten resumes, just by word of mouth.
Q. Of those eight or ten resumes you received, how many actually sat with you?
A. How many I interviewed?
Q. Yes.
A. I interviewed -- since we were doing word of mouth and the people that, you know, referred these people to me, I think I interviewed at least eight.
Q. Okay.
A. And then, you know, I narrowed that down and passed two or three onto the Congressman. Those are just rough numbers.
Q. No, I understand.
A. Don't hold me to those numbers.

Q. So you were filling one position or filling two position?

A. Two.

Q. So you hired two people?

A. Yes.

Q. Marty was hired at the same time as who else?

A. Cassie Leonard is the person's name. She's our legislative correspondent. So Cassie handles our mail issues, and Marty was coming into handle our animal issues or AG issues.

Q. Are you familiar with the Peters Amendment that deals with the banning of polar bear hunting?

A. I am familiar with polar bear issues generally, just because the Congressman has been involved in that in the past. I don't remember specifically the Peters Amendment.

Q. Do you recall Mrs. Whitfield communicating with you about the Congressman voting on that amendment?

A. She may have communicated with me on that amendment. But that was again another one of those circumstances where the Congressman had
previously been involved with the polar bear issues,
and you know, he actually went to the floor and
spoke on the floor about one of the amendments. I
think, you know, this was probably back in 2009. He
spoke on the Ensley -- Congressman Ensley was in
Congress and had an amendment, so he went and spoke
on that amendment. So the Peterson Amendment -- if
the polar bear -- was we had always been involved
in, something we always supported.

Q. I want to check my notes, but I think
we have covered, I think, most of our questions.
Bryson, do you have any questions?

MR. MORGAN: I just want to understand
a little bit more generally what this interaction
with Mrs. Whitfield was like. If I were in your
situation, I would imagine that that might be a bit
challenging to juggle, getting requests from the
Congressman's wife, trying to determine how to
handle those, which once you agree to, which ones
you vet with the member --

A. Yeah.

MR. MORGAN: So that's my words --
those are my words, but I was wondering if you could
describe generally what managing that relationship
was like for you.
A. I mean it is challenging which is part of the reason why I am always on the phone with the House Ethics Committee, to make sure, you know, I am trying my best to operate within the confines of the house rules.

MR. MORGAN: Have you ever discussed with the House Ethics Committee, you know, you discussed you sort of have a methodology, if she mentioned to you --

A. Right.

MR. MORGAN: -- that Representative Whitfield should sign onto something or vote a certain way if it's what he's done in the past, you would generally do that?

A. Right.

MR. MORGAN: Have you ever discussed that with the Ethics Committee?

A. No, like our procedure of signing onto legislation?

MR. MORGAN: Yes, at her request.

A. No, no.

MR. MORGAN: Okay.

MR. PASSATINO: To be fair, I'm not sure he said they signed on at her request. I think you are mischaracterizing --
A. Yeah, I agree.

MR. MORGAN: Signed on subsequent to a request by her.

A. What do you mean subsequent?

MR. MORGAN: Were there -- were there instances in which she reached out to you and asked that you have Representative Whitfield sign onto a bill, were there instances?

A. Yeah, but --

MR. MORGAN: Okay. Were some of those instances, were there times when he did in fact sign onto a bill?

A. Yeah.

MR. MORGAN: Okay.

A. But it wasn't because she was asking.

MR. MORGAN: Right.

A. It was because either he had long-standing -- long-standing, you know, cause for being involved in that or I asked him if he wanted to get involved, and you know, he's the boss. But you know, going back to your first question, you know, Mrs. Whitfield is probably disadvantaged in a certain extent because she does get an extra layer of scrutiny whenever she contacts our office, just because she is the Congressman's wife and she is a
registered lobbyist.

Q. How often does she contact the office?

A. On -- well, I mean -- she contacts our office two or three times a day, but you have to keep in mind, a lot of those are probably like, you know, when is the Congressman going to be home tonight or did he feed the dogs or, you know, what is the schedule look like for the rest of the week, you know, those types of things.

Q. How many of the calls per week would you say as an estimate is the ones where the staff have to come to you and ask a question whether something should be decided on what to do going forward?

A. I wouldn't know. I mean that would be purely guessing on that. I mean it sort of varies on a week by week basis, so I wouldn't know how to even guess on that.

MR. MORGAN: Have there been times when she reached out to you and requested that Representative Whitfield sign on as a co-sponsor or vote a certain way or take any other form of an official act where ultimately that course of action was not taken?

A. Yes.
MR. MORGAN: Can you describe some of
those instances if you recall any specifics.
A. So there is this Egg Bill.
MR. MORGAN: As in E-G-G?
A. Yeah, there is this Egg Bill that the
Humane Society cares about and the bill sets federal
parameters on the cage size for chickens for
hatching eggs, and farmers in our district don't
want it, farm bureau doesn't like it, the
cattlemen's association doesn't like it, the pork
producers don't like it. So Humane Society is one
of the leads on that legislation. She had contacted
me in the past about the Congressman engaging on
this issue. I told her it was a bad idea, we can't
do that and then I talked to the Congressman about
it, explained to him why we can't do it, he agreed
with me and we are not a co-sponsor of the
legislation.
And there are other examples too, but
that I think is one of the most recent.

MR. PASSATINO: Hey, do you mind if I
ask a question, do you mind if -- I think he might
have misspoken in response to a question, and I can
ask him about that in front of you all --
(inaudible).
(Whereupon, the recording is terminated.)
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EXHIBIT 8
From: Connie Harrison-Whitfield  
Sent: Saturday, January 7, 2011 9:33 PM  
To: Hicken, Cory <Cory.Hicken@mail.house.gov>  

Yes, I was assuming the changes would be made in markup.

Sent from my iPhone.

On Jan 7, 2011, at 5:39 PM, "Hicken, Cory" <Cory.Hicken@mail.house.gov> wrote:

The problem is that the bill has already been introduced and no changes to it can be made. We could suggest that they make the change during a markup. We could also seek feedback from him and put on his radar screen about making these changes during the committee process. I did not anticipate the Committee will be reviewing this bill for a couple of months in the future.

Sent from my iPhone.

On Jan 7, 2011, at 3:44 PM, "Hicken, Cory" <Cory.Hicken@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Since you are working with Chris on the bill, may you have him add in the two words "if appropriate" after the mention of shelter dogs as an exception? I was wondering why he removed "preferred" before "optional" but that added two words make too big of an out.

Thanks

Sent from my iPhone.

On Jan 7, 2011, at 2:13 PM, "Hicken, Cory" <Cory.Hicken@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Thanks, Connie. We've been talking to the staff about the bill and working through the new republican rules regarding introducing legislation and constitutional authority.

Sent from my iPhone.

On Jan 7, 2011, at 2:06 PM, "Hicken, Cory" <Cory.Hicken@mail.house.gov> wrote:

FYI

Cory,

Note that the bill is 50 years instead of 3 and unlike Hix's bill, it has no requirement to ensure the program produces scientifically reliable outcomes. More later.

Sent from my iPhone.
Begin forwarded message:

From: "Martin Mayerfield" <humanesociety.org>
Date: January 6, 2011 11:07 PM EST


With the support of original sponsors Reps. Michael Michaud, D-Maine; Peter King, R-N.Y.; and Leonard Lance, R-N.J., H.R. 267 would create a pilot program for training dogs to help treat veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder or other post-deployment mental health conditions. The bill was crafted so that the program will use the dog training process itself to provide therapeutic benefits, in essence, than for use as service animals or for their physical comfort. Another feature of the bill that he has brought forward from the animal welfare community is that it will allow shelter dogs to be involved so they can be part of the program.

In May, the Humane Society's President & CEO Jane C. Goodall issued a joint letter with Senators John McCain and Jim Webb requesting the inclusion of dogs in the legislation. The Humane Society provided the committee with a copy of the letter and asked that they consider the following points:

1. The need for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs to develop a comprehensive program for training dogs to provide support to veterans with PTSD and other post-deployment mental health conditions.
2. The importance of involving shelter dogs in the program to provide them with a second chance at a new life.
3. The potential for the program to serve as a model for other programs that assist veterans.

"This bill represents a major step forward in the fight against PTSD," said Rep. Grimm. "So many service members and veterans returning from combat struggle with PTSD. I am pleased that the Humane Society, the American Psychological Association, and other advocates have provided thoughtful input into the development of this legislation. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that this important legislation is enacted into law."

In the final version of the legislation, the Humane Society and its partners worked to ensure that the program would be well-funded and would involve shelter dogs from across the country.

"We are pleased that the language in the final version of the legislation will allow for the inclusion of shelter dogs in the program," said Jane Goodall. "This is a significant step forward in the fight against PTSD and will provide a second chance at a new life for thousands of shelter dogs.

"This is an important step forward in addressing the needs of our veterans," said Sharon Anliker, Senior Vice President for Government Relations at the Humane Society. "We look forward to working with Congress to ensure that this program is properly funded and that it has the resources necessary to help our veterans and shelter dogs.

The Humane Society of the United States is dedicated to the protection of all animals, and we believe that the inclusion of shelter dogs in this program is a significant step forward. We are grateful to Rep. Grimm and his team for their efforts in this important issue."

Confidential Treatment Under the NonDisclosure Provisions of H.Res. 855 or the 110th Congress

as Amended Requested
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In the last session of Congress, Sens. Al Franken, D-Minn., and Johnny Isakson, R-Ga., and Reps. Ed Gomes, D-Conn., and Ed Whitfield, R-Ky., championed provisions in the 2009 Defense authorization bill authorizing the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to partner with reputable organizations on a three-year pilot study of the use of service dogs to treat and rehabilitate wounded veterans, including those suffering from PTSD.

Media Contact: Matis Montefiore, 202-543-

Follow The HSUS on Twitter: See our work for animals on your iPhone by searching "HumaneTV" in the App Store.

The Humane Society of the United States is the nation’s largest animal protection organization—backed by 11 million Americans, or one of every thirty. For more than a half-century, The HSUS has been fighting for the protection of all animals through advocacy, education, and hands-on programs. Celebrating animals and confronting cruelty—on the web at humane.org.

If you would rather not receive future communications from Humane Society of the United States, please send by writing Humane Society of the United States, P.O. Box 99, Washington, DC 20007 United States.
EXHIBIT 9
I've got to get this draft bill out before the next week. I'll get to it in August...

[Email content]

On July 14, 2013, at 10:05 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

They got back with me. We are on the initial meeting call.

Karen/Trudie
Legislative Aide
Congresswoman Betty Nutter (93-11)

Confidential Treatment Under the Non-Disclosure Provisions of H.R. 685 or the 111th Congress as Amended Requested
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Kevin, I tried to email Drew Kent, but it bounced back. Can you add Rep. Whitfield as a co-sponsor to HR 2012?

Cory Hicks
Legislative Service/Policy Coordinator
Rep. Ed Whitfield
212-325-3112
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
- Image001.png - Image002.png - Image003.png - Image004.png - Image005.png
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
Visit his official website.
EXHIBIT 10
The email and press release content is as follows:

**Email Content**

OK, let’s talk to Craig and John.

From: Cori Hamre-Wheeler (hamre-wheeler@senate.gov)
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 11:11 AM
To: Hamre, Cori
Cc: Hamre-wheeler@senate.gov
Subject: Re: Utah: Times investigation paints disturbing picture of horse racing industry

I was just thinking that Ed is in the House and two more articles are coming. Are people seeing the articles you write a Pulitzer award.

From: Cori Hamre-Wheeler (hamre-wheeler@senate.gov)
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 11:11 AM
To: Hamre, Cori
Cc: Hamre-wheeler@senate.gov
Subject: Re: Utah: Times investigation paints disturbing picture of horse racing industry

She’s a good writer. I think Utah is in a different position for issuing a statement because the article is about his state. I think it makes as much sense for WA to do one, but I can still fire away answering to what is out there.

From: Cori Hamre-Wheeler (hamre-wheeler@senate.gov)
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 11:07 AM
To: Hamre, Cori
Cc: Hamre-wheeler@senate.gov
Subject: Re: Utah: Times investigation paints disturbing picture of horse racing industry

10:09 Press Secretary a good writer? Yes, perhaps they could issue a statement.

From: Cori Hamre-Wheeler (hamre-wheeler@senate.gov)
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 11:02 AM
To: Hamre, Cori
Cc: Hamre-wheeler@senate.gov
Subject: Re: Utah: Times investigation paints disturbing picture of horse racing industry

Thanks, Water issue unsolved.

From: Cori Hamre-Wheeler (hamre-wheeler@senate.gov)
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2017 10:56 PM
To: Hamre, Cori
Cc: Hamre-wheeler@senate.gov
Subject: Re: Utah: Times investigation paints disturbing picture of horse racing industry


**Press Release Content**

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
March 26, 2017

Utah: Times investigation paints disturbing picture of horse racing industry

WASHINGTON — Following a two year, in-depth report by The New York Times on the state of horseracing, in the United States, U.S. Senator Tom Udall (D-NM) issued the following statement:

"Below is the statement issued by Tom Udall in response to The New York Times investigation of horse racing, "Broken Down – Death and Dishonor at America’s racetracks."

 regards,

Kevin

Kevin We Care
Office of Sen. Tom Udall

Confidential Treatment Under the Non-Disclosure Provisions of H. Res. 889 or the 110th Congress as Amended Requested
The findings outlined in The New York Times investigation about horse racing in the United States, and New Mexico in particular, paint a very disturbing picture of the industry.

The sport of horse racing, while at its best, showcases the majestic beauty of this animal and the athleticism of jockeys, has instead an alarming level of corruption and exploitation. The consequence of mismanagement and lack of oversight is an epidemic of animal doping that has led to countless humiliations of helpless horses and the injury and death of their riders.

The Times report has shone a glaring light on the need for national standards in a sport that spans gambling, pari-mutuel betting, and horse racing. The Integrity Horse Racing Improvement Act would help address these issues.

I urge our leaders in Congress to advance this bipartisan legislation between Congressman Ed Whitfield and I have introduced in both chambers to improve the sport of horse racing and set minimum, nationwide standards for medication and doping. The Integrity Horse Racing Improvement Act would help restore the sport. The horse racing industry has promised voluntary reforms for decades, but as we’ve partially observed, our legislation is the only viable way to address doping problems plaguing the sport.

"Now is the time to end the unsavory practices of these trainers and track veterinarians in horseracing who abuse these magnificent animals and endanger jockeys for gambling profits."

---

Confidential Treatment Under the Expediting of the Non-disclosure Provisions of H. Res. 865 or the 110th Congress in Amended Requested
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EXHIBIT 11
From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 11:50 AM
To: [humanesociety.org]
Subject: Re: Jockey

Ok

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Comic Maryland-Wilfond [humanesociety.org] 
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 11:48 AM 
To: Hicks, Cory 
Subject: Re: Jockey

Cory,

Please be sure to vote for the Piusa amendment today (banning polar bear imports and hunting in all parts). Ed voted this way last time.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 17, 2012, at 11:07 AM, "Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov" wrote:

> Good point on how hard it is to ban militarization on tracks. Maybe I don't fully appreciate how hard it might be for a track owner to prohibit bets, but I know he is very controversial as he was involved in Soro's in Maryland. We need to have good winners, without bogglers and free what I've found out, he has bogglers.

> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: Staci Harrier [actforsan.org] 
> Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 9:43 AM 
> To: Hicks, Cory 
> Cc: "Golde Harrier-Wilfond" [humanesociety.org]; "Arthur Handicaps" [actforsan.org] 
> Subject: RE: Jockey

> Getscha...maybe don't need to rock the boat right yet.

> But we do need to follow up on the issue with Neptune and Mr. Dunkin. Because he did ATTEMPT to ban medication on his tracks.

> We all know by now that it isn't so easy as just stopping medication...due to need for his tracks to make money...but if the track owners threaten to leave there and run elsewhere...that is just another example of why we need the Federal Legislation.

> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov] 
> Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 8:15 AM 
> To: [humanesociety.org]; [actforsan.org] 
> Subject: Re: Jockey

> Thanks, Staci. We'll follow up with Cory today.

EW4o40770
We looked into Strickland and he seems to be a pretty controversial person, especially in Maryland. Plus, if he owns all these properties, he can test even always periodic. I know one trial, but I’m concerned about getting him in front to explain why he failed: answer probably being he owned a male name.

--- Original Message ---
From: Staci Hartsock <stacihartsock@astound.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 4:23 AM
To: Camile Hartsock-Matfield <camile.matfield@humanunity.org>; Hicks, Gary
Cc: "Arturo Hernandez" <stacihartsock@astound.com>
Subject: Re: Jockey

Spoke with Gary yesterday from the airport.............He is working on coming up with another jock to testify.
He mentioned Jerry Balfay.
I qualified again the lack of the hearing on that Jockey safety and health would be a major issue.

Gary do you want to work directly with him? Or ......?
I sent you his email address last week......
Let me know either you can follow up today or I will.

Also, just back in town...what happened about NAGA testifying?
Strickland himself, Murphy King, or....
Gary said he could make one call about this as well. He just needs the go ahead.

Gary is such a great team member!!!!

Staci
EXHIBIT 12
From: Nick Cory  
Subject:  

That's a bad idea. Pork producers were just in today lobbying against it. Cattlemen don't like it and farm bureau doesn't either.

Sent from my iPad  
On Sep 18, 2012, at 5:35 PM, "Connie Harrisson-Whitfield" wrote:  
> Ed just decided to sign on to the egg bill. I advised against it....  
> Sent from my iPad  
> On Sep 11, 2012, at 7:52 PM, "Miss, Cory" wrote:  
> so. She did not. She understands its sensitivities.  
> Sent from my iPad  
> On Sep 12, 2012, at 9:02 PM, "Connie Harrisson-Whitfield" wrote:  
> Ed, Cory,  
> bill Cory made reference to the HB54 in fn's press release as this article seems to suggest?  
> Sent from my iPad  
> On Sep 12, 2012, at 6:14 PM, "Michael Herkheimer" wrote:  
> http://www.tennessean.com/story/2012/sep/12/tennesse-pressstat  
> into-push-for-banning/PID518199/  
>  
> Sullivan Wednesday, September 12, 2012 WASHINGTON - Seniors, the  
> practice of putting inviting chickens on a horse's leg to make it prance, would be  
> prohibited if a law U.S. Rep. Steve Cohen plans to introduce becomes law.  
> The Humane Society of the United States has condemned the practice as cruel. In a  
> statement circulated by both Tennessee Democrat Cohen's and Kentucky Republican Congressman  
> Ed Whitfield's offices, they describe seeing it as an abusive practice used by some horse  
> trainers to the Tennessee Walking Horse Industry.  
> Mike Hickendorf, president of the East Tennessee Walking Horse Association, said Wednesday  
> He was aware of some controversy regarding the practice raised by the U.S. Department of Agriculture  
> but was not familiar with the proposed legislation.
EXHIBIT 13
EXHIBIT 14
EXHIBIT 15
Justin Freid
legislative Aide
Rep. Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
(202) 225-

... Original Message ...
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 3:00 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]; Freid, Justin;
blackberry, ed; Park, Chris
Subject: Re: Rules Committee/PAST

Isn't the current Dear Colleague signed by only Whitfield and Cohen?

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 16, 2013, at 2:40 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Yes. We'll make that change.
>
> ... Original Message ...
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 2:30 PM
> To: Hicks, Cory
> Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]; Freid, Justin;
> blackberry, ed; Park, Chris
> Subject: Re: Rules Committee/PAST
> > Cory,
> >
> > Did you see that the list of endorsers needs to be revised?
> > Sent from my iPhone
> >
> > On Jun 16, 2013, at 2:28 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:
> >> Thanks, Connie. Deadline to submit amendments is 2pm on Monday and the cmts will meet at
> >> 5pm, but the amendments may not be discussed until the following day on Tuesday. We have all
> >> the items below except the AGA support letter.
> >>
> >> ... Original Message ...
To: Nancy, Greg Fared, Quinby, Justin Fared 
Cc: Greg Ficks; Blackberry, Ed,ファク,Chris
Subject: Ed/Rules Committee/RAST

Ed is now focused on RAST. We discussed it this morning and have come up with the following checklist that needs to be implemented ASAP.

1. When will Mon/Tues is he scheduled to go before Rules Committee?
2. Supporting documents etc. need to be finalized for his appearance before Rules.
3. OIS Report
4. RAC/AMP Press Release
5. NHMA AMP Press Release
6. List of Endorsers (needs to be revised: American Quarter Horse Association should be #4 on list and under Horse Industry Professionals, Items 15-27 should be eliminated)
7. Text of Amendment
8. Article showing violations of top trainers in Hyster program
10. Myers v Facts Sheet
11. Tennessee articles

3. Send out DME colleague letter Mon Tues, Wed with signatures of all 5 lead co-sponsors.

5. If amendment is allowed, arrange meeting with Lucas.
6. Arrange meeting with Peterson.

Sent from my iPhone
EXHIBIT 16
From: Connie Harman-Whitfield <harmanc@house.gov>

Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 4:43 AM

To: Hicks, Gay <gay.hicks@house.gov>

Subject: Re: statement on weighted dose implementation under FAST

Name and Contacts used in fall. They would like a statement disagreeing the weighted dose provision from the bill's text and the委员 the member votes no on the amendment. It would be Monday.

Send Screen reference:

On Sep 24, 2013, at 9:37 AM, "Hicks, Gay" <gay.hicks@house.gov> wrote:

> So, they want a statement at the hearing? That's easy, but far off. This is an official document from our office, so can someone at TSHA take part in the hearing? Maybe they can reword the bill? 
> 
> <Original message>
> From: Connie Harman-Whitfield <harmanc@house.gov>
> 
> Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 9:31 AM
> 
> Dear Gay, 
> 
> Subject: Re: statement on weighted dose implementation under FAST
> 
> Yes, they want an update on the hearing. I'll reword the bill for you. Can someone at TSHA take part in the hearing? Maybe they can reword the bill?
> 
>  
> > From: Gay Hicks <gay.hicks@house.gov>
> > 
> > To: Connie Harman-Whitfield <harmanc@house.gov>
> > 
> > Sent: September 24, 2013 10:20 AM
> > 
> > Subject: statement on weighted dose implementation under FAST
> > 
> > So, they want a statement at the hearing? That's easy, but far off. This is an official document from our office, so can someone at TSHA take part in the hearing? Maybe they can reword the bill?
> > 
> > From: Gay Hicks <gay.hicks@house.gov>
> > 
> > To: Connie Harman-Whitfield <harmanc@house.gov>
> > 
> > Sent: September 25, 2013 8:34 PM
> > 
> > Subject: statement on weighted dose implementation under FAST
> > 
> > Gay, 
> 
> > The McGovern document is in "unprocessed material" and is a DSGU document (though we should see it by now). It doesn't help my cause at all, so I would come from the office and be referred to the document. This is being treated just like before, as if it is in the context of minor policy and small issues.
> 
> From: Gay Hicks 
> 
> To: Connie Harman-Whitfield <harmanc@house.gov>
> 
> Subject: statement on weighted dose implementation under FAST
> 
> Gay, 
> 
> The first time I saw the McGovern document, it came from your office. I thought it was something we would refer to the document. It doesn't help my cause at all, so I would come from the office and be referred to the document. This is being treated just like before, as if it is in the context of minor policy and small issues.

Confidential Treatment Under the Non-disclosure Provisions of H. Res. 685 or the 110th Congress as Amended Requested
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EXHIBIT 17
Sure thing.

--- Original Message ---
From: Condoleeza Harris <Condoleezaharris@whitehouse.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 12:37 PM
To: Hicky, Cory; Pack, Chris
Subject: Hicky: Correction...Re: cosponsor list on PAST

Can you set up a meeting with Varoufakis?

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Miki Brady <Miki.Brady@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 12:37 PM
To: "Hicky, Cory" <Cory.Hicky@whitehouse.gov>, Condoleezza Harris <Condoleezaharris@whitehouse.gov>, "Pack, Chris" <Chris.Pack@whitehouse.gov>, Sara Amidon <Sara.Amondon@humanesociety.org>, Keith Wone <Keith.Wone@humanesociety.org>, Cee Kerner <Cee.Kerner@humanesociety.org>, Lauren Allen <Lauren.Allen@humanesociety.org>
Subject: Correction...Re: cosponsor list on PAST

I just noticed that Rep. Varoufakis recently joined the Energy and Commerce Committee (replacing Harvey), and is on the Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade Subcommittee. I noted the double canton symbol after his name on the attached list, so this is the better version to use if you need it. Thanks, Mind

--- Original Message ---
From: Miki Brady
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 12:37 PM
To: "Hicky, Cory"; Condoleezza Harris; Pack, Chris
Cc: Sara Amidon; Keith Wone; Cee Kerner
Subject: cosponsor list on PAST

FYI, so you all have it, attached to our current cosponsor list -- which doesn't yet have Rep. Varoufakis. (Note that the list here does not include Cong. Whitefield as a cosponsor, since these sheets are meant to match THOMS. In the scorecard and my email to the Hill, I did include the prime sponsor in the total count.) Miki

--- Original Message ---
From: Miki, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicky@whitehouse.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 12:39 PM
To: Condoleezza Harris; Miki Brady; Pack, Chris
Cc: Sara Amidon; Keith Wone
Subject: RE: checking on this...mi: marathon will sign on to working
But not yet. They said they would get back with us tomorrow when their SB gets back.

--- Original Message ---
From: Connie Harrison-Whitfield [humansociety.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 12:16 AM
To: Mimi Brody; Nicky; Cory; Pack; Chris
Cc: Connie Harrison-Whitfield; Sara Andrews; Keith Burns
Subject: Re: checking on this...#8: Marino will sign on to sponsoring

Did Marino contact Ed’s office to co-sponsor?

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 14, 2013, at 12:04 AM, “Mimi Brody” <humansociety.org> wrote:

We haven’t yet added Marino to the list, which explains the discrepancy in our counts. With him and counting Cong. Whitfield, there are currently 39 on PAST. Do you know where we’re at on this? Please let me know if you’d like me to reach out to Bill Tingle or Anjay Fox. I don’t want to duplicate, and wasn’t part of the meeting last week, but I’m happy to try contacting them and could play dumb – just wanted to confirm before we include check for him on the scoreboard. We’ll be circulating via email to House offices tomorrow.

From: Connie Harrison-Whitfield
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 3:46 AM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Marino will sign on to sponsoring

Working on that.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 10, 2013, at 2:18 PM, “Mimi Brody” <humansociety.org> wrote:

Tara wrote me back, “No, please don’t. Marino’s office should contact Cory first.” I told her I’d wait. Frankly, we could wait a long time for Marino’s staff to do the next step. Maybe Cory or Chris can call Marino’s office to confirm what they heard Marino (or his staff) told you?

From: Connie Harrison-Whitfield
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 1:55 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Marino will sign on to sponsoring
do for it!

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 10, 2013, at 2:43 PM, “Mimi Brody” <humansociety.org> wrote:
Howay -- great work, Sara, Emma, and Keith! Is it ok to let Rep. Barletta's staff know that Martino has agreed to join on PAST? I ask because when I met with his staffer Calie Karchak last fall, she said she was surprised that Martino wasn't yet a cosponsor of PAST, having found the animal fighting analogy compelling. She's not the point person now for Barletta -- I'm following up with Thomas Lamorte, who may not have noticed that Martino wasn't on the bill. But it couldn't hurt to let him know as an update (reason to double-check after my email to him on TARS), if you're ok with my indicating that Martino has said he will sign on.

-----Original Message-----
From: Sara Amundson
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 2:26 PM
To: Fed leg list
Subject: Martino will sign on to spring

But likely can't add him today, so please dont change score. Jesus/IP, convicted on animal fighting quickly. Let's catch up.
EXHIBIT 18
We will go through the list along with the proposed text as soon as we get your edits.

--- Original Message ---
From: Cokie Mathews <COKIE.NOBLE@MCCONNELL.Senate.GOV>
Sent: Tuesday, October 8, 2013 9:49 PM
To: [Redacted]@snowmass.org
Cc: Paid, Office of Senator Pack@Sen.Biz.Senate.GOV
Subject: Re: DC Letters

Cokie,

I just got the draft. New colleagues for whom I reach out to Congress (cusses, and hopefully US delegation. It also seems likely now that Kehoe is in the Illinois delegation. In both cases, should we give them a list of their delegation members emailing from 5 A.M. or will their figures than ask themselves?  

Cheers

Sent from my iPhone
From: Marcia Harriman-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Does M still get 2 witnesses?

Let me talk to John.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 31, 2013, at 11:54 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Spoke to Gary, he basically wanted to let me know that they are updating Fred on all of this on Tuesday. I informed him that a dual bill legislative hearing was not acceptable. Also spoke with him about H165 and he agreed that wasn’t a good thing. He is talking to John later today on this issue and he is going to ask John to call both and tell them not to testify. We’re still working Schowowsky’s office too. I mentioned this other guy that could testify and he was very reluctant to have a secret witness because he was worried that we couldn’t keep it secret (which was my main worry as well). What if he just suggested to the docs that they ask someone else (another typo)?

---Original Message---
From: Marcia Harriman-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 12:55 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Does M still get 2 witnesses?

Ok, let me know.

---Original Message---
From: Marcia Harriman-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 11:35 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Does M still get 2 witnesses?

Let me talk to John.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 31, 2013, at 11:34 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Spoke to Gary, he basically wanted to let me know that they are updating Fred on all of this on Tuesday. I informed him that a dual bill legislative hearing was not acceptable. Also spoke with him about H165 and he agreed that wasn’t a good thing. He is talking to John later today on this issue and he is going to ask John to call both and tell them not to testify. We’re still working Schowowsky’s office too. I mentioned this other guy that could testify and he was very reluctant to have a secret witness because he was worried that we couldn’t keep it secret (which was my main worry as well). What if he just suggested to the docs that they ask someone else (another typo)?
So far she's only got Dr. Bennett, but they're giving her two. I doubt she can find anyone else.

-----Original Message-----
From: Corina Harrison-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 9:00 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: 0012: Does NYS still get C witnesses?

-----Original Message-----
From: Corina Harrison-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 9:32 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: HSUS testifying? RC: ERC hearing on minor

-----Original Message-----
From: Corina Harrison-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 9:48 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: HSUS testifying? RC: ERC hearing on minor

-----Original Message-----
From: Corina Harrison-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2013 10:48 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: HSUS testifying? RC: ERC hearing on minor

-----Original Message-----
From: Corina Harrison-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 3:38 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: HSUS testifying? RC: ERC hearing on minor

-----Original Message-----
From: Corina Harrison-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 2:23 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: HSUS testifying? RC: ERC hearing on minor
I think the HSC is working with the Dems to be able to testify.

Sent from my iPhone

Cory,

688
EXHIBIT 20
Cory wants us to do the puppy mill bill. NBA wasn't ideal, but I think it is fine. We've been on it every year.

H.R.363 (112th)

Latest Title: Puppies: Uniform Protection and Safety Act


Committee: House Agriculture

Referred To: 3.07


Chris Vilsack
Legislative Director/Policy Coordinator
Rep. G. Allard Staff
220-325

Follow Rep. G. Allard on the web:


http://www.house.gov/allard
EXHIBIT 21
From: Frederick M <Frederick.McCray@house.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2013 2:10 PM
To: [snip]

Subject: HR687, can Greg Whitefield join funding letter before tomorrow's deadline?

Dear [snip],

I am writing to follow up on the email I sent last week regarding the possibility of Greg Whitefield joining the funding letter for HR687 before tomorrow's deadline. As of now, it appears that the letter will not be signed by all the members of the committee.

I understand that there may be some logistical issues that need to be addressed before we can finalize the letter. However, I would like to emphasize the importance of having a united front in our efforts to secure the funding for HR687.

Please let me know if there are any updates on the status of the letter. I would be grateful for your assistance in this matter.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Frederick McCray

---

Reply from [snip]

Subject: Re: can Greg Whitefield join funding letter before tomorrow's deadline?

Dear [Frederick McCray],

Thank you for your email. I am pleased to inform you that Greg Whitefield has confirmed his intention to sign the funding letter for HR687 before tomorrow's deadline.

Please let me know if there are any further updates or changes to this arrangement.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

[snip]
EXHIBIT 22

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW
OF REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD’S
CONGRESSIONAL AIDE
INTERVIEW OF [REDACTED]

April 24, 2014

Present:

Kedric Payne
Bryson Morgan
[REDACTED]
Stefan Passatino
Benjamin Keane

Transcribed by:
Stephanie Lyn Rahn, CSR
License No. X101717

**PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of the transcript are phonetic**
QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

Q. This is Kedric Payne and Bryson Morgan with the Office of Congressional Ethics, and we are joined by [redacted] as well as his attorneys Benjamin Keane and Stefan Passa’tino.

A., I want to just begin with a few background questions. Some are pretty obvious but we need them for the record.

What is your current job title with Representative Whitfield’s congressional office?

A. Press Secretary.

Q. And how long have you been Press Secretary?

A. Since March 1.

Q. And what was your title prior to being Press Secretary?

A. Congressional Aid.

Q. And how long were you in that position?

A. I think it was December 2 when I started, so three months.

Q. Where were you employed prior to working in the Congressman's office?

A. I had my own company in Tennessee,
Baskin Irby Construction Company which we closed in
August or decided to close in August of last year.

Q. What type of construction is that company?
A. Home exterior.

Q. How long have you known Representative
Whitfield?
A. I met him by phone in -- around the
first week of September, just before Labor Day of
2013.

Q. And can you describe that phone call?
A. Yes, I actually reached out to his
office in DC, I could give you a lot more
background, but I was in the Tennessean newspaper
for coming out endorsing the PAST Act, and I reached
out to his office in Washington, D.C. to let them
know I'd like to help with the PAST Act and if there
is anything I could do, I'd be willing to help and
probably three weeks, four weeks later, Emma his
scheduler finally contacted me, it took awhile, and
said he would like to talk to me and set up a phone
call for me to talk to him.

Q. And what was discussed during that
phone call?
A. Basically my background in the walking
horse industry, what goes on as far as soring and the abusive practices that the PAST Act would stop. What my -- you know, my most recent turn of events had been over the past year with coming out sort of publicly against the soring, and he asked me if I would be willing to testify at Congress if they had a hearing.

Q. And did you agree to testify?
A. Yes.

Q. And were there also any discussions about you coming to DC and meeting with members of Congress or staff for Congress concerning the PAST Act?
A. No.

Q. How long have you known Mrs. Whitfield?
A. About the same time. She was actually on the phone call when he called me.

Q. And what did she say on the call?
A. She really didn't say that much, she just asked some questions about my background as well.

Q. Who else was on the call?
A. That was all.

Q. And when did you learn that you would
testify in the hearing?
A. Well, the next morning, Cory Hicks, his Chief of Staff, contacted me and said he thought they would have a hearing, and he asked me again, and I said yes, I told the Congressman I would be willing to testify and we really didn't know, it was up in the air for several months because the hearing date kept getting pushed back, and I came to DC for another reason, a Sound Horse Conference, and we finally found out the date of the hearing while I was actually here in DC.
Q. What conference did you say you were here for?
A. Sound Horse Conference.
Q. When was that that you came for the Sound Horse Conference?
A. Within a few days of October 13, 2013, one way or the other, a few days.
Q. And when was the hearing when you testified?
A. November 13.
Q. November 13?
A. I believe that's right.
Q. What did you do between November --

October 13 and November 13 related to the FAST Act?
A. An associate of mine Donna Bennefield and I went to meetings to basically lobby for the FAST Act and try to educate people about the soring issues.

Q. And how was that arranged, that you and Donna would go and speak to people about the FAST Act?

A. Some of our first meetings we actually went to ourselves and were set up through the Sound Horse Conference people, and then a few days later, Congressman Whitfield's office started setting up appointments for us.

Q. How did Congressman Whitfield's office get involved?

A. We basically told them since the hearing was postponed, we would be willing to stay and help, you know, support the bill if they would be willing to set up meetings for us to go to.

Q. Who is Donna, can you give me more details on her?

A. She is a Sound Horse advocate that's been involved in this since the early 1980s, she's probably been involved in this issue probably longer than anybody on earth that I know of and she's the Vice President of the International Walking Horse
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1 Association, and she was the former -- don't hold me
to this title exactly, Director of the Horse
Protection Association -- Horse Protection
Commission.

Q. These meetings that you had on the
hill during that time period, October up until the
hearing, can you describe those meetings in general,
what were they, who attended, what would you say in
general?

A. Some of the meetings were with actual
members of Congress, some of the meetings were with
staff members, some of the meetings were set up by
Congressman Whitfield's office, some of the meetings
were set up by other people, like Former Senator Joe
Tidings. I know he set up some meetings that we
went to, he actually introduced the original Horse
Protection Act of 1970.

Donna and I went to most of the
meetings together, sometimes we had other people
that went with us, Keith Dane from the Humane
Society or Sara Admundson, a few of those Connie
Whitfield went to with us, and there were other
people from the Sound Horse Summit, Laurie Northrup
from Friends of Sound Horses that went,
veterinarians that went with us to some of the
meetings. There may have been some with the
American Horse Council, there were a lot of
meetings, so it's hard for me to remember.

Q. How many meetings were there?
A. Oh, gosh, between 75 to 100 probably,
I mean -- well, if we did it four days a week, there
were probably five to six -- yeah, probably about
that number.

Q. And these meetings went from October
until after the hearing or before the hearing?
A. Until about three or four days after
the hearing. Whenever Donna left, she had to go
back to Tennessee.

MR. MORGEN: You were here in the DC
area that entire period?
A. Uh-huh.

MR. MORGEN: Who was covering your
expenses while you were up here?
A. Well, for part of the time I stayed
with a friend, Keith Dane, and for about a one week
period of that, an organization Friends of Sound
Horses that I am a member of covered the expenses
and then the rest of the time Congressman Whitfield
actually let me stay at his home with him.

Q. Approximately how many days or weeks
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did you stay with Congressman Whitfield?

A. Probably altogether about six weeks or so, and part of that was prior to working for him and part of that was after coming to work for him, because I basically was homeless.

Q. Okay.

MR. MORGAN: I think you mentioned it, I don’t want to -- you know, ten minute explanation, but give us sort of a more general idea of how you came to be homeless, your transition up here to DC, we understand from the documents that there was a little bit of a story there.

A. I don’t mind telling it, well, I had to file for bankruptcy, my wife left me and half of my family doesn’t speak to me because I came out publicly for this issue because my family is very deeply entrenched in the soaring issue and very against having the bill forward. My business partners were very heavily involved in it, all of the people I am naming have Horse Protection Act violations and so my whole world collapsed, the best way I know to sort of describe it.

I had to leave shortly after I first talked to Congressman Whitfield about testifying.

My wife actually went and told the general public
that I had agreed to testify, so for safety reasons,
because I had threats, I actually had to leave where
I lived and went to Alabama for about a week, and
then I ended up going, I didn't have a safe place to
go, I ended up going and staying with Donna
Bennefield at her home in Tennessee for about five
or six weeks prior to coming to DC and came to DC
with her.

Q. And then after going through all of
that and coming up here and doing the hearings and
the meetings, how did you come to settle up here and
specifically, how did you come to work for
Congressman Whitfield?

A. Well, because I didn't have a job
while I was here, actually lobbying, I applied for
other jobs, I really enjoyed DC and liked what I was
doing. I applied for some jobs with the Senate
committee and some other members' office and I think
you all probably have the emails about those, and
then after I testified, I had a threat that was very
-- the Huffington Post actually wrote an article
about it and it's out there, and my safety was an
issue of going back to Tennessee or not, and so
Congressman Whitfield said we would like for you to
say with us for a little longer, we don't think it's
safe for you to go back to Tennessee, we don’t want
anything to happen to you.

So I was still here, staying with him,
looking for a job and I went to friends in Virginia,
actually let me back up, I went -- first he
mentioned to me that there was a job, a legislative
correspondent, that just a few days before, the guy,
Adam, I can’t tell you his last name, was leaving
because he’s getting married and asked me if I might
be interested in it, and I said what did it entail?
It was basically just writing letters and I said I
need some kind of job, and he said if you are
interested, would you go talk to the Chief of Staff
and send him your resume and everything like that.
So I went through that process, talked with the
Chief of Staff and then he said basically he thought
I was a little more seasoned for something a little
bigger than that job, and they did have another
position that a guy named Justin Fareed had been in
several months before that handled the PAST Act and
he had not filled that position and he asked me if I
might be interested in that, and I said yes, that
would be something more apt for what I’d like to do,
and he said okay, I’ll get back to you. Then I
probably didn’t hear anything for a week or so or
maybe ten days, and I was gone out of town to
Virginia for a friend of mine to Thanksgiving and I
came back the Sunday after Thanksgiving, Sunday
night and was still staying at the Whitfields,
Congressman Whitfield told me that he thought that
Cory was really interested in hiring for me for that
job, and told me the next day to talk to Cory about
it and he hired me for the job.

Q. And did you have any -- did you apply
for any jobs at the Humane Society?
A. I did in August of last year, I
applied for the Director of the Doris Day Rescue
Ranch in Texas and then in either late October or
early November, I applied for the Director of Rural
Outreach and there was another job that was in
public relations or communication and I can't
remember what the title was but there were three
different jobs I applied for.

Q. And did you speak with Keith Dane
about possible employment with the Humane Society?
A. I did once but not really him so much
as they have a process, they have a very lengthy
process, I spoke with -- I went through three or
four different interviews on different levels,
mainly I spoke with Ben Callison who was in Texas
with the Doris Day Ranch out there.

Q. Did you speak with Wayne Pacelle?

A. Yes, once.

Q. Concerning employment?

A. Yes.

Q. And what did he say about your employment with the Humane Society?

A. He basically said that he thought I would be good at government affairs and he referred my name to another gentleman Wayne Waters but I never heard anything back from him.

Q. Did Wayne or Keith mention to you the possibility of you working in Representative Whitfield's office?

A. No.

Q. Okay. And did you speak with Mrs. Whitfield about your seeking employment in Representative Whitfield's office?

A. After he said something to me, I told her I applied for a job there and went and talked to Cory.

Q. And what did she say about you working there?

A. She said well, she thought I would be good to have in the office, outgoing, and an
Q. And did she go into any more details in terms of being good in the office and being an asset, what did she mean by that?

A. I think because of my outgoing personality and I have been effective with talking with other legislators and I don't meet a stranger. Honestly Justin Fareed, I think, in the office who had my position before was very similar.

Q. Okay. And did you guys -- well, did you and Mrs. Whitfield discuss the PAST Act and how that may be impacted by you going into Representative Whitfield's office?

A. Yes, we talked about that it would be good to help promote the PAST Act along with all the other agricultural issues, but, you know, that I had the knowledge and background and I think there was sort of a disconnect in the office at the time of people who actually really had a lot of first-hand knowledge and experience, so I brought a lot to the table with my experience and knowledge about it.

Q. When you started working for the Congressman in December 2013, can you describe your role with the PAST Act?

A. It was probably about half of my time
I spent on the PAST Act. The other half, there is a whole portfolio of issues. I went to some meetings with a variety of people, set up some meetings for a variety of people, called a lot of offices trying to get co-sponsors. Just basically generally gaining support from different people for the bill and the coalition there.

Q. And were you also involved in with strategy and determining the best way to promote the bill?

A. Yes, yes.

Q. What were your other duties?

A. The Science and Technology Committee, all of the entire AG portfolio which is, you know, anything to do with farming, GMO labeling, just a variety of issues and ethics -- trying to, there is a couple more, postal issues, the -- did a lot of work on the farm bill, because at that time we were working on the farm bill, so a lot of my time was spent on the farm bill.

Q. When you first started the job, were you expecting that it actually may be more time spent on the PAST Act, say maybe 70 to 80 percent of your time on the PAST Act?

A. I don't know that I expected it to be
that much but I thought there would be a good bit of my time, yes.

Q. When you were working on the PAST Act, are you still currently working on the PAST Act?

A. I am. I still handle all the agricultural issues, and they gave all the other issues to somebody else.

Q. Let me clarify that then, currently as Press Secretary, you deal with all the agricultural issues, which includes the PAST Act?

A. That's right.

Q. And then you deal with press?

A. Yes, and social media, all communications basically.

Q. When you are working on the PAST Act, I am saying from December until the present, can you describe your communication with Mrs. Whitfield on that, and I am saying in general, so what role does she play with those things that you just described ranging from meeting with members, gaining co-sponsors, strategy, just gaining support?

A. You know, we talked maybe once a week, maybe every other week about horse -- when I was staying with them, we talked more, but since I haven't been staying with them, we talk every week,
every other week, about strategy, and is there
anybody that we need to sure up and find out if they
are interested in helping us with the bill or are
there any -- you know, new co-sponsors that we could
gain, things like that, mainly co-sponsors.

Q. Let me make sure I understand the
timing of when you no longer lived with the
Whitfields. So you were basically --

A. The month of December.

Q. So in January --

A. My lease started January 1, so the
month of December, but we were closed for part of
that time with Christmas and the holidays, so it was
actually about three weeks of December.

Q. And your communication with her during
this time period from December to present, when it
comes to what you just described, is that typically
over email, in person, over the phone?

A. That was at night when we were at home
and eating dinner or just talking in general.

Q. So that was more so in December, how
about in January to present now that you are living
separately?

A. A lot less, I mean like I said,
probably once a week or every other week, maybe for
-- I have probably talked to her a total of 30
minutes in the past two weeks.
Q. Was there a time in, say, December,
when the communication was a lot more, so that for
whatever reason, you were speaking with her multiple
times per day?
A. I don't think during the day really
but like I said, at night, yes, there definitely was
because I was staying with them and it was the topic
that we both were interested in and cared about so
we talked about it every day.
Q. Do you recall scheduling of interviews
in -- sorry, scheduling of meetings in January and
issues with whether or not Emma would be able to
schedule the interviews that were related to the
PAST Act?
A. Yes.
Q. I keep saying interviews.
A. Meetings, yes.
Q. And can you describe that, the issues
that were involved and the concerns?
A. There were some offices that I think
Emma had already reached out to prior to me coming
to work there that she said she had reached out to
and I can't give you specifics, and they either
didn't respond or had not met with anybody, and so
she wanted me to, Cory and I had a discussion about
this, she wanted me to contact the offices and set
up the meetings instead of her, and she said, you
know, now that you work here, you need to be the one
setting up the meetings, and then I think other -- I
started setting up the meetings from that point
forward other than when the district attorneys from
the State of Tennessee came in town, and we all sort
of chipped in, Cory, Emma and I to schedule meetings
for them.

Q. Did Mrs. Whitfield speak with you on
how to deal with the scheduling issues and having
Emma make the calls for the meetings?

A. I think one time she said something
about would you see if Emma would help you about the
meetings because you have so much work now, and I
did, and then I had push back from Emma that
basically it was my job to do that not her job.

Q. Do you have communications with Mrs.
Whitfield about making sure or having Representative
Whitfield do certain things related to the PAST Act?

A. No, not really.

Q. Any situation you can think of? Like
having him meet with certain potential co-sponsors?
A. There -- I really don't remember anything specifically that, you know I have asked him things that I came up with, you know, like I would take a list of co-sponsors and ask Cory or somebody are these people somebody likely to get on the bill and then give him packets to go to the floor but not really directly from Connie, no.

Q. I am going to show you a document that's bates stamped EW4002881. Feel free to read the entire document but I will ask you a question concerning the email from Mrs. Whitfield to you that begins with maybe we should try to get Ed to call Yoho.

A. Yes, I remember this. It was really more, I think -- I initiated and asked Connie about it. Could you contact Yoho's office -- (inaudible).

Yeah, I do remember discussing this with her about talking to Yoho but it was more of a collective effort of, you see they are talking about Whitney here, that was Whitney Miller with AVMA, the American Veterinary Medical Association, and they have met with Congressman Yoho on a number of times and occasions and I think he's a veterinarian and a member of the organization, so I do remember this, yes.
Q. So are you saying -- so I am clear, whose idea was it to have him meet with Yoho --
A. I don't remember specifically. I mean if we sat here and read this whole thing you could probably figure it out, but I know we discussed Yoho on a number of occasions with American Veterinary Medical Association Whitney Miller from there.

MR. MORGAN: Who were some of the other people you were in frequent contact with once you started working in the congressional office with regards to the PAST Act?
A. Did I answer what you wanted to ask about that?
Q. Yes.
A. Well, you have Jay Hickey and Ben Pendegrass with the American Horse Council, and then Keith Klein with the American Association of Equine Practitioners, and Ronda Haven and Whitney Miller with the American Veterinary Medical Association, and then you have Wayne Pacelle and Keith Dane with the HSUS, and then you have Sara Admundson with HSLF and Carolyn Snur I think is how you say it and Anthony with the ASPCA. And then you have Chris Hyde with the Animal Welfare Institute, and then you have Samantha Roberts with Senator Ayotte's office.
and Kaitlyn Runyon with Senator Warner's office and
Marilyn Dilhay with Congressman Cohen's office and
Mike Dunvet and Mark Davidson who are the district
attorney and assistant district attorney in
Tennessee who prosecuted the Jackie McConnell case,
and Laurie Northrop with Friends of Sound Horses,
Teresa Bippen with Friends of Sound Horses, there is
more. I am just trying to remember.

MR. MORGAN: Any one of those
organizations that you were in more frequent contact
with?

A. I would say AVMA, American Horse
Council, AAEP and HSUS and ASPCA, those five are
probably the main ones that I have talked with the
most. I mean the others are in there pretty much,
because I have like a sort of coalition when we have
information, we send it out or ask a question about
what they think about this or that, but those are
the main five groups that have volunteered to do the
most work really.

Q. I am going to show you another
document dates stamped EW3000459. I really want to
ask you about meetings with Senator Alexander.

A. I remember this.

Q. Okay. So you -- when Mrs. Whitfield
1 says Ed and I met with him, what was your
2 understanding of --
3 A. That was before I was ever involved in
4 the PAST Act and I know they met with him but I
5 don't really know what happened, it was before I
6 ever met them I believe.
7 Q. The email is dated December 13 but you
8 are saying she's referencing a meeting?
9 A. Prior to meeting them.
10 Q. Have you attended a meeting with
11 Senator Alexander?
12 A. No, not in person. Well, met him on
13 the subway train and brought it up.
14 Q. You don't miss an opportunity?
15 A. No, not at all.
16 Q. Okay. Are you aware of Mrs. Whitfield
17 and Representative Whitfield meeting the Senator
18 other than this reference in the email of something
19 that happened before you were involved?
20 A. No.
21 Q. Have you attended any meetings with
22 members of Congress or their staff where you were
23 there along with Mrs. Whitfield and Congressman
24 Whitfield?
25 A. No, not with both of them.
Q. So you have had meetings with Representative Whitfield and other members of Congress?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And you have had meetings with Mrs. Whitfield and other members of Congress?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And all related to the PAST Act?
A. Yes. Well, with him, far more than the PAST Act, but --
Q. Okay.
A. Yes. I mean I meet with him with anybody that has to do with AG issues, so.
Q. Did you meet with Representative Phil Roe?
A. Yes.
Q. And did Mrs. Whitfield or Representative Whitfield attend?
A. Mr. Whitfield did not but I believe Mrs. Whitfield did with Donna Bennefield and myself.
Q. And when did that meeting take place?
A. Sometime in the second half of October or first half of November, I couldn't tell you the date.
Q.  2013?
A.  Yes, 2013.
Q.  And can you describe the meeting?
A.  We discussed the PAST Act with him, Donna and I both being from Tennessee, he's a medical doctor, he said his issue was it that it had a felony provision, and we explained to him that Tennessee statute had passed a law in the previous year that made it a felony in the State of Tennessee and now people were going over to Kentucky and other areas, particularly Congressman Whitfield's district and doing more of the soring, so that was a need for the felony provision nationally, and he said I'll take a look at it, and you guys have done a good job presenting this to me and we will see what we can do.

And then I think we had follow-up emails with his staff who just kept blaming it back on the felony provision and wouldn't really give us a straight answer really.
Q.  Did you have any other meetings with the member?
A.  With Phil Roe?
Q.  Yes.
A.  I think I stopped him in the hallway
one time too, outside of his office, and brought it
up again, yes, I think that was just me.

Q. With the meetings you had in October
2013, that was prior to you being a staffer, were
there any current staffers with Representative
Whitfield at that time?

A. At that particular meeting?

Q. Let me rephrase it. Tell me everyone
who attended the meeting?

A. That meeting? Donna Bennefield,
myself, and Connie Whitfield.

Q. Okay. And that was it?

A. Yes. I am not -- there wasn't a staff
person but I am not telling you that -- who was in
his office and was there or there is a possibility
that Keith Dane could have been there, I just -- I
have had a lot of meetings.

Q. Okay. Have you attended a meeting
with -- well -- Senator Thad Cochran?

A. Yes.

Q. Who attended that meeting?

A. Connie Whitfield, myself, Senator Joe
Tidings who is a former senator, he set up the
meeting, Cory Hicks and Chris Pack.

Q. You said Tidings set up the meeting?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Can you explain?
A. Well, I think they are sort of the same era, same age bracket, and Senator Cochran was somebody we were trying to get on board the PAST Act and Senator Tidings had a list of people he brought up to us. Rockefeller, I think people he had known a long time that he wanted us to go meet with and he said he would set up the meetings if we would go.
Q. I am going to show you an email bates stamped HSLFOCE029215. And I want to ask you about the email from Mrs. Whitfield to you which she begins perhaps you as Whitfield’s office can let McCaskill’s, et cetera, et cetera.
A. Let me read.
Q. Sure, take your time.
A. From here up and then let me see.
Okay. So you are asking me about the email at the top from Connie?
Q. That’s right. Basically the question what does that mean and then can you explain the will do?
A. Background is Teresa Bippen is the President of Friends of Sound Horses, FOSH, this starts. She and I and Connie went to a meeting with
Roy Blunt's Chief of Staff during the days prior to
the hearing because Teresa was here and she
testified at the hearing. I think Connie set up
that meeting on her own because she's friends with
Roy Blunt and knows him, somehow, and then -- so
Teresa got actively involved and wanted to get the
people from Missouri on board, and basically she's
mentioning here, I kind of let McCaskill's and
Wagner's offices know Fosh is trying to get a hold
of them and maybe pass along Teresa's information
and I can't remember if I did or I didn't.

Q. What was the significance to you as
you read as Whitfield's office, that she puts after
perhaps you?

A. I don't really -- just me, I worked
there at the time, so.

Q. Are there other ways that you would
contact the office other than as Whitfield's office?

A. Not after coming to work there, no.

Q. Okay. Did you receive similar
requests from Mrs. Whitfield about setting up
meetings for --

A. Yes, a few times. I can't remember
specifics, but -- I am trying to think if there is
any -- I think maybe she suggested some of the
people that I asked the Tennessee attorneys to meet with. Basically educating me because I was new on names of good people to try to meet with.

Q. Did there come a time in December 2013 when Mrs. Whitfield contacted you and informed you she would no longer contact you at Representative Whitfield's office?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And what do you recall about that?

A. I think there was an email she sent Emma and I had that she and I had been working together and she really didn't think about it as working in his office, and she was instructed or something she wasn't supposed to contact us anymore or something like that.

Q. And after that, how did the communication change between you --

A. I just talk to her on my own time, I mean at night or something like that.

Q. Okay. Can you define your own time, so at night?

A. At night, weekends and sometimes I go for -- we have lunch hour, sometimes I go for dinner to their house, something like that, you know.
Q. And during your own time, is when you would have conversations about the PAST Act?

A. Uh-huh.

MR. MORGAN: So the way you interpreted her message was that she wasn't to contact you during official time?

A. Yes.

MR. MORGAN: But she was permitted to contact you outside of official time?

A. Yes.

Q. When is the most recent time that you communicated with her?

A. Last night.

Q. Okay. And what was that concerning?

A. Basically Congressman Whitfield, he's hurting really bad right now and has some pains, I was checking on him and actually I called to let her know that one of the Senate offices had contacted me, that they might be interested in co-sponsoring and it was some good news, thought she might need some good news with the way he's kind of been hurting lately.

Q. And so at this point, I guess you answered this before, I guess at this point you communicate with her probably how many times a
week?
A. Once a week, once every other week.
MR. MORGAN: How often would you say those communications involve the PAST Act?
A. We probably discuss it every time, but nine times out of ten, but I mean we discuss a lot of personal things too, she is with me like my family was, she's sort of become like my second mother through all this too, and really helped me with some personal things, just talking.
MR. MORGAN: We did notice that some of the emails, you refer to her as mom?
A. Yeah, I mean she's -- like, yeah, I love her to death and she's been great, just, you know, emotionally and things like that, just talking about things, so.
Q. And the way you just described it is a situation where you contact her but how frequently does she contact you, whether on your own time or whatever, concerning --
A. I probably call her more than she calls me.
Q. Does she email you still?
A. Yes, she emails more than she calls, and I'll email -- you know, I'll email her back,
sometimes it's about the PAST Act, sometimes it not.

Q. And just estimating, how frequently
does she email you about the PAST Act?
A. A couple times a week, two or three
times a week.

Q. I want to ask you about other
legislation?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. The Puppy Uniform Protection and
Safety Act, is that part of your portfolio, have you
worked on that at all?
A. It would probably be part of it but I
don't specifically remember that bill. It sounds
like it if relates to an animal, I deal with it.
Q. Safeguard American Food Export Act?
A. I know what it is, SAFE Act.
Q. Do you work on that now?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you had communication with
Mrs. Whitfield similar to what we described about
the PAST Act about co-sponsors, strategy?
A. I think I asked her about it one time,
because when I was new, I was trying to educate
myself on all of these other bills, because I knew
about the PAST Act, I didn't know about the other
bills, and maybe she told me what it was about, and
I remember talking to her one time about it.

Q. Do you remember any other time
communicating with her about it?

A. No, I don't think so.

Q. The Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act?

A. Is that the one with the -- yeah, I
think I know the bill you are talking about. That's
the -- what is the name of it?

Q. Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act?

A. I am not sure if that's the same bill.

There is another bill that's related to veterans and
rescuing dogs, but I don't know if that's the same
bill or not, a different name.

Q. So the bill you have in mind deals
with veterans and rescue dogs?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And what is your role with that
legislation?

A. I handle it under the portfolio of
animal portfolios, and actually the American Welfare
Institute is who brought it to my attention.

Q. Have you had communication with Mrs.
Whitfield concerning anything related to that bill,
whether it's -- like we mentioned before,
co-sponsors or strategy?

A. I don't remember if I did or not.

Q. And the Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act?

A. I don't know what that one is.

Q. Dog fighting related?

A. Not cock fighting?

Q. I'm not sure. Are you familiar with the cock fighting?

A. There is a cock fighting bill but I don't know about the one you are talking about.

Q. Is it the one where the member is co-sponsoring?

A. I couldn't tell you. It's not one that I worked on.

Q. Okay. Okay.

MR. MORGAN: With regards to the PAST Act, you listed a bunch of organizations and bunch of names. How relative to the other people you are in contact with, how do your contacts with Mrs. Whitfield compare, is she one of the more frequent persons you have contact with?

A. She's one of the less frequent.

Q. Less frequent. Who would you say is the most frequent person you have contact with about
the PAST Act?

A. I would say -- probably equally Keith Dane, Ben Pendegrass, Teresa Bippen and Whitney Miller. Maybe a little bit more with Keith Dane but it's only because they forward a lot of emails to me, I don't really respond to all of them, they just like to forward emails.

Q. Is Mrs. Whitfield on those emails as well?

A. Sometimes yes, sometimes no.

Q. Just so I am clear, when you say equal, you mean of those four people you listed, it's equal amount of time with them?

A. Yeah. I mean I really -- probably Keith Dane and Teresa Bippen the most two, Teresa is with FOSH but I have known them a lot longer, so I may contact them and ask them a question about something I don't know the answer to or hey, guys, do you have the statistics on this. They have the records and what not, stuff like that, so if I need statistics or information, I'll go to them to get it usually.

MR. MORGAN: Going down from that, those are the people you have the most contact with, Mrs. Whitfield would be significantly below that or
less frequently --

A. Eighth or ninth.

MR. MORGAN: Okay.

A. Something like that.

MR. MORGAN: You said it was in that October time period leading up to the hearing, I think you said you did about 75 to 100 meetings?

A. Yeah, probably about right.

MR. MORGAN: How many of those meetings were attended by Humane Society folks?

A. I don't know the exact number, half.

MR. MORGAN: Half.

A. I am guessing that.

MR. MORGAN: Any other organizations, any other organization that had a large chunk of meetings?

A. FOSH, Friends of Sound Horses, some of the veterinary people with some, I guess ASPCA, I guess, had some, I'd say FOSH is probably the other organization that had the most, because their main purpose for existence is this one thing, that

organization.

MR. MORGAN: So is it -- would it be correct to say that -- well, you said that you have contacted -- you have the most contact with Keith
Dane and Teresa Bippen?
A. Uh-huh.

MR. MORGAN: That would be with FOSH and the Humane Society?
A. Yes.

MR. MORGAN: Would it be fair to say those are the two main organizations primarily involved in the issues, do they have more involvement than the others?
A. I think they are probably equal with AVMA, American Horse Council, AAP, and ASPCA but I personally reach out to them more because I know them better, because I have a longer history with them, and if I need information, those are the two people I know I can get it the fastest from.

MR. MORGAN: Okay.
A. And with me, getting something fast in Congress is important.

Q. Good luck with that.

I just want to go back to something you mentioned in the beginning, your portfolio was ethics when you first started, and I just want to understand, what was the policy for dealing with contacts from Mrs. Whitfield with the office when you started?
A. Contacts from Mrs. Whitfield?

Q. Was there any policy, any discussion that the people had with you when you started at the office about what is the normal way that they deal with Mrs. Whitfield contacting the office?

A. Basically it was on a case by case thing. If there was something I felt like I should ask somebody else about, I went to Cory our Chief of Staff and asked them is this okay or not okay.

MR. MORGAN: Do you remember any specific instances when you took something to Cory?

A. Talking about some of the meetings that we set up and things like that.

MR. MORGAN: Do you recall, what was the question for Cory?

A. Basically there was some meetings that -- I think we set up, and I went to with Keith Dane from the Humane Society, and I really, I think it may have come from Keith Dane, I don't think necessarily that came from Connie, but I asked Cory, is it okay to set up and go to these meetings, so.

Q. You set up the meetings with Keith Dane or Mrs. Whitfield?

A. Keith Dane.

Q. Why would it not be okay?
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A. Because we already had the ethics issue come up.

MR. MORGAN: Was Mrs. Whitfield going to attend those meetings as well?

A. No. I only attended two meetings with her since I worked there and she set those meetings up.

Q. Which two were those?

A. Pennsylvania Senator that's a Democrat, his Chief of Staff, don't ask me -- Casey, and Rand Paul.

Q. When did those meetings occur?

A. December or January, I'm not certain.

Q. December 2013 and January 2014?

A. Yeah, somewhere in there. She met Casey's Chief of Staff at a fundraiser or something, some party she went to herself, and then knew Rand Paul.

Q. And just so I am clear, it seems like then with respect to any issues that come up with Representative -- well, Mrs. Whitfield contacting Representative Whitfield's office, is it a case by case situation and then you take it to Cory?

A. Yes.

Q. But there is no, just one policy one
way or the other of what is supposed to happen?
A. Well, basically I just kind of go on a
-- if I think this looks like something, you know,
that there could be a question about, I am going to
ask Cory about it whether it be her or anybody else,
I mean it's -- I tend to air on the side of caution
with anything whether it's her or somebody else on
another issue and ask the Chief of Staff, so.
Q. Do you have anymore questions?
MR. MORGAN: I don't think so. But
let me check my notes.
MR. PAYNE: I think that's all we
have.
MR. PASSATINO: Can I ask a quick
question and clarify one thing?
MR. PAYNE: Yes.
A VOICE: Independent of conversations
that you might have had either with the Chief of
Staff or anyone else, did you have an understanding
with respect to what office policy was with regard
to Mrs. Whitfield engaging in lobbying efforts with
your office?
A. Yes, I understand from reading the
ethics manual and ethics training that she could not
directly lobby our office.
MR. MORGAN: What did you understand the word lobby to mean in that context?

A. She couldn't try to get us to get on a bill, to write legislation or change legislation, co-sponsor a bill, things like that.

MR. MORGAN: Would that have included discussing legislation with her?

A. Well, I mean --

MR. MORGAN: Strategy?

A. In my opinion, no, because I discussed strategy with her but it wasn't about changing the legislation or Congressman Whitfield getting on a bill or things like that. From our office standpoint, it was strategy of getting other offices, co-sponsors to support our bill.

MR. MORGAN: And your understanding of what -- is your understanding just from your reading of the ethics manual or is that informed from conversations with somebody else in the office?

A. That's the way I took it and from other conversations with Cory, our Chief of Staff.

Q. Did you have any conversations with Representative Whitfield concerning that policy?

A. No.

Q. Or that rule or anything?
A. No.

MR. MORGAN: Any conversations with Mrs. Whitfield about that policy?

A. Yes.

MR. MORGAN: Can you tell us about those conversations?

A. Basically, you know, just like what we were talking about earlier when we strategized and things like that, I try to do it on my own time basically when I was with them at their house or something like that.

MR. MORGAN: Was that her understanding?

A. I guess it’s something we kind of both came to, just to make sure we were going above and beyond not to do anything improper.

MR. PAYNE: Okay.

A. Okay.

MR. PAYNE: Thanks.

(Whereupon, the recording is terminated.)
CERTIFICATE OF OFFICER

I CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony and proceedings as reported stenographically by me at the time, place and on the date as hereinbefore set forth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the action.

______________________________

STEPHANIE LYN RAHN
License No. X101717
Notary Public of the State of New Jersey
My Commission Expires April 18, 2017
43.8

G

gain 17.5
gaining 15.5 16.20
16.21
general 7.7 9.9
9.25 16.18 17.20
generally 15.5
gentleman 13.10
getting 5.8 11.9
37.37 41.12 14
give 3.13 6.19 9.9
18.25 20.6 25.19
giveo 15.15
go 6.5 8.12 10.5
11.13 14.2 20.6
27.8 9.29 23.24
35.21 37.20 38.21
40.2
goes 4.1
going 10.4 5.9 23
14.12 20.8 22.21
25.10 27.10 35.23
39.3 40.4 42.15
good 13.9 25 14.3
14.15 16.1 25.14
29.3 30.20 21
37.19
gosh 8.5
government 13.9
great 31.14
groups 22.19
guess 30.22 24
36.18 19 42.14
guesting 36.13
guy 11.7 19
guys 14.10 25.14
33.18

H

half 9.14 14.25
15.1 24.23 24
36.11.12
halfway 25.25
hand 16.5 33.20
handled 11.20
happen 11.2 40.1
happened 23.5 19
hard 8.3

haven 21.18
haven't 16.25
hear 11.25
heard 13.11
hearing 4.7 5.1 4.7
5.10 19.6 16.7
8.10 10.12 28.23
36.6
headings 10.10
heavily 9.19
help 3.17 18.6 17
14.15 19.16
helped 31.9
helping 17.3
herebefore 43.6
herein 11.9 20.23 25.5
30.15.21
hey 35.18
hickey 21.15
hicks 5.2 26.24
hill 7.6
hired 12.8
hiring 12.6
history 37.15
hold 7.1 28.9
holidays 17.13
home 3.5 8.24 10.6
17.19
homeless 9.5 10
honestly 14.8
horse 4.1 5.9 14.16
6.10 21.25 7.23
7.16.23 8.2 9.20
16.23 21.16 22.12
37.11
horses 7.24 8.22
22.6 27.27
24.36
hour 29.24
house 22.9 25.10
half 21.21
halfed 202.1215
27.11
buses 21.22 23.13
haffington 10.21
hammon 7.20 12.10
12.20 13.7 36.10
37.4 38.18
hurting 30.16 22

Hyde 21.24

id 3.17 18 11.23
36.19
idea 9.21 2.2
ill 11.24 25.13
31.25 14 35.21
in 34.2 8 39.13
included 14.2
important 37.18
improper 42.16
independent 10
industry 41
inform 22.17
information 28.10 25.1 27.14
inform 29.5
initiated 20.15
instances 38.11
institute 21.24
33.22
instructed 29.14
interested 11.10.13
11.22 12.8 17.3
18.10 30.9 43.12
international 6.25
interpreted 30.5
interview 1.4
interviewed 12.24
18.12.15.18
introduced 7.16
investigate 31.4
investigate 6.14.22.23
9.19.15.8 18.21
3.23 19 28.6 37.8
investigation 37.9
issue 6.23 9.16.17
10.23 25.8 39.29.40.8
issues 6.4 14.16
15.2 16.7 16.67
16.10 18.14.20
19.13 24 14.37.8
39.20

J

Jackie 22.5
January 17.10.11
July 13.11.13
17.22 18.13 39.13
39.14
Jay 21.15
jerry 43.23
jub 2.10 10.14 11.4
11.6 12.18 12.78
12.15 13.20 15.21
19.19 19.25.14
jobs 10.16 17.12 10.12
12.18
joe 7.14 26.22
joined 2.5
justin 11.19 14.8

K

kaitlyn 22.1
ekent 1.13 2.6
kerry 9.1 2.3
keep 18.18
kerik 7.20 8.20
12.19 13.22 21.17
21.20 26.16 35.2
35.5 15 36.23
18.37 19.22.24
kentucky 25.10
kept 5.8 25.18
kind 11.12 28.8
39.21 40.2 42.14
klein 21.17
knew 32.24 39.17
know 3.17 4.3 5.6
6.17.24 7.15 9.8
9.22 14.16 15.14
15.25 16.22 17.4
19.5 20.2 23.1 5
23.4 28.9 29.23
30.18 31.15 25
32.16 25 33.8.13
34.5 11.35 18.3
36.11 37.12.15
40.3 42.7
knowledge 14.17
14.20.21
knew 3.6 4.15
27.7 35.16
knows 28.5

L

labeling 15.15
labor 3.9
large 36.15
late 12.13
lately 30.22
laurie 7.23 22.6
law 25.8
leading 36.6
learn 4.25
lease 17.11
leave 9.23 10.2
leaving 11.8
left 8.12 9.14
legislation 32.7
33.19 41.4 4.12
legislative 11.6
legislators 14.7
lengthy 12.22
letters 31.11
levels 12.24
license 1.17 43.22
liked 10.16
list 20.4 27.6
listed 34.18 35.12
little 9.12 10.25
11.17 17.34
lived 10.3 17.7
living 17.22
lobby 6.2 40.25
41.2
lobbying 10.15
40.21
long 2.13 19 3.6
4.15 27.8
longer 6.23 10.25
17.29 26.35.16
37.13
look 25.14
looking 11.4
loans 40.3
lots 3.13 8.2 14.19
14.20 15.4 17.19
17.24 18.4 26.17
31.6 25.5 16
love 31.14
luck 57.19
lunch 29.24
lyn 1.16 43.22
EXHIBIT 23
Appointment
From: Sara Amundson [Redacted]@shusf.org
Sent: 1/7/2014 7:31:03 PM
To: Marty [Marty.Marty@mail.house.gov]; Connie Harriman-Whitfield [Redacted]@shumzmsociety.org
Subject: Strategy
Location: conf call
Start: 1/8/2014 4:00:00 PM
End: 1/8/2014 5:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: [none]

Please dial:

800/754
Access:
Security:

Confidential Treatment Under the Non-Disclosure Provisions of H.R. 655 or the 110th Congress as Amended Requested
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EXHIBIT 24
Appointment

From: Sara Annundson [sarahlphillips.org]
Sent: 1/10/2014 5:32:05 PM
To: Troy, Marty [marty.riley@house.gov]; Connie Harriman-Whitfield [humanesociety.org]
Subject: Follow-up FAST
Location: conf call
Start: 1/10/2014 8:00:00 PM
End: 1/10/2014 8:30:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: (none)

800/504
Access: 
Security: 

Confidential Treatment Under the Non-disclosure Provisions of H Res. 860 or the 110th Congress as Amended Requested
EXHIBIT 25
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 3:41 PM
To: Marty

Subject: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Softening Tactics) Act

Maybe we should try to get Ed to call Yoho.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 9, 2013, at 5:13 PM, "Ibby, Marty" <Marty.Ibby@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Ok, I'll ask Larry to help. I just sent him another message and reminder about Seattle.
>
> --- Original Message ---
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <wh@hsus.org>
> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 3:09 PM
> To: Ibby, Marty
> Subject: Re: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Softening Tactics) Act
> >
> > Yoho is a huge Tea Party guy.
> >
> > Sent from my iPhone
> >
> > On Dec 9, 2013, at 2:50 PM, "Ibby, Marty" <Marty.Ibby@mail.house.gov> wrote:
> >
> > Or Cory Gardner?
> >
> >> --- Original Message ---
> >> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <wh@hsus.org>
> >> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:49 PM
> >> To: Sara Amundson
> >> CC: Keith Deme, Ibiy, Marty, Sara Amundson, Connie Harriman-Whitfield
> >> Subject: Re: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Softening Tactics) Act
> >>
> >> What about having Yoho call him?
> >>
> >> Sent from my iPhone
> >>
> >> On Dec 9, 2013, at 2:45 PM, "Sara Amundson" <s.amundson@mail.house.gov> wrote:
> >>
> >> Please do. But I don't think that's the problem. He is a very tea party guy who just doesn't care about legislation.
> >>
> >> From: Keith Deme
> >> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:40 PM
> >> To: Ibiy, Marty, Keith Deme, Sara Amundson, Connie Harriman-Whitfield
> >> Subject: RE: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Softening Tactics) Act
> >>
> >> I'd be glad to have you reach out to Whitney thanks, Minni.
> >>
> >> From: Misti Brody
> >> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:37 PM
> >> To: Ibby, Marty, Keith Deme, Sara Amundson, Connie Harriman-Whitfield
> >> Subject: RE: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Softening Tactics) Act
> >>
> >> I can forward it to Whitney with your request, unless Keith wants to or Sara/Connie object?
> >>
> >> From: Ibby, Marty <ibby.marty.lby@mail.house.gov>
> >> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:31 PM
> >>
> >
Good, still hit them from a different angle. I have been instructed since they say "No" to leave them alone on my end...
Subject: HR. 1518 PAST (Prove All Sectors Trash) Act

>>

 Alexandrea:

>> I just wanted to follow up with you on our meeting from a month or so ago regarding Mr. Whitfield’s bill. Since then, a hearing has been held in the House on the issue. I have passed the link to the hearing information below. In addition, I was told by Mr. Whitfield last week on a staff member to handle this and other upcoming issues. We would greatly appreciate Congressman Amodeo’s co-sponsorship. Please let me know if you have questions on the hearing information or anything else. We are up to 64 co-sponsors in the House.

>> I look forward to working with you further on this and other issues.

>>


>>

>> All the best,

>>

>>

>> Marty Joly

>> Congressional Aide

>> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)

>> 2184 Rayburn House Office Building | Tel: 202.225.2000 Fax: 202.225.3547

>> marty.joly@mail.house.gov/public.affairs.house.gov/whitfield.house.gov

>> Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

>> <image001.jpg> - <image002.png> - <image003.png> - <image004.png> - <image005.png> - <image006.png>
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From: MaryPerley@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, January 7, 2014 11:41 AM
To: Connie Hartman-Waltrip BHMOS@humanoscociety.org
Cc: Teresa Beazer
Subj: "Re: Missouri Update/Quarterly"

Will do.

> From: [email protected]
> To: [email protected]
> CC: [email protected]
> Subject: Missouri Update/Quarterly
> Date: Tue, 7 Jan 2014 11:41:11 -0600
> 
> > Marty
> > > > Perhaps you (as Wellnets' efford) can let McCaskill and Wagner's offices know that MOSA is trying to contact them, the importance of MOSA etc. That way, Terri is yet to receive the reception she deserves.
> > > > Best,
> > > > Connie
> > > > Sent from my iPhone
> > > > On Jan 7, 2014, at 10:19 AM "Mary Perley" <MaryPerley@msn.com>
> > > > wrote:
> > > > Hey Terri!
> > > > Yes please do contact McCaskill, she is one of only 5 females in the Senate not on the AIS. We need her! Also Rep. Ave Wagner's COS is Christian Morgan (Christian.Morgan@Missouri.Governor.org) or [email protected] (Missouri.Governor.org) and her ID is Brian O'There

[Redacted]

> In Marty and Connie
> > I should let my Congresspeople know that I'm aRewcent-which has been in print and the story is not new. My mother has owned it for decades and has numerous situations. Her name isless Smith. After visiting her office in October and sending emails, I have heard numerous times and no one will return my calls.
> > 
> > So, I am going after first time Congresswoman Ann Wagner, [RE] who is a Democrat next to mine. Should I call first and ask for name of Chief of Staff? I just received the letter today on her 2013 tax writing as President of MOSA and at Missouri resident. I also have some information on the Missouri non-profit which aids in Missouri.
> > 
> > On another note, I have written Burt's COS, Pam, about 4-5 times. Should I start approaching Senator Claire McCaskill? She's a Dem and I know we wanted to load us on with first. Just let me know.
> > 
> > Time to bundle up to feed and shovet-- a brisk -5 (not a.m.) Make letter writing look easy."
> > 
> > Thanks,
> > 
> > Teresa
Will do. Thank you for letting me know about this... a major help to know.

Sent from my iPhone.

On Sat, 6 Jun 2014 18:19, Al J. Carvalho <jcarvalhowhitefield@humanesociety.org> wrote

...still be made through your email.

I looked up God Bless Elwood. It is stunning that she MUST set up appointments for out of town adoptions and that you can do it along. I've been in any problem with her please let me know immediately.

Great ideas.

Stay from me if you please.

On Sat, 6 Jun 2014 07:24, "Hey, Merry!" <lennon.rose@goodhouse.org> wrote:

We searched the Senate schedule calendar but it's off.

Sent from my iPhone.

On Sat, 6 Jun 2014 07:24, "Carvalho Whitefield" <jcarvalhowhitefield@humanesociety.org> wrote:

What does he mean "after consulting with legal and finance?"

Sent from my iPhone.

Inbox Service 

Jane, Smith Jones <jane.smithjones@humanesociety.org> to carvalhowhitefield@humanesociety.org

Date: Sat, 6 Jun 2014 01:43 AM

Subject: "Hey, Merry!" with regard to the poodles.

Car, Sarah Amato <sarah.amato@humanesociety.org> to carvalhowhitefield@humanesociety.org

Date: Sat, 6 Jun 2014 01:43 AM

Subject: "Hey, Merry!" with regard to the poodles.

Rachel Mil, Pasadena Branch

Date: Sat, 6 Jun 2014 01:43 AM

Subject: "Hey, Merry!" with regard to the poodles.

Doggie...

I got all of these messages on one subject tonight.

I am sorry to hear you are disappointed in having the Pasadena Branch overseeing DC on a monthly. Also consulting with legal and finance and determining the best place for it to go to DC is a lofty and ambitious goal, but the solution one of the day that she could make it, based on her schedule.

I hope you have a great day.

Kathy.

Sent from my iPhone.

On Fri, 5 Jun 2014 09:49 PM, "Carvalho Whitefield" <jcarvalhowhitefield@humanesociety.org> wrote:

Sent from my iPhone.

On Fri, 5 Jun 2014 09:49 PM, "Carvalho Whitefield" <jcarvalhowhitefield@humanesociety.org> wrote:

On Fri, 5 Jun 2014 09:49 PM, "Carvalho Whitefield" <jcarvalhowhitefield@humanesociety.org> wrote:

Kathy.

I am glad you were here in OHE's office today. However, the Boynton Beach branch is currently too busy to do a full-time meeting. Therefore, she will be available to meet with you on Friday.

Please.

Sent from my iPhone.

On Fri, 5 Jun 2014 09:49 PM, "Gail Ohe" <gail.ohe@humanesociety.org> wrote:

Brenda Poynter removes horses of thinking!  Thanks for walking us your way of thinking.


Please send me your thoughts. Thank you.

Brenda Poynter

Date: Fri, 5 Jun 2014 09:49 AM

Mike @ 510.366.9082


Confidential Treatment Under the NonDisclosure
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EXHIBIT 28
EXHIBIT 29
From: Carrie Harrison-Whitefield <carrie@harrison-whitefield.com>

Sent: Sunday, January 19, 2014 11:15 AM

To: info.Mary@bigfoot.com

Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Re: Major's story

We need to see the state of play on the
Openpath with members of the Ohio delegation.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 18, 2014, at 2:20 PM, "Mrs. Mary" <Mary info@bigfoot.com> wrote:

> Michael,

> Thank you for your response on January 17.

> My understanding is that the major's wife is inquiring about the
> status of the OpenPath development in Ohio. She also wants to
> know about the possibility of the project being moved to another
> state. Can you please provide an update on these issues?

> Thank you,

> [Redacted]

> [Redacted]

> [Redacted]

> [Redacted]

> [Redacted]

> [Redacted]

> [Redacted]

> [Redacted]

> [Redacted]

> [Redacted]
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EXHIBIT 30

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW OF REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD’S SCHEDULER
INTERVIEW OF [REDACTED]

April 24, 2014

Present:

Kedric Payne
Bryson Morgan
[REDACTED]
Benjamin Keane
Stefan Passantino

Transcribed by:
Stephanie Lyn Rahn, CSR
License No. XI01717

**PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of the transcript are phonetic**
QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

Q. This is Kendric Payne and Bryson Morgan with the Office of Congressional Ethics and we are with —

A. —. It's a mouthful.

Q. Spell your last name for the record?

A. Yes, —.

Q. And she is joined with her attorneys Ben Keane and Stefan Passantino. It is April 24, 2014.

, I want to start with a little background, get a few questions in here that are pretty much obvious but we need them for the record.

What is your job title with Representative Whitfield's office?

A. I am a Scheduler and Office Manager.

Q. Go ahead. How long have you been employed with his office?

A. Since August 2012.

Q. And have you had any other job titles other than Scheduler and Office Manager?

A. No.

Q. What was your prior employment?
A. I worked for a fundraising firm on the hill called Bogart Associates, so not with Federal Government.

Q. How long were you with Bogart Associates?

A. For about a year and a half.

Q. Have you ever worked on the hill before?

A. No.

Q. Can you describe your job duties as Scheduler and Office Manager?

A. Sure, I handle the Congressman's schedule predominantly, I process all meeting requests that come into the office, I schedule for staff as well. I meet almost daily with my Chief of Staff to go over the calendar, the meeting requests, I communicate daily with the congressman regarding his calendar and the rest of the staff for committee events, receptions, dinners, I also handle all of our campaign side scheduling, so I work with the firm that handles all of our fundraising here in DC, just on -- you know, the scheduling side.

As for office management, I handle all of our technology support, system administration, so anything with emails or cell phones, things of that
nature for my staff, purchase orders, communicate
with the district staff about district scheduling
and then I handle all of the Congressman's travel,
so, you know, getting him to and from Kentucky,
rental cars, hotels, I create travel packets, I also
handle all of his foreign travel if he is traveling
overseas, so I handle their passports, visa
applications things of that nature.

Q. Okay. With those job duties of
scheduling, are you in contact with Mrs. Whitfield?
A. I am, yes.

Q. Okay. And can you describe the type
of communication you have with Mrs. Whitfield?
A. Most of the time it is just strictly
about scheduling, so what is on the Congressman's
calendar, when he will be home during the day, you
know, we talk about events that she has scheduled,
so I can hold them on the calendar, any trips that
they have planned. I work with her with all of
that, you know, she -- I tell her whenever he is
traveling so she's aware of what flights he's taking
and when he will be gone, and that's really pretty
much it. We talk -- and a variety of other things
but mostly, you know, scheduling and just about what
his daily schedule is.
Q. Does she communicate with you about scheduling outside what the Congressman is doing, that is scheduling for anything that she's concerned with?

A. No, and I mean unless it's involving something that she wants him to also attend, a dinner or something that she has set up with another member or if she's involved in a charity event, then, yes, but that would be only because he would also be attending.

Q. Does she discuss with you scheduling for meetings that she's going to have with people on the hill whether they are members or staff of Congress?

A. No.

Q. Does she communicate with you at all about Humane Society issues or scheduling events or meetings relating to the Humane Society?

A. I don't directly with her, no. I am usually aware of the Humane Society events that are happening on the hill but not because she tells me about them, because I communicate with other Humane Society staffers.

Q. Who are the Humane Society staffers?

A. I communicate mostly with Sara
Q. And anyone else there?
A. Really just Sara.
Q. Mimi Brody?
A. Oh, yes, and Mimi, but not -- I haven't spoken to Mimi in months.
Q. How about Keith Dane?
A. I have emailed with Keith, yes.
Q. During the time period of October 2013, around that time, do you recall arranging meetings for Marty and Donna?
A. Uh-huh, yes.
Q. And who is Marty?
A. Marty is currently our press secretary in our office. He at the time was a part of the Tennessee Walking Horse Association, and was asked to come to the hill by the Congressman to promote and educate people about his -- the PAST Act.
Q. Who is Donna?
A. Donna, I actually don't know that many details about Donna, but she is also involved in Tennessee Walking Horses, so she used her expertise to also meet with members to promote the PAST Act.
Q. Approximately how many meetings did you set up for Marty and Donna?
A. Between 50 and 70 meetings.
Q. And with whom were they meeting?
A. They were meeting with members and members' staff, so depending if the member was available, then they -- I would set up a member level meeting, if not then most times they met with the Chief of Staff or the staffer that handles animal issues in that office that I was reaching out to.

Q. And just to be clear, what was the subject matter of the meetings as you understood it?
A. About the PAST Act.
Q. And the PAST Act is?
A. HR 1518 it's about preventing soring of Tennessee walking horses.
Q. How did it come that you were the person scheduling these meetings?
A. I was asked by the Congressman to set up the meetings because Marty and -- Marta -- Marty and Donna were coming by his request, so he asked me to set up these meetings on his behalf.

Q. And did you have any communications with Mrs. Whitfield about the scheduling of these meetings?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe those communications?
A. Well, I shared with her the schedule I had created for the meetings, so I prepared a Word document and I would share that with her.
Q. Why did you share it with her?
A. Because I was asked to by her and the Congressman.
Q. Okay. And who attended those meetings, the meetings with Marty and Donna and the members?
A. I don’t know who attended every single meeting. I only know that I shared it with -- I sent these meetings to Marty, Donna, Keith, Sara and Connie. And to a certain point, and whoever was available attended. I never knew exactly who attended the meetings.
Q. Was it your understanding at any point that Mrs. Whitfield would attend those meetings along with Marty and Donna?
A. If she did, I never knew. If she was actually there or not, I never attended any of the meetings so I didn't know who showed up each time, so I wouldn't have --
Q. Okay.
A. I wouldn't be able to tell you exactly
if she was planning on attending or not, so.
  Q.    So just so I am clear, you didn't know
  whether she was actually at the meeting because you
  were never at any meetings?
  A.    Yes.
  Q.    However, did you know whether it was
  anticipated that she would attend?
  A.    I was told that she could attend but I
  never knew for sure if she was going to.
  Q.    Who told you that she --
  A.    Because I shared the information with
  her, was really the only way that I knew she would
  be potentially attending the meetings.
  Q.    Did she tell you that she was going to
  possibly attend any meetings?
  A.    Not specifically, no.
  Q.    I just want the to show you a document
  that's bates stamped EW4004518.
  A.    Okay.  Okay.
  Q.    So in the email it says Connie says
  that those with asterisks below are more likely to
  agree to a meeting if they know she's going to be
  attending.
  A.    Okay.
  Q.    When you were scheduling the meetings,
did you tell or notify members or staff that Mrs. Whitfield planned on attending?

A. I never did in the initial ask, I would only tell people that she may be attending if they asked me who all was going to be attending with Marty and Donna because I never knew for sure whether or not that -- that she would be attending.

Q. And I am going to show you now a document bates stamped EW4005227.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And feel free to read the entire document but I want to draw your attention to the email from you to Amanda Stevens at 5:21 p.m. on the first page.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. You just referred to situations where you would notify later that --

A. Uh-huh.

Q. That Mrs. Whitfield was attending, here it says my boss' wife Connie Harriman-Whitfield will be joining them in the meeting as well. Is this one of the circumstances?

A. Uh-huh, yes.

Q. Here you say will be joining, doesn't say may?
A. Well here -- well, I mean as a Scheduler and I feel this is very common for Schedulers on the hill, we want to know who all will be attending the meeting, that's a question I ask probably daily to the people I am scheduling meetings with. So, you know, it's just common courtesy for me to inform a fellow scheduler, this is the amount of people that may be attending your meeting, and so we usually just communicate saying they will be attending. Whether or not they actually attend, I don't know. That happens to me, I set up meetings where people say there will be six people there and I end up with three.

So I mean -- I don't always know, and so I like to give them the courtesy of knowing this potentially could happen, that she potentially could be coming because I was told she could potentially be coming but that's all I know.

Q. So I am clear, in the situation where you say she will be joining, you are saying you thought she potentially would be joining the meeting?

A. Yeah, uh-huh.

Q. Is there any reason you didn't say she may be joining?
A. I don’t know in that scenario, I don’t remember.

Q. Okay. You also identify her as my boss’ wife. Why did you do that?

A. Because that is what she is to me, you know, I mean she’s my boss’ spouse, so I mean -- yeah, I probably could have said, my boss’ wife who works for the Humane Society as well, but for this particular member, she -- he knows my boss and so I probably just assumed that they were aware that she also worked for the Humane Society. You know, my boss has been in Congress for 20 years, a lot of people know what his wife -- what the occupation of his wife is.

Q. Did you include my boss’ wife for any other reason other than to make sure it was okay for her to attend?

A. No, it was just the courtesy of letting them know that she could be attending.

Q. Okay. And this email in general is similar to other emails you would have sent to people that you were scheduling meetings with?

A. Uh-huh, yup. I didn’t read through the whole thing, but -- yeah, uh-huh.

Q. When you were scheduling these 50 to
70 meetings during that time, approximately how much
time would that take you per day?

A. Um, that's a really good question.

Um, probably, you know, several hours. Actually
going through and sending the initial asks don't
actually take that long, it's the follow-up, and I
mean as you can see, from this one email, there was
a variety of emails back and forth before the
meeting was actually set and that's usually what
takes the additional time.

Q. So what was the process, walk me
through it, you send the initial ask and then follow
it up with an email?

A. Yes, our office policy is to handle
everything in writing, and so that is kind of how I
work with other offices as well, so I would have
some people that would call me, but I would always
ask them to, you know, confirm with me via email, so
I would send the initial ask based off of a list,
you know, that usually Cory would provide me. Cory
or whomever was handling the horse issues at the
time. Which I think actually was Chris, and Chris
and Cory would put together a list and ask me who to
reach out to, so I would prepare those emails with
the schedulers, Cory actually sent this one as you
can see, to the Chief of Staff and copied me on it, so I would email them to ask and then once I heard back from them, go through the schedule and schedule the meeting for when it worked best for that member.

Q. How much follow-up would you do, so once you send the initial ask and do a follow-up, would you do an additional follow-up?

A. No, if they came and said we are not available for a meeting, then I did not -- I didn't follow-up. If that was -- if other people on my staff may have followed up, but I did not.

Q. Okay.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. You said there were 50 to 70 meetings that you scheduled for Marty and Donna?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Have you scheduled that many meetings for any other group or people?

A. In my job in total?

Q. Since 2012 when you started.

A. Not that I am aware of. Or not that I can think of right now.

Q. And what was it about these meetings that resulted in you doing this type of level I should say of --
A. Well, October was when the government was shut down, so my current -- my -- you know my job was kind of at a standstill, we weren't really having any meetings in our office, and no meeting requests were coming through to our office because of the shut down, so during those two weeks, I had some additional time to work on this project. So I was asked by Cory to help assist with the scheduling. And in it's -- it's pretty basic on the hill for, you know, if a member is asking for a meeting, then they go scheduler to scheduler. So it wasn't out of the ordinary in anyway for me to help out in this scenario.

MR. MORGAN: Who were among the people that might attend the meetings? There is Marty.

A. And Donna. Well the ask was for Marty and Donna and then the only thing I was aware of was that I sent the schedules to Keith, Sara and Mrs. Whitfield. Beyond that, I didn't know who else from the Humane Society may be attending the meeting. I was never told.

MR. MORGAN: Were you ever told that any representative of Representative Whitfield's staff might attend?

A. Yes. At times, you know, depending on
the meeting, one of our staffers would also attend, so it just depended on the meeting entirely.

MR. MORGAN: But you weren't sharing the schedule for these meetings with any staffers?

A. You know, I was -- Cory was always aware of the schedule, we had a folder in our shared drive of where all the Word documents were and he could access it just as easily as I could, Cory and Chris and Marty once he started working there, you know, our shared drive is open to anyone on the staff.

Q. Are you aware of Representative Whitfield planning on or attending any of these meetings that you scheduled in October?

A. There were some, actually I don't remember for sure, but I don't think he attended many of the meetings at all. It depended on the member or if it was a certain Senator. He would try and attend, but most of the time, no, he did not attend those meetings.

Q. Do you recall any particular Senators or members where he attended?

A. I don't.

Q. Were you involved in additional scheduling of meetings similar to these in January
of 2014?

A. January 2014, with other --

Q. With --

A. Do you have an example, you have to jog my memory here.

Q. So this is document Bates stamped EW3000304, the next page is what I am going to direct your attention to, which is --

A. Okay.


A. Oh, yeah, so this is when we had some additional people come into town, and I -- once Marty was hired, I was not as involved in any of the scheduling, Marty handled that on his own, but in some situations, we realized that I could be more effective if it was coming from me, as I mentioned before, you know, the member to member ask, going through the schedulers is very common on the hill, so, yes, I helped with this scenario.

Q. Let's walk through it then. You said more people came to town. What people came to town?

A. In this scenario, it was the two Tennessee district attorneys that were, you know, supporters of the PAST Act.
Q. So these meetings were regarding the PAST Act?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And which situations were you more effective, was it determined you were more effective with scheduling?
A. We -- Cory, Marty and I sat down with a list of members that we could reach out to and determined which members that I would assist with with reaching out to and then the rest Marty reached out to, so I don't remember exactly who they were, or people that I personally have connections with, for instance, I am from Ohio originally, I remember reaching out to Senator Portman's office. You know, I know in that scenario, I knew people in his office, so we deemed it would be probably be effective for me to reach out to them as opposed to Marty. And a few other house members but I had really reached out to a lot of house members, clearly with 50 to 70 meetings I set up in the fall, and so I felt like an additional ask from me probably would not be as effective coming from me as it would be coming from someone else in our office.
Q. And approximately how many meetings were scheduled this go around, was it more, less?
A. A lot less. I think for this one there were maybe at max 15 meetings and that's probably a high estimate.

Q. And those were meetings that you scheduled or --

A. Marty scheduled a majority of them, I may have scheduled one or two.

Q. For a total of 15 approximately?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And was it anticipated that Mrs. Whitfield would attend those meetings?

A. I wasn't aware of any of that.

Q. Was it the same situation as before in October --

A. No, she -- I did not communicate almost at all with her about any of this. I actually don't think I communicated with her at all about this situation.

Q. And why is that?

A. Because Marty handled it, I wasn't as involved, I didn't need to be as involved. And the decision between Cory, Marty and I was I wasn't going to be as involved, so I did not communicate with her about any of this.

Q. Was it a situation where you did not
want to be involved based on the volume of work it
was or was it some other issue?

A. I mean partially but part of that was
just that, you know, Marty -- when Marty was hired
he started handling these issues and it came from
him as opposed to coming from me, so.

Q. During the time period when you were
scheduling the meetings in October of 2013?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Did there come a time when there were
issues or ethics concerns with you scheduling these
meetings for Marty and Donna?

A. Not for Marty and Donna. There were
no concerns about that.

Q. Well, what were the concerns about?

A. Well, I mean -- the only thing that we
come to realize is I should not be directly
communicating with Mrs. Whitfield about the
meetings, and so I no longer emailed with her about
it. I emailed with Keith and Sara.

Q. And when was that determined?

A. I don't know the exact date but
October, late October, mid October maybe.

Q. And who told you that it would be
better if you did not communicate directly --
A. Cory.

Q. And what was his reason?

A. Because, you know, because she is the Congressman's wife, we thought we just, you know, directly communicate with Keith and Sara as opposed to also sending that information to her.

Q. And did Cory relay any information he received from the committee on ethics concerning what was okay and not okay?

A. I mean we briefly discussed a call that he made to the ethics committee about it but really it just came down to him asking me just to not send her that information anymore. So I am not sure exactly what was discussed in the call.

Q. Was it your understanding -- let me show you this.

MR. MORGAN: While you are looking for that, let me go back to these October meetings, 2013, you said you were asked by the Congressman to set up the meetings?

A. Uh-huh.

MR. MORGAN: I want to see if there is anything more of his request that you remember, do you remember how that request was conveyed to you?

A. I just -- I was told by Cory and Chris
that these people were going to be coming into town
and the Congressman wanted me to reach out to the
members to set up the meetings.

MR. MORGAN: So that wasn't directly
communicated to you by Representative Whitfield?

A. Honestly it might have been and I just
don't really remember. I talk to my boss about a
lot of different things, so I can't remember every
single request.

MR. MORGAN: To your knowledge, did
that request come from Mrs. Whitfield?

A. No.

MR. MORGAN: I know we -- you said
that setting up that volume of -- that number of
interviews for other groups, you couldn't think of
any other instances of that. I want to just ask you
if it was typical, you know, or if it was unusual or
out of the ordinary for you to set up meetings where
the attendees were predominantly not members of your
staff, so here --

A. Uh-huh.

MR. MORGAN: You said you shared the
schedule with five individuals, all of whom were not
members of the staff.

A. Uh-huh.
MR. MORGAN: Would that be common for you to do?

A. No, but this was, you know, a scenario where, you know, this is a bill that my boss is really passionate about and if he asks me to work to do some additional work for this bill, then, you know, I would be willing to do that. I -- you know, that's my job, when he asks me to, you know, help schedule, then I am going to say yes to him, so.

Q. I want to show you a document that's bates stamped HSLFOCE015759.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. I really wanted to draw your attention to the email from Mrs. Whitfield to you but you can read the entire document. My question is going to be about -- well, let me know when you are done.

A. Okay.

Q. Do you recall having a conversation with Renee Elmer's office?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Can you describe that conversation that they had with you concerning scheduling these meetings?

A. I just sent the initial ask to them, and they reached out to Cory. They didn't come back
to me with anything, so it went from me sending them
an initial ask directly to Cory, so I was never
involved in the in between of any of their concerns
or what not.

Q. Did Cory share with you in general
what they spoke with them about in response to your
e-mail, what did he say?

A. He just said that they were concerned
about the situation because Mrs. Whitfield was
involved.

Q. And at that point did you have any
conversations with Mrs. Whitfield about the concerns
with the scheduling?

A. No.

Q. And according to this e-mail, you
continued to schedule meetings after what occurred
with this office?

A. Uh-huh. I scheduled meetings, yes.

Q. That was at Mrs. Whitfield's request?

A. No, that was at Cory's request.

Q. Have you scheduled any other meetings
for additional people who are in town or any other
similar type meetings that we haven't discussed so
far?

A. Well, Priscilla Presley was in town in
February and I helped Marty with a couple of those meetings, but she was only in town for a day, so I -- they -- we did not have any meetings scheduled, and I helped with -- I communicated with Sara about a reception that they had for her, but I did not communicate with any other members regarding the reception or anything. I mean I -- once Marty started working, I would send, if asked, I would send the initial request and then let Marty handle everything else. So --

Q. Approximately how many initial requests did you send?

A. For that instance?

Q. For the Priscilla Presley?

A. Probably like maybe five.

Q. And what was your understanding of who could possibly attend those meetings?

A. My understanding was it was Marty was going to be with her and Sara, and then she came with I guess a staffer of her own, and that those were -- that -- my understanding is that -- the only people that were in the meetings but I never knew for sure. So --

Q. Did anyone mention to you that it was possible that Mrs. Whitfield may attend those
meetings --

A. No.

Q. -- with Priscilla Presley?

A. No.

Q. No one ever mentioned it?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Any other additional meetings?

A. No. Marty, if any other people came in, Marty handled it. I mean I was -- I am aware of pretty much everyone who comes in and out of our office, so I knew there were additional people coming in and helping him, you know, meet with members to discuss the PAST Act but was not involved in any of that.

Q. Going back to the discussion that happened in October 2013 about scheduling meetings and Mrs. Whitfield's involvement, what is currently the policy as you understand it in the office with respect to scheduling meetings when she is involved?

A. I don't schedule any meetings that she is involved in, I mean if she has meetings she wants to schedule, she does that herself, I don't communicate with her about any of that.

Q. Are you instructed that that is the office policy?
A. Well, that's always been our office policy, that's her job, I am not in relation to that, anything I communicate to her is regarding the Congressman and his job, so I -- yeah, I am not aware of what she's doing on a work -- for her work on a day-to-day basis.

Q. I guess what I am trying to understand, in October 2013, you were scheduling the meetings and then this ethics issue came up and then you seem to have changed how those meetings were going to be scheduled?

A. I didn't necessarily change how they were going to be scheduled, I just became aware that I was not to share this information -- well, not necessarily, but, you know, I wasn't going to communicate with Mrs. Whitfield about it.

Q. Okay. Okay. Alright. So currently --

A. If she was going to gain this information, it wasn't going to be from me.

Q. Okay. Okay. I think I got it, so currently, the way you handle any scheduling as it relates to the Humane Society?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Is that you do it, but you don't
communicate that to Mrs. Whitfield?

A. Well, I -- you know, communicate with

the people who communicate with me which is

predominantly Sara.

Q. Have you been involved in other

scheduling for the Humane Society, and I'll be more

specific, have you reserved rooms in the capitol for

the Humane Society?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you describe why you did that and

what it is?

A. They have a reception every year where

ey give out their humane awards to, I don't even

know who, a variety of members, you know, hundreds

of members, and they ask me to, you know, use the

speaker's office and reserve rooms for them, so,

yup, for the last two years since I have worked

here, I have reserved a room for them.

Q. You said they ask, who asks you to do

it?

A. Sara.

Q. Has Mrs. Whitfield ever asked you to

reserve a room?

A. No, I mean she's aware of the

situation. She didn't this year in 2012 -- or '13
-- yeah, 2013, I know she was aware of the
situation, you know, we -- I think we communicated
about dates but other than that, no. The request
came from Sara, in 2013 it came from Jessica who
works there. I don't remember her last name, it's
hyphenated, so I don't know if you are familiar with
her.

Q.  I am familiar with a lot of people.
A.  So, yeah, I worked with Jessica in
2013 and I worked with Sara this year, because it
was just a couple weeks ago.

Q.  Have you reserved rooms for -- let me
rephrase it, have you reserved rooms in the capitol
for any other person other than someone in the
office before?
A.  Oh, I don't understand what you mean,
like other organizations?
Q.  Yes.
A.  Oh, yeah, I reserve rooms like every
week, I mean we get a lot of requests for rooms for
a variety of different organizations the Congressman
is involved in, you know, a lot of energy companies
will ask for me to reserve rooms for them for
receptions or briefings or meetings. I mean that's
a big chunk of my job, yes.
Q. So you have -- and you actually do reserve the rooms?
A. Well, I run everything by Cory, you know, in some scenario, really it's rare that I would say no especially if it's an organization that I am familiar with, but I do run everything by Cory just to make sure he is aware that I am reserving a room, I mean there is a kind of complicated process with reserving rooms in every single building, so, you know, I just want to make sure he's aware, for instance, the Kentucky Realtors come in every year, and I reserve a room for them and the CVC so they can have rooms with meetings with members.
Q. Okay. Can you give me a few more examples, the type of --
A. Sure, actually did one yesterday for First Energy, they want to do a staff briefing, so they had asked me to reserve a committee room, so I reached out to the Energy and Commerce Committee and there is a form you have to fill out and everything, my boss is the co-chair of the Turkey Caucus and I reserve rooms for them very regularly for breakfast, lunches, reception in either of the house office buildings, in the capitol or the CVC, so.
Q. You say these come weekly?
A. Oh, yeah.
Q. These requests?
A. Oh, yeah.
Q. So you say you know Sara at the Humane Society?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And were you aware she went to the State of the Union address in January of this year?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you involved in at least getting the ticket to her?
A. Yes.
Q. How did you become involved with that?
A. I -- as usual -- as our office policy whenever we receive tickets to the State of the Union for instance, this week was the Whitehouse Easter Egg Roll, same kind of thing, I ask the Congressman if he would like to use these tickets or if they he would like me to invite someone to use the tickets, and in that instance, all I heard back from telling him that we have State of the Union tickets was an email from Connie saying I have someone who wants to use the ticket. I didn't know it was Sara until I was -- had to gather the information about, you know, I have to submit a form
on who is going to be using the ticket.

Q. Okay.

A. So.

Q. Similar to my question about reserving the room, can you give me other instances where you have provided a State of the Union ticket to anyone else?

A. I don't even remember who went to the State of the Union the year before or if we even honestly if the Congressman doesn't want to use the ticket, than our staffers usually go to the State of the Union. For this past year, for the White House Easter Egg Roll is another example, the Congressman's daughter invited a friend who lives here and she attended with her family, actually escorted them, so I was there. The year before Cory went with his family and his son.

Q. This is the Easter egg roll?

A. Yeah, State of the Union we only get one ticket, so I think in years past, we have received a request from the UPS, their executives are usually in town for the State of the Union and they have asked to use our ticket as well. So I know Cory has communicated with them about that.

Q. Do you know who attended in 2013?
A. I think that UPS used it or it was a staffer, one of our staffers.

Q. When you say UPS, you are referring to the United Parcel Service?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And also with the Inauguration of 2013?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Were you involved with Sara receiving a ticket to --

A. I wasn't involved in that at all.

That's another staffer who handled all of our Inauguration materials.

Q. I am going to ask you about this email which is bates stamped HSLEOCE014649.

A. Okay.

Q. And it's just a general question once you finish reading, can you just describe what this dinner is?

A. It was a dinner with Senator Vitter, he didn't actually attend. And I didn't really know anybody else who was invited to the dinner. I emailed with a couple of them, actually I think I emailed with everybody to figure out what kind of -- what their option was for dinner, but I didn't know
anybody -- I didn't know of any of the people that were attending.

Q. It was for Senator Vitter?
A. I have no idea.

Q. Do you know if it was a campaign fundraiser?
A. No, it was not a fundraiser.

Q. Was it discussing any particular legislation?
A. I have no idea.

MR. MORGAN: How did you come to know that Senator Vitter did not attend?

A. How he did not attend? Because his scheduler told me he wasn't going to be able to attend.

MR. MORGAN: Did a staffer or somebody else go in his place?

A. I think his Chief of Staff and then a member of one of the committees he works on attended. I think they were planning on attending anyway, but something came up in Louisiana and he had to fly home that evening.

Q. Similar email bates stamped HSLPOCE006209. Basically the same question for you which is can you explain to me what this dinner is?
A. This -- I don't remember exactly which dinner this is, but I think it had something to do with the class of 1994 which is the Congressman's class that he was elected and those are all the other people, and this is -- Mrs. Whitfield usually asks me for a guest list before any event she attends with him, fundraising event, whatever, and so I provided that to her.

Q. Why does she ask for the list of attendees?

A. I don't know.

Q. She's never shared with you why she wants it?

A. No, I think she just wants to know who is going to be there, if she has any friends there or what not, I don't know.

Q. This is an email bates stamped EW4005262.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. My question with this document is simply when you received it, what did this mean to you, what was to change, if anything?

A. Um, that was just really -- I mean saying what we talked about earlier, once I became aware of the ethics issue, I just didn't communicate
-- I emailed strictly Keith and Sara as opposed to
communicating and I actually had not been
communicating with her for awhile before she sent
this. I think she just realized that she shouldn't
-- once Marty started, she shouldn't be
communicating with Marty in the way that she was
before he was hired. So in my perspective, this was
more about her contacting Marty and not as much
about contacting me because I was already aware of
the situation with Marty, not communicating with her
about it, so.

Q. Going to that issue, or event of the
hiring of Marty, you were there when he was hired?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And how did it come to be that he was
hired there?
A. We had our legislative correspondent
decided to leave and take another job, and we had an
opening in our office and the Congressman decided to
hire Marty.
Q. And what are his job responsibilities?
A. When he first started?
Q. Yes.
A. He was a congressional aid and he
handled a variety of issues including animal issues
and AG, I don’t remember what all of them were.

Q. And you mentioned earlier that when

you came on, he was working on scheduling for the

PAST Act. Was the PAST Act one of his main things

in his portfolio?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Did he spend most of his time working

on the PAST Act?

A. Not necessarily, I mean the farm bill

was also around that time, so that was definitely

one of his responsibilities as well. I don't know

exactly everything that Marty does everyday.

Q. And what is -- what are his job

responsibilities now?

A. He is our press secretary now and he

handles just agriculture and animal issues in the

legislative portfolio.

Q. And when did he become press

secretary?

A. Um, when Chris left which is the end

of February so the beginning of March.

Q. Chris Pack?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. You mentioned that you work on some of

the scheduling of travel for the member, does that
scheduling also involve plane tickets for Mrs. Whitfield?

A. Yes.

Q. And when they are traveling, and paying for Mr. Whitfield's travel, are you using the MRA for his travel?

A. It depends on the trip. So if he is traveling to Kentucky for official events, then, yes. If he's traveling to Kentucky for campaign events or anywhere, then, no, I put it on our campaign. She travels only on the campaign.

Q. So when there are flights --

A. If she travels with him for any, you know, related trip.

Q. Okay. So if Mrs. Whitfield is traveling with a member, you are saying you have always paid for it with the --

A. Campaign account.

Q. And it's being paid for by the MRA?

A. No, never.

MR. MORGAN: Going back to those October 2013 meetings, I just want, I think we have this from you perhaps already, but I want to make sure we get it, did you view yourself as scheduling meetings for Representative Whitfield?
A. Uh-huh.

MR. MORGAN: Or did you view yourself as scheduling meetings for the Humane Society?

A. Oh, for Congressman Whitfield. I mean I was asking for these meetings on behalf of him.

So, uh-huh. I mean that's how the ask was in the email.

Q. Do you have anything else? So that's it.

A. That's it, alright. Thanks.

(Whereupon, the recording is terminated.)
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From: Corrine Hammen-Whitfield  
To: Haylauf, Brenda  
Subject: Ac Meeting Schedule  
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Email,

If a number is available to meet on Thurs at 11:00AM, feel free to cancel here. Meeting with an LA for a Calif Rep isn’t worth much.

Condie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 15, 2013, at 5:04 PM, "Haylauf, Brenda" <Haylauf@Mail.house.gov> wrote:

All,

Attached below is the meeting schedule for tomorrow and Thursday. I have contacted many more offices today and am in the process of scheduling additional meetings. Please let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,

Condie

Meeting Schedule
Ms. Donna Ammerfield and Mr. Marty Troy

Wednesday, October 16

Meeting with Congressman Frank Pallone (NJ) 9:45am
Location: 237 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Billy Long (MO) 10:30am
Location: 1144 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Bill Cassidy, M.D. (LA) 11:15am
Location: 1131 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Mike Rogers (AL) 1:00pm
Location: 224 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman John Barrow (GA) 1:45pm
Location: 232 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Gregg Harper (MS) 2:35pm Location 367 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Roger Williams (TX) 3:00pm Location 1122 Longworth

Meeting with Richard Vaughn, Chief of Staff for Congressman Scott DeLaField (NH) [Marty and Donna ONLY] 3:30pm

EW4 002133
Meeting with Congressman Devin Nunes (CA)
4:15
Location: 1015 Longworth
Thursday, October 17

Meeting with Congressman Gus Bilirakis (FL-12) 10:00am
Location: 2313 Rayburn

Meeting with legislative Aide, Misha, for Congressman Ami Bera (CA-07) 11:00am
Location: 1008 Longworth

Meeting with Dan Scandling, Chief of Staff for Congressman Frank Wolf (VA-10) 11:45am
Location: 233 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Don Beflexi (NY-24) 2:00pm
Location: 422 Cannon

Evan Heydlauff
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
235 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3907

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
https://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield
https://twitter.com/RepEdWhitfield
https://www.linkedin.com/profile/view?id=17607500
https://whitfield.house.gov/news

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

Wednesday, October 18: Schedule for M. Irby and D. Benefield.docx
Thursday, October 17: Schedule for M. Irby and D. Benefield.docx
EXHIBIT 32
From: Connie Harman-Whittington [humanesociety.org]
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Cc: Connie Harman-Whittington; Keith David; Sara Amundsen; Marcy Hoy; Helen; Cozy; Pack, Chris; Edward Whittington
Subject: Re: Meetings for Next Week

These are marvelous meetings. I think we can cancel McCleod because she signed up yesterday.

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 19, 2013, at 4:00 PM, "Heydlauff, Emma" <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov> wrote:

All —

Attached and below are the meetings scheduled for next week. I am still in the process of scheduling some others. Please let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,
Emma

Monday, October 21

Meeting with Justin Ostmeyer with Congressman Mark Sanford’s Office 10:00am
Location: 202 Cannon

Meeting with Herman Fry with Congressman M.違い Brockett’s Office 2:00 PM
Location: 224 Longworth

Wednesday, October 23

Meeting with Congressman Mario Diaz-Balart (FL-25) 10:30am
Location: 436 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Gus Bilirakis (FL-12) 11:15am
Location: 2315 Rayburn

Meeting with Congresswoman Joe Garcia (FL-26) 11:45am
Location: 2440 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Rich Madcutt (FL-11) 12:15pm
Location: 1227 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Kevin McCarthy (CA-23) 1:30pm
Location: H-107, Capitol

Meeting with Congresswoman G.違い Golden (TX-20) 3:00pm
Location: 2479 Rayburn

Meeting with Jon Amair and Amanda Slade, Legislative Assistants for Congressman Alan Lowenthal (CA-47) 4:00pm
Location: 335 Cannon
Meeting with Congressman Don Buefi (NY-24) 4:30pm
Location: 422 Cannon

Thursday, October 24

Meeting with Congressman Mike Thompson (CA-09) 9:00am
Location: 231 Cannon

Meeting with Saul Hernandez, Legislative Director for Congressman GR Butterfield (NC-01)
3:00pm
Location: 2206 Rayburn

Meeting with Congresswoman Gloria McLeod (CA-35) 1:30pm
Location: 1644 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Duncan Hunter (CA-50) 2:00pm
Location: 223 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Devin Nunes (CA) 3:00pm
Location: 2123 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Joe Crowley (NY-14) 4:10pm
Location: 1436 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Ted Yoho (FL-03) 4:30pm
Location: 551 Cannon

Emma Heylaufl
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2141 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3467
Fax: (202) 225-3567

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<https://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield>
<https://twitter.com/RepEdWhitfield>
<https://www.flipboard.com/representativewhitfield>
<https://www.youtube.com/whitfieldedy>
<https://whitfield.house.gov/newsletter>

Click here<https://whitfield.house.gov/newsletter> to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter,

<https://whitfield.house.gov/events>
EXHIBIT 33
Thanks for those details! We are confirmed for Tuesday at 415.

Amanda Stevens Baldwin
Scheduler/Office Manager
US House of Representatives
Michael C. Burgess, M.D.
2336 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-5319

From: Hayduff, Emma
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:21 PM
To: Stevens, Amanda
Subject: RE: favor

You can just contact me or Cory with any questions. My boss’s wife, Corvina Harrison Whitfield, will be joining them in the meeting as well.

From: Stevens, Amanda
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:19 PM
To: Hayduff, Emma
Subject: RE: favor

Will anyone from your office accompany them? If not, can you send me their contact information?

Thank you,

Amanda Stevens Baldwin
Scheduler/Office Manager
US House of Representatives
Michael C. Burgess, M.D.
2336 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-5319

From: Hayduff, Emma
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:15 PM
To: Stevens, Amanda
Subject: RE: favor

That works. Thanks so much!
From: Stevens, Amanda
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:18 PM
To: Heydauff, Emma
Subject: RE: favor

I can do 4:15.

Amenda Stevens Baldwin
Scheduler/Office Manager
US House of Representatives
Michael C. Burgess, M.D.
3351 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-5725 FAX 202-225-2619

From: Heydauff, Emma
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:16 PM
To: Stevens, Amanda
Subject: RE: favor

They have another meeting at that time. Would a 3pm meeting work for you next Tuesday?

Thank you,

Amenda Stevens Baldwin
Scheduler/Office Manager
US House of Representatives
Michael C. Burgess, M.D.
2336 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-5725 FAX 202-225-2619

From: Strickland, Kelle
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:12 PM
To: Stevens, Amanda
Subject: FW: favor

Kelle Strickland
Chief of Staff
Rep. Michael Burgess (TX-26)
2336 Rayburn HOB
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-...

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 1:31 PM
To: Strickland, Mel
Cc: Herr/Staff, Emma
Subject: favor

Kelly, I hope you are well. Quick question: two people are coming into town next week for a conference with the Friends of Sound Horses. Two of those people are involved in the TN Walking Horse industry and are supportive of our efforts with the PAWS Act. One of them is Marty Dray - the former president of the TN Walking Horse Association. Marty is actually a constituent from what I’ve been told. The other person is Donna Goodfield, President of the International Walking Horse Association. If your boss could take a meeting with them, my boss would really appreciate it. They are available all day Monday (except 2 and 3pm), from 11 to close of business Tuesday and all day Friday. Do you think you can make something work?

Cory Hicks
Chief of Staff
Chairman Ed Whitfield
202-225-...

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
http://RepEdWhitfield.com
EXHIBIT 34
Oh, great! Thanks!

---

From: Heydauff, Emma
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:27 AM
To: Thomson, Kristin
Subject: RE: Favor

Great! Thanks so much. I will have them there next week. My boss's wife Connie will be joining them in the meeting as well.

Thanks,
Emma

---

From: Thomson, Kristin
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:25 AM
To: Heydauff, Emma
Subject: RE: Favor

Yes, we can make 1:30PM work! Thanks!

---

From: Heydauff, Emma
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:24 AM
To: Thomson, Kristin
Subject: RE: Favor

Could we do 1:30PM? If not, I can make 3 pm work. Let me know.

Thanks,
Emma

---

From: Thomson, Kristin
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:21 AM
To: Heydauff, Emma
Subject: RE: Favor
Hi Emma,

Kevin would be happy to meet with them. Would 1PM on Wed October 23 work? This would be in H-307. Thanks!

Kristin
Executive Assistant
Majority Whip Becky Siddell
Phone: (202) 225-7250

From: Hoydauff, Emma
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2013 12:10 PM
To: Thomson, Kristin
Subject: Favor

Kristin,

Quick question: two people are in town this week and need a meeting with the Friends of Sound Horses. Two of these people are involved in the TN Walking Horse Industry and are supportive of our efforts with the PAST Act. One of them is Mary Ann, the former president of the TN Walking Horse Association. The other person is Donna Benefield, President of the International Walking Horse Association. If your boss could take a meeting with them, my boss would really appreciate it. They are available on Thursday and all next week. Do you think you can make something work?

Thanks,
Emma

Emma Hoydauff
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Jim Whitefield (NY-21)
2354 Farmers House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3070
Fax: (202) 225-3097

Follow Rep. Whitefield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. G. Whitefield's newsletter.
EXHIBIT 35
From: Connie Browne-Whitefield  
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2011 6:07 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Milford; Buchanan@email.house.gov
Subject: Re: Meeting with Sen Scott Browne

Forward!

Sent from my iPhone:

On 6/7/2011, 6:07 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@email.house.gov> wrote

> Buchanan and John Whitefield
> 
> I have a meeting confirmed for Tues the morning of Tuesday of June 7th with Sen. Scott Browne. The meeting will be at his office, 107-Children.
> 
> Thank you,
> 
> Melissa
> 
> Melissa Buchanan
> 
> Whitefield
> 
> Office of Congressman Ed Whitefield (PA-06)
> 
> 314 Cannon House Office Building
> 
> Washington, DC 20515
> 
> Phone: (202) 225-7603
> 
> seniorhay1@yahoo.com
> 
> <http://www.house.gov/homepage/edwhitefield>
> 
> <http://www.house.gov/house yapıları/
> 
> > Thanks for coming for the Browne. Ed Whitefield's a smart guy.
> 
> > ---Original Message---
> 
> > From: Buchanan, Melissa  
> 
> > Buchanan, Melissa
> 
> > 314 Cannon House Office Building
> 
> > Washington, DC 20515
> 
> > Phone: (202) 225-7603
> 
> > Melissa.Buchanan@email.house.gov
> 
> > To: Buchanan, Melissa
> 
> > Subject: Meeting with Sen Scott Browne
> 
> > "I'd love to meet with Senator Scott Browne. Can you please introduce me? I'm a friend of a friend who is interested in meeting with him."
EXHIBIT 36
Send via my iPhone

Dear Forwarded message:

From: "Buchanan, Melanie" <Melanie.Buchanan@house.gov>
Date: July 14, 2011 8:00 PM (EST)
To: "Congressman Whitmire" <thomaswhitmire@house.gov>
Subject: Rep. Ed Whitmire

Yes. So far I have:
Congressman Green--9:00am on Wednesday, July 20
2254 EHOB
Congressman LaToya--10:00am on Wednesday, July 20
2251 EHOB
Congressman Young--1:00pm on Wednesday, July 20
2250 EHOB

I am all set to hear from the Offices of Congressman Perri, Dold, Pingree, and Congressman Glenn's Chief of Staff.

I will send you a final schedule as soon as I have it complete.

Melanie Buchanan
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitmire (NY-01)
2505 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3072
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Follow Rep. Ed Whitmire on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitmire's e-newsletter.

---Original Message---
From: "Congressman Whitmire" <thomaswhitmire@house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 4:16 PM
To: Buchanon, Melanie
Subject: Rep. Ed Whitmire

Sent from my iPhone
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You are receiving:

Sent from my iPhone

On May 21, 2013 at 9:19 PM, "Buchanan, Michelle" <Michelle.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Via Congressional Staff Wallet ( virus-free)
2009 Rayburn. House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-6700
Fax: (202) 225-0413
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's newsletter

--- Original Message ---
From: Congressional Staff Wallet
Date: Monday, May 20, 2013 3:04 PM
To: Buchanan, Michelle
Subject: Re: Meeting with Sen. Trent Lott

I hope he was not planning to go to the Issues:


On May 21, 2013 at 2:36 PM, "Buchanan, Michelle" <Michelle.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

I will hold a meeting on Congressman Whitfield's schedule:

Thank you.

Michelle Buchanan
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield ( KY -02)
2009 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-6700
Fax: (202) 225-0413
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's newsletter

--- Original Message ---
From: "Buchanan, Michelle" <Michelle.Buchanan@mail.house.gov>
Date: Monday, May 20, 2013 3:04 PM
To: Buchanan, Michelle
Subject: Re: Meeting with Sen. Trent Lott

I hope he was not planning to go to the Issues:


On May 21, 2013 at 12:10 PM, "Buchanan, Michelle" <Michelle.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

I will hold a meeting on Congressman Whitfield's schedule:

Thank you.

Michelle Buchanan
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield ( KY -02)
2009 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-6700
Fax: (202) 225-0413
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's newsletter

--- Original Message ---
From: "Buchanan, Michelle"
To: Buchanan, Michelle
Subject: Re: Meeting with Sen. Trent Lott

I hope he was not planning to go to the Issues:


On May 21, 2013 at 10:44 AM, "Buchanan, Michelle" <Michelle.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

I will hold a meeting on Congressman Whitfield's schedule:

Thank you.

Michelle Buchanan
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield ( KY -02)
2009 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-6700
Fax: (202) 225-0413
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
None of the content in the image is legible or readable.
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TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW
OF REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD’S
WIFE
INTERVIEW OF [REDACTED]

April 25, 2014

Present:
Kedric Payne
Bryson Morgan

Susannah May

Transcribed by:
Stephanie Lyn Rahn, CSR
License No. XI01717

**PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of the transcript are phonetic
QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

Q. This is Kedric Payne and Bryson Morgan with the Office of Congressional Ethics. We are joined by [redacted] --

A. [redacted]

Q. [redacted]

A. Not [redacted], just [redacted].

Q. [redacted] and her attorney

Suzannah May. It is April 25, 2014.

[redacted], are you currently employed with the Humane Society Legislative Fund?

A. I am.

Q. What is your job title?

A. I think it's called Legislative Specialist.

Q. How long have you been employed with HSLF?

A. Well, I think I was hired towards the end of 2011, like -- not, you know, maybe at the end of October or so.

Q. And where were you employed prior to HSLF?

A. The Humane Society of the United States.
Q. And what was your title there?
A. Well, I was -- something -- I am not big on titles, something like Senior Policy Advisor to the President.
Q. And when did you begin employment there?
A. There being the Humane Society?
Q. Yes.
A. I think 2000 -- August of -- I'm not good on dates either, I think approximately August 2007.
Q. And how did you begin employment there, and what I am just trying to understand is how did you seek employment there, did someone reach out to you, how did you decide to work for HSUS?
A. Well, I never sought employment there. My husband -- was working on a bill that involved banning the slaughter of horses in the United States, and I was the Vice Chairman of the Kentucky Horse Racing Authority, and had jurisdiction over all racing in the State of Kentucky and many of the horses that are sent to slaughter are failed race horses, failed thoroughbreds, failed standardbreds, failed quarter horses, all of whom race and they were all under my jurisdiction.
So I was asked to talk on behalf of different people in Kentucky who were constituents of Ed's and outside of Ed's district to go to Washington DC with them, these are people that owned horses, breed horses, raise horses that were in favor of this bill, so I was in meetings with a lot of members with these very famous people, one man won the Kentucky Derby three times.

Anyway, Wayne Pacelle I guess heard about me and that I was a very passionate advocate for this legislation and he observed me in a couple of speaking situations and asked me whether I would be interested in working with the Humane Society.

Q. And to the best of your recollection was that around 2007, right before you started working there?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Representative Whitfield speak with anyone at the Humane Society about your hiring?

A. Not at all, not to my knowledge.

Q. And as Senior Policy Advisor or -- to the president or whatever your title was, what were your duties, job duties?

A. Well, first of all I started out in fundraising, that was my first job, so it didn't
have anything to do with -- that was my very first
job, fundraising, had nothing to do with legislation
or the hill or anything like that. And I did that
for, I want to say a year and a half maybe, two
years, and then moved to the -- the second role
which was the special advisor and in that capacity,
I worked directly with Wayne Pacelle to come up with
ways of involving wealthy individuals or external
groups or celebrities to become involved with the
Humane Society in one way or another, like
endorsements, like giving money, like doing a PSA,
like coming to the hill, stuff like that.

Q. Anything else?
A. Not that I can remember.
Q. And why did you transition to the
HSLF?
A. I am trying to remember. I don't
remember that anybody consciously said you need to
change your job, I don't remember that. I think it
was a combination of things, Wayne and I never sat
down and discussed it. I think it was a realization
on his part that the Humane Society has wonderful
contacts on the hill with Democrats, it's perceived
as a democratic organization by Republicans,
therefore they don't -- the Humane Society probably
feels like less comfortable trying to get
Republicans to understand their position, positions.
And I think because Ed Whitfield had been such a
passionate supporter of animals, I wouldn't say the
Humane Society because there are a lot of positions
he's taken against the Humane Society, but such a
passionate animal supporter, that they felt that
having me involved was not a problem because I am a
passionate animal supporter.

Q. And when you made the transition, did
Representative Whitfield have any conversations or
discussions with people at the Humane Society or
people at the HSLF regarding your transition?

A. First of all, I think the only person
he would have known back then was Wayne Pacelle and
to my knowledge, they never talked about it. I
don't think he would have known anybody else to talk
to.

Q. With HSLF, to whom do you report?

A. Well, directly I report to Sara

Amundson.

Q. Does anyone report to you?

A. No.

Q. And what are your job duties?

A. Well, my job duties are to make --
well, my job duties are informal often. If I am
with a member, a republican member like say Roy
Blunt, and I run into him in the hallway, and I'll
say, hey, Roy, how do you think the puppy mill
initiative is going in Missouri, he will -- we will
talk about it, you know. A lot of my job involves
kind of chance encounters, that sounds funny to say,
but a lot of it really does involve chance
encounters, because I am around members a lot.

    If Ed is flying home and I am at the
airport, I might run into Jim Cooper from Tennessee,
because we are all flying into Nashville. He will
run into me and raise a question like, Connie, this
bill that you guys have, it's a great bill, you
know, I really like it.

    So I think in some ways, I am kind of
like a listening post for members because they know
me from 20 years of being at events, CDELS,
whatever and they feel comfortable talking to me.
The Republicans especially, Bill Cooper is not a
Republican, but the Republicans especially, if they
have a question, they will come to me or call me,
like Roy Blunt called me once and said I want a dog,
can you help me get a dog, and I got him a dog.

    Q.    Okay.
A. But so, it sounds silly but it's kind of like I am a safe person to talk to, and so if they have questions or if they have concerns, I am the go-to person, especially -- I mean mainly for Republicans, because they don't trust most of the people at the Humane Society.

Q. And you are a registered lobbyist?

A. I am a registered lobbyist, I have -- except -- well, I have had meetings, specific meetings with people but unlike most lobbyists, I don't spend my time going to fundraisers or having a daily log of meetings on the hill. That's just --

Q. Okay.

A. It's much less formal.

Q. But you lobbied some bills and other policies and things for the Humane Society, and I should say HSLF?

A. When I first started trying to influence people on the hill, it was before I was employed by the Humane Society, it was the ban on horse slaughter, and that was in my capacity as a Vice Chairman of the Kentucky Horse Racing Authority, and also bringing citizens from the State of Kentucky to members on the house with people like T.Boone Pickens and his wife Madeline Pickens, we
would all go together, and I wasn't a lobbyist then, and I was just representing the interests of horses, and helping people who could not otherwise get meetings except for, you know, I would -- some of them could have, but T. Boone Pickens could have gotten a meeting no problem.

So anyway, when I first started out, it was -- it had nothing to do with the Humane Society or HSILF, and then my fundraising experience and dealing directly with the President wasn't until really I think the beginning of 2012. And even then, I mean I left out a really important piece of what I do. A lot of what I do, I would say, 70 percent of what I do, is I talk on the phone with other members of HSILF or HSUS about strategy.

Q. Strategy for what?
A. Strategy for finding out information, the best way to find out information, strategy like which members like each other, strategy like things that -- things that certain members really care about.

Q. So legislative type strategy?
A. Yeah, but I am mainly giving information to my colleagues, because again, they
don't have access to most Republicans, so they don't
know what I know from having been around members for
20 years, but I would say strategy is my most
important strong point.

Q. And through those duties, working on
strategy and also whatever else you were doing as a
registered lobbyist, have you been involved with the
PAST Act?

A. I have.

Q. Some questions I ask are very --

A. That's fair, you are doing a record, I
got it.

Q. And the PAST Act, is to Prevent All
Sorcery Tactics?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. And how long have you been involved
with that act?

A. Well, again, you are saying involved,
involved at all? It's hard for --

Q. Yes.

A. Okay, first of all, I cannot give you
a date, because I am brain dead when it comes to
dates. When I took my dad for an Alzheimer's test,
he passed, I failed.

But when you say involved, do you mean
talking to people about it or do you mean
specifically talking to members about it or just
being, like --

MR. MORGAN: What was your first
recollection of the act or the idea for legislation
to address that issue?

A. Well, I was not involved in the
drafting of the act at all, not at all. So any
involvement I had came after the legislation
existed. And I know that over time, different
groups, like the American Horse Council in
particular and the American Veterinary Medical
Association to a lesser extent had particular points
they wanted in the legislation, and I never talked
to them about it. I don't even know what the points
were, but I know they talked with Ed's office and
that -- I mean that's all I know. So I mean I was
not involved at all in actually writing the bill,
and I am trying to -- really trying to remember my
first involvement.

Q. Well, were you --

A. I don't know.

Q. Were you involved with finding
cosponsors before the bill was introduced?

A. No, you wouldn't -- you couldn't have
a co-sponsor before the bill was introduced.

Q. Potential sponsors before it was introduced?

A. No.

Q. What were you involved in with the legislation -- let me rephrase it. Do you remember when the legislation was introduced?

A. No, I do not. And I don't know even know if it was introduced twice. I don't know if it was introduced once and reintroduced, I don't know.

Q. Were you involved with the bill after it was introduced in 2013 with scheduling meetings or being involved with meetings with potential co-sponsors?

A. The first meetings that I can remember, distinctly, were probably in October or November, the end of 2013.

Q. And can you describe those meetings in general?

A. Well, I didn't go to very many. Most of them were -- I could say most nearly all of them were with Republicans. I went -- well, some I went with Marty Irby who was visiting from Tennessee and essentially a citizen lobbyist but somebody who was
involved in the horse soring world since he was like
three years old, so he was like a super expert on
the subject.

Some of them involved Marty Irby and
Donna Bennefield and she also was visiting from
Tennessee, citizen advocate, very knowledgeable
about horse soring issues.

There was one meeting that Senator --
or maybe at least one maybe two, Senator Hollings
who was one of the two Senators that passed the
original bill in the senate back in 1970 called and
-- called and insisted that I attend. And I can't
remember everybody who was there, but he was -- he's
really good friends with Senator Cochran, and he
arranged this meeting with Senator Cochran and said
Connie, the day before, you have to be here, you
have to be here, and I said well, fine, whatever.

So I went, I think Marty was there and
then Cory and one other person from Ed's office
walked in, they never said one word the entire time.
And that meeting was basically Hollings talking to
Cochran and Cochran had his staffer there, and
Hollings was trying to tell to him the history and
everything, and so that was kind of a unique
meeting.
Q. That meeting took place, I know you are bad with dates, took place around October or November of 2013?

A. I think so. It could have been earlier this year, but it's --

Q. It could have been --

A. I don't really remember when it happened, but it would be sometime from October forward.

Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you are involved in strategy in general, specifically with the PAST Act. Have you been involved with strategy for that?

A. Not so much because there is so many groups involved, and one of the things that I know -- Cory and Ed feel very strongly about, is that on this particular bill, they didn't want the Humane Society to be out in front, because most Republicans don't like the Humane Society, and they felt that they needed a strong Republican showing to get the bill passed, so for example, the Humane Society was excluded from the hearing that they had and so they wanted this to be seen as a horse industry bill, so the American Horse Council, the American Veterinary Medical Association, The Medical Association of
Equine Practitioners, all these groups were going to
be, you know, front and center, so they have been
very involved in strategy, and, you know, there have
been disagreements.

Q. Were you also involved in that
strategy of realizing that it would be better for
the Humane Society to not be on the front end of --

A. It wasn't a choice for me. It's not
my decision. I mean it's not my decision, I agree
with it, but it's not my decision.

Q. Whose decision is it?

A. It was -- well, it was Ed's and
Corey's decision.

Q. And as an employee of the Humane
Society, did you have a position on whether or not
the Humane Society should be out front on this
legislation that you were --

A. My reaction was this is the man who
introduced the bill, this is the man who is leading
the charge, if he doesn't want the Humane Society
involved then that's the way it's going to be.

Q. During this time period when you were
working on the PAST Act, say the fall of 2013 and
you attended these meetings, did you contact
Representative Whitfield's staff regarding these
meetings that you were attending?

A. Did I contact Whitfield's staff regarding these meetings? Okay. You mean about the fact they occurred?

Q. Scheduling the meetings, so scheduling meetings in October and November of 2013?

A. Emma -- Emma was asked to set up meetings for Marty and Donna. Ed wanted her to do that, because he felt very strongly that they would -- he had told several members about them, and that they were both experts, and he wanted other members to have the benefit of their expertise.

So he told a lot of members that he wanted them to talk to them, and so then Emma was asked to set up meetings. Now sometimes Ed tells me things, we will be in the car, and he'll say, oh, tell Cory such and such, tell Emma such and such, so it's quite possible he said to me tell Emma to set up meetings and I called Emma and said set up meetings.

Q. Did you instruct Emma to send you all of the meetings that being scheduled, send you a calendar of the meetings that were being scheduled --

A. Do you have a document?
Q. Yes.
A. You know I have to say for all of these questions you have been asking me, it would be nice if you had given me documents.
Q. Well, I don't want to effect what you remember or what you recall by showing you a document, so if you recall it without the document --
A. How could I recall something like that? So I feel like you are playing games now. I am putting that on the record.
Q. Alright. Well, I will let you know that we are not playing games, the way the investigation works is to see what you recall --
A. Well, you know what, you could have said that at the beginning.
Q. Are you clear now --
A. No, I am not clear. You can tell me exactly what it is you should have said at the beginning.
Q. Let me just understand with the meetings that were being scheduled --
A. No, I am not talking to you about the meetings that were being scheduled. Because I am very annoyed at the moment. I want to know exactly
how you are planning to treat the documents you
have.

Q. I am conducting the interview, I have
to ask you certain questions. We will get to any
document I need to show you.

A. Fine, then if you are asking me a
question and you have a document relating to it,
show it to me.

Q. The process through which we ask the
questions will not be dependent upon whether I have
a document. So I cannot --

A. Okay, fine.

Q. -- establish that every time I am
going to ask you a question --

A. But you just said you did have a
document.

Q. We have 20,000 pages worth of
documents.

A. I am talking about the document
relating to the question you just asked me.

Q. Every question I am asking has a
document. Some I will show you, some I will not.

A. Okay. And why will you not show me
certain documents?

Q. I don't have all of them here.
A. Okay, but are you therefore going to show me all the documents you do have here?

Q. Depends on what we get to the in the interview.

A. Why are you not showing me documents you do have here, what is your reason?

Q. I cannot go through the entire interview and try to describe to you why we are asking questions?

A. I am not asking that. I am asking why are you not showing me documents that you have here that relate to the questions you are asking me.

Q. If you have a recollection of something where I don't need to have a document to refresh your recollection?

A. How do you know that you have a document that I need to refresh my recollection, how do you know that?

Q. There is only way to find out is for me to ask the questions, see what you remember --

A. Okay, go ahead.

Q. Okay. Thank you. With scheduling of meetings with the members in this October November time period, did you contact any of Mr. Whitfield's staff other than Emma and I think you mentioned
Cory?

A. I don't remember.

Q. With respect to identifying potential co-sponsors --

A. I don't remember.

Q. So I didn't finish my question.

A. Go ahead.

Q. You don't remember?

A. Well, you said with respect to --

Q. Co-sponsors?

A. Go ahead.

Q. With response to -- with respect to identifying potential co-sponsors with the PAST Act during this time period, October 2013, did you have contacts with Mr. Whitfield's staff?

A. I don't remember.

Q. And with respect to determining strategy, discussing strategy, with Representative Whitfield's staff, did you have such contacts?

A. I don't remember.

Q. And did you have any contacts with Representative Whitfield concerning the PAST Act and different steps he should take with advocating that legislation?

A. I don't remember.
MR. MORGAN: You said that Ed wanted Marty and Donna to do the meetings.
A. Uh-huh.
MR. MORGAN: How did you become aware that that's what Representative Whitfield wanted.
A. Because Marty told me, Marty and Donna told me.
MR. MORGAN: So Marty and Donna told you that Ed wanted them to do meetings, that wasn't a direct conversation you had with Representative Whitfield?
A. No, no. I mean why would he tell me that?
MR. MORGAN: I believe you said sometimes Ed would tell me things that he wanted and have me tell the staff.
A. No, no, no, that's if we are driving in the car, and he's saying, oh, there is this -- I was on the house floor last night and so and so wants to know why I am not co-sponsoring the bill. I meant to be on the bill. Call Cory I am going to be in meetings all day, call Cory and tell him I want to be on that bill. I am talking about he's wanting something done by the staff and I am the messenger.
MR. MORGAN: He relays that through you.

A. Right.

Q. I want to show you a document bates stamped EW3000946. Feel free to read the entire document. I want to ask you about the email from you to Emma at the top.

A. What is the question?

Q. The question is, why was Ms. -- why was Emma sending you the schedule for the meetings?

A. First of all, I don't think this is a list of schedules, a scheduled list, it says I went through the list of Republican E&C members that we have not met with yet, so it's not scheduling meetings.

Q. What is it?

A. The list -- well, you can read.

Q. No, no --

A. It says the list of Republican E&C members that we have not met with yet.

Q. Okay. When you say let's try the last four on this list plus Greg Walden, what does that mean?

A. Well, I think what that means is -- I mean I don't remember this, but I think that it
means they are probably good people to talk to.

Q. And were you going to attend any of
these meetings that she scheduled?

A. I wouldn't have known at the time if I
was going to attend them or not.

Q. Of the members that are listed here,
did you attend any meetings with those members?

A. Yes, and I did so because the House
Ethics Committee told me I could. I was advised by
the general counsel that I could do that.

Q. And which meetings did you attend?

A. I attended the meeting with Billy Long
and Cassidy. Harper I am drawing a total blank on.
Oh, wait a minute, I may have gone to Harper too.
General Counsel told me I could go to any meetings I
wanted to with Marty and Donna and Ed's scheduler
could set them up.

Q. You went to multiple meetings with
Marty and Donna that were set up by Representative
Whitfield's office?

A. Sometimes I set them up on my own, but
in the Senate side, I don't think his office had
anything to do with it.

Q. Okay.

A. And again, house counsel said that
Ed's office could set up meetings through Emma for Marty and Donna because he wanted members to hear from them and that I could attend them.

Q. Okay. And you indicate to the staff members that -- well, let me rephrase that, did you indicate to Emma that you would attend --

A. I never knew from one day to the next, there were lots of them I never showed up for, depended what else I was doing that day. She never knew, she never ever knew, ever knew which meetings I was going to. Because I didn't know. And furthermore, it's none of her business. I don't have to tell her that kind of thing, it's just another waste of time for me.

Q. I want to show you a document here that is Bates stamped EWJ000753. Feel free to read the entire document, but my question simply is why were you requesting that Mr. Hicks set up a meeting?

A. I have no idea because I have never met with Yarmouth in my life. I have never stepped foot in his office.

Q. Thank you.

A. Also it's to the press secretary, Chris Pack, it's not from Cory.

Q. Did I say Cory, sorry, I misspoke,
from Chris?

A. That's another reason why it doesn't make any sense.

MR. MORGAN: Well I think the first or second email there is from you to Cory, Hicks and Chris Pack.

A. Oh.

MR. MORGAN: And then the response at the top there appears to come from Chris Pack.

A. Wait, this is confusing, we have an email from Mimi, and then we have Mimi Brody saying I just noticed Representative Yarmouth, and then I added whatever, and then I said can you set up a meeting with Yarmouth, I have no idea. Because number one, he's a Democrat, and I don't tend to work with Democrats, and number two, Chris Pack is the Press Secretary, so that doesn't make any sense. Because

MR. MORGAN: So who would that meeting have been for then.

A. I have no idea. I don't understand why -- I have no clue, because as I have said, I have never -- I have been never been in Yarmouth's office, I don't know where it is, I would have no reason to talk to him myself, he was a co-sponsor on the bill, I think, already, so I have absolutely no
idea what this refers to, I mean it makes no sense, because Chris Pack was the Press Secretary. 
Q. At this time period in October of 2013, was Chris Pack handling animal welfare issues? 
A. He's never handled animal welfare issues. Chris Pack? 
Q. Was there a time period before the hiring of Marty and after Justin Fareed left -- 
A. Well, maybe, maybe, but again, I don't -- I don't know what this question is there, I don't know. 
Q. Okay. 
A. I mean I don't understand what it means. 
Q. That's fine. 
A. Or what it's for. 
Q. That's fine, thank you. I want to show you a document Bates stamped HSLFOCE29215, feel free to read the entire document, but I want to ask about the email you sent to Marty at the top. 
A. Well, FOSH was one of the organizations that strongly supports the bill, Friend of Sound Horses, and they are based in Missouri, which is I think where McCaskill is, and I think that -- I don't know if she was coming to the
hill or had been to the hill and was trying to get
through to them afterwards, but she met with -- I
went with her to Roy Blunt's office from Missouri,
and I think, Um, I was just working with Marty to --
because Marty was with me I think in a meeting with
this woman Teresa, just trying to let him know that
those other Missouri offices or the McCaskill office
anyway, I don't know who Braguer represents. It
would be helpful for them to tell them she's from
Missouri.

Q. When you say Whitfield's office, what
is the significance of that?

A. I have no idea.

Q. Is there any other way he would
contact her other than being from Whitfield's
office?

A. No.

Q. Is this part of what you described
earlier, the strategy so that it comes from
Representative Whitfield's office as opposed to the
Humane Society?

A. Probably, although McCaskill is a
Democrat, so she likes the Humane Society. I am not
sure that would be applicable then.

Q. This email is January 2014. Do you
have similar type contacts with Marty concerning the
PAST Act this year, have you been having contact
with him?
A. Well, we are on conference calls once
a week without about 15 other people.
Q. Those conference calls are related to
strategy or what specifically?
A. Strategy, whose has done what to whom,
state of play, it's -- you know, all sorts of
people.
MR. MORGAN: Who are the people that
are on these calls? Is it the coalition of groups
interested in the PAST Act?
A. Sometimes, it depends on the call.
Sometimes it will be people from the equine
department, sometimes it will be people from the
press department, sometimes it will be people from
Federal Affairs, sometimes --
MR. MORGAN: You are referring to the
Humane Society?
A. Yeah.
MR. MORGAN: So is this a Humane
Society weekly call.
A. Sometimes people from HSLF, sometimes
from people outside, like AVMA, or the American
Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, or the Animal Welfare Society, depends on what the agenda is.

MR. MORGAN: And Marty is on those calls?

A. Yes, he is on those calls.

MR. MORGAN: Is anybody else from Representative Whitfield's office on those calls?

A. Not to -- I don't think so.

Q. Do you also have one on one meetings -- I should rephrase that, have you had one on one meetings with Marty concerning the PAST Act?

A. Meetings?

Q. Meetings or phone calls or even emails concerning the PAST Act?

A. Sure, yeah, as in updating.

Q. Did they relate to strategy, strategy as well on the PAST Act?

A. No, we are beyond that pretty much.

Q. I'm sorry, maybe I am not clear about the time period, I am saying ever, so since Marty has started working for the congressman in December 2013 until the present, have you had those type of communications with him where it's not a conference call but it's the two of you discussing strategy or
anything else related to the PAST Act?

A. That's a broad question.

Q. Okay. Have you had conversations with him related to strategy on the PAST Act?

A. Since when?

MR. MORGAN: Since the time he started working for Representative Whitfield's office.

A. I don't know. I mean I don't -- Marty lived with us for almost two months, so we talked about a lot of things. It was more -- it would be more likely that we were talking about status reports, where things are, you know, who is still not on the bill.

Q. This is a document bates stamped HSLFOCE0239306, and I draw your an attention to the email from January 1, 2014, when you say Marty and I met all day yesterday RE: Strategy?

A. This is what is so cute when you don't show the document. I don't know what that means. I don't know how we can meet all day RE: Strategy, seems like an exaggeration.

Q. And the title of the email says --

A. Because -- because Marty would have nothing to do with Mary Landrieu doing a fundraisers or women Senators.
Q. This is --
A. And I am not sure, go ahead.
Q. Next sentence says -- all women senators will present to the PAST committee and Priscilla Presley will be the draw, is this related to the PAST Act, this email?
A. Well, the part where I am talking about Mary Landrieu doing a fundraiser, yes. And the women Senators who support PAST, yes, and Priscilla Presley being the draw, yes.
Q. Just so I am clear, you are just saying that with respect to the sentence of Marty and I met all day regarding strategy, you said you don't know what the strategy was concerning?
A. No, I don't. I don't remember.
Q. And do you have any --
A. It could have been fundraising, I don't know.
Q. Do you work with Marty on fundraising?
A. No, I do not. He has nothing to do with fundraising. I meant to say media or attention, because it looks like I was talking about get media attention.
Q. Concerning Priscilla Presley? Or concerning --
A. Concerning attention to people knowing about the topic.

Q. What is the topic?

A. It's, I think the fact that women Senators support the PAST Act.

Q. Okay.

A. And that Priscilla Presley supports the PAST Act.

Q. Okay. So the discussion would have been about -- well, let me ask you, are you -- does this refresh your recollection that you had a conversation about strategy related to women Senators in supporting the PAST Act?

A. No, they already support the PAST Act.

Q. Do you have any better understanding what you meant by strategy after what you just said concerning the PAST Act?

A. No.

Q. And just so I am ultimately clear, with respect to this email, you don't know what strategy was discussed with Marty?

A. Not at all, and this is the problem with emails as you know, we write tons and tons of them, thousands and thousands.

Q. And the RE line on here is (inaudible)
Priscilla Presley, what does Priscilla Presley refer to?

A. If you look in the last paragraph of the email, it says Priscilla Presley will be the draw if Keith can get her to do it.

Q. And the draw is for discussing the PAST Act?

A. No, it's a draw for the fundraiser that Mary Landrieu would be having.

Q. Did Priscilla Presley come into town to speak on behalf of the PAST Act?

A. Yes, she did.

Q. Thank you. This is document bates stamped HSLFOCE029449. Feel free to read the entire document, but I want to draw your attention to the email from you to Mimi which says if okay with you all, I may have Marty stand in for me on Friday. He and I communicate hourly on PAST and I was hoping to take Friday off.

A. Well, clearly that's an embellishment exaggeration, obviously he and I do not communicate hourly on PAST. That's a -- how do I say it, it's -- it's an impossibility.

Q. How often do you -- well, at that time period, December 2013, how often would you say that
you actually communicated regarding FAST?

A. Not that often, because -- I don't know when he was hired.

Q. December 2, 2013.

A. Okay. When he was first hired, he was going through all sorts of training and ethics classes and he wasn't able -- I mean he was very busy, he was filling out employee reports and meeting people, and whatever, whatever. This is so out of context, I mean he and I -- there is no way we could communicate hourly on FAST, even if we wanted to.

Q. And so you are saying you communicated at that time period daily?

A. No, no, I don't think so, no.

Q. Weekly?

A. Let me explain something, because you know what, these questions are very redundant. If I did speak to Marty, it was as part of a group of people who were trying to advance legislation. We are all sharing with each other all the time things like how many co-sponsors do we have, who is pushing back. What is Marsha Blackburn up to. When is Marsha Blackburn going to have an ethics complaint filed against Ed Whitfield, that's the kind of thing
we talk about, so it's something all of us are
discussing, just as you would if you were working on
a project and you wanted to know what the status of
the project was.

Q. Did you have any conversations --
well, did you have conversations with people in his
office beyond -- that were beyond typically what the
status of it was regarding strategy, not necessarily
with Marty Irby, but other staffers with regard to
the strategy on how to push the PAST Act?

A. I don't remember.

Q. I want to show you a document bates
stamped EW4001271. I'll ask you questions about the
email on the second page from you to I believe Cory
Hicks.

A. Second page?

Q. Yes, where it says Ed is now focused
on PAST, we discussed it this morning.

A. This is a typical example of Ed
Whitfield using me as a messenger. Basically I mean
-- often times it's a spouse, the spouse will call a
staff person and say this is what my husband wants
you to do. That's just what happens, and it happens
because the member -- well, Ed is the Chairman of
the Energy and Power Subcommittee, okay, so he has
meetings like three times a week, so there are plenty of times when he and I are in the car, and he will say to me, oh, get Emma to do this, get Cory to do this, get Marty to do this, and he doesn't have the time to do it so I do it as the dutiful wife.

Q. So you are saying that he had you send this list to the staff members related to the PAST Act?

A. Sorry?

Q. You are saying your husband had you send this list to the --

A. Well, he would have said to me, I didn't know he was going before the rules committee, but he was going before the rules committee and he wanted to know when. Because I didn't have anything to do with the rules committee.

Q. In what --

A. This would be the kind of thing that Ed said to me, these will be the type of documents I need, tell Cory. I need the OIG report, this, this this and this. He knows about all these documents because he has seen them in his office, they all have big stacks of stuff. He knows about the list of endorsements, he's seen all this stuff, and he would say -- he would say I want all the articles in
the Tennessee newspapers, this is what I want, tell
Cory this is what I want.

I think part of the problem was that,
because I don't know when Justin left, but after
Justin left, Ed felt that there was nobody in the
office who was really that familiar with things, and
so he -- in this case is a good example, he was --
he knew that I knew what these things were, he knew
that I knew what these things were, so I was acting
like a secretary almost, saying okay, Cory this is
what Ed wants.

Q. It says here we discussed it this
morning and have come up with the following
checklist. Did you two --
A. Meaning he gave me this checklist to
convey to Cory.

Q. So you had no input on this checklist?
A. As to documents they needed to gather?
Q. As to the six that are listed here,
did you have any conversations with Representative
Whitfield about what should be included?
A. Well, if he asked me, is there
anything I have left out, maybe I did, but I am
telling you what, my husband is probably more
knowledgeable about every document related to this
bill than anybody I know including me. So he -- I mean he's seen all these things over and over, so he probably would take them off, but he probably said, is there anything I have forgotten.

And again, I mean at that point, I am his wife, he's asking me, okay, I am trying to put something together, can you think of anything I have forgotten. I am not working for the Humane Society at that point or HSLF, I am not speaking for HSLF, I am answering his question, is there anything I have forgotten.

Q. Does that happen often when it may be something related to the PAST Act where he just needs your help as a wife with working on it and working on the strategy or what to do?

A. My husband does not like to ask for help. Usually it's only when he's in a mad rush, and he can't do it himself or there is a deadline and he will say, call Cory, call Emma, call so and so and tell them X.

But this kind of stuff, I mean, if amendment is allowed, arrange meeting with Lucas, that's nothing I could have come up with, and only Ed could have said I want to meet with Lucas. I couldn't, say, I arranged a meeting with Congressman
Lucas, or arrange a meeting with Peterson. I mean
-- that's something Ed would have to say.
Q. Okay. Did you have any conversations
-- well, let me -- let me ask this.
Did you have any meeting with your
husband and other members of congress related to the
PAST Act?
A. I remember two meetings on the Senate
side.
Q. What were those meetings?
A. One was with Alexander, I think this
was a long time ago, I don't really remember when it
was, it was a long time ago. And I don't even
remember why we went over there. I can't remember
why we went. But I know that Ed wanted to talk to
Lamar about the bill. And Lamar Alexander was the
first person to do a fundraiser for my husband when
he ran in 1994 and he and I know each other, so Ed
said come with me. I never opened my mouth the
entire meeting, and I don't think Lamar Alexander
even knew I worked for the Humane Society
Legislative Fund, he saw me as Ed's wife.
Q. But that the meeting was related to,
back then, and I guess it was a different version of
the PAST Act?
Q. And what is the second meeting that you had --
A. Second meeting was with Senator Brown of -- from Massachusetts, and again, was it the PAST Act? It may have been the horse slaughter bill. I can't remember which it was. It may have been the horse slaughter legislation but I remember Ed wanted Brown to get on as a co-sponsor on the Senate bill, and --
Q. What was your role in that meeting?
A. Nothing, I sat there and listened, met his dogs and his daughter.
Q. Did you discuss horses and --
A. No.
Q. Did you discuss the two of you on horses or discuss Scott Brown on horses, and that you all own horses, were there any discussions like that?
A. I mean who knows. We do own horses, so it's possible.
Q. Do you remember any meetings on the house side with you and Representative Whitfield together discussing the PAST Act?
A. With 433 other members.
Q. Oh, do you frequently have meetings there with Representative Whitfield, so much that you are saying there are too many meetings?

A. No, I am trying to think about all the members, not the number of meetings. I rarely have meetings with my husband.

Q. Okay.

A. And other members. I don't need to have him in the room, nor does he need me, he definitely doesn't need me. I can't remember any.

Q. Document bates stamped HSLFOCE20139.

A. I don't think -- I don't think Ed ever went to this meeting.

Q. Did you attend the meeting?

A. I have met with Phil Roe. Yes, I have. I do not remember -- I don't ever remember Ed being in a meeting with me and Phil Roe. I don't remember. I think -- you know, he often times doesn't show up for meetings.

Q. With the meeting with Phil Roe, who attended that meeting that -- (inaudible)?

A. I don't remember. When is this, July 18, 2012? Well, it couldn't -- I just -- I don't remember. I know I spoke to him and it was the very -- very -- you know, I think he was one of the very
first people I ever spoke to.

Q. Do you know if a staff member from Representative Whitfield's office attended?

A. Well, I definitely don't think Ed did, definitely don't think he did. I don't know.

Maybe. I just don't remember.

Q. Do you remember if Cory Hicks attended?

A. He may have. Here is the deal, Cory, I know, talks to Roe's staff about a lot of issues, so I know he talks with Roe's staff, I know I was in a meeting with Roe, I know. I remember sitting across from him talking to him in his office. Cory may have been in the meeting, I just don't remember.

Q. Do you recall what the meeting was about, which legislation?

A. Well, it would have been -- well, I know -- he invited Ed and me to a party down in Tennessee at the Bark Ball, the equivalent of the Bark Ball, but I think it was -- yeah, I think Tennessee walking horses, because they are in his district. But again, the house counsel advised me that there was nothing wrong with attending meetings in this set up, so that's what -- and that's why I was there.
Q. And I'll be -- when I ask you questions, does not necessarily mean something was wrong, not only does it mean something was wrong, but our office can't even say something was wrong.

A. I understand. I just want you to know it was on advice from the General Counsel from the House Ethics Committee that I went to these meetings.

Q. Go ahead and explain that then, at what point did you approach the -- at what point did that become a time you were speaking with the General Counsel?

A. Again, I don't remember, it was probably sometime -- most recently, I remember over the years, we talked to them all the time. Probably October maybe.

MR. MORGAN: Do you recall what prompted you --

A. Yes, I can tell you exactly what prompted it. Someone visited Renee Elmer's -- no, no, wrong, somebody who talked to Renee Elmer's -- Chief of Staff or LD, trying to arrange a meeting with Ellmers who I have never met in my life, so I was not involved in this but I heard about it. The person on her staff made a statement that they
thought that Ed's office shouldn't be involved in
setting up meetings, so that got back to me, so I
immediately called the House Administration
Committee like that day, and I asked to talk to
Sensinbrenner, the General Counsel, and I said could
you please tell me your position on this. And he
said, well, tell me what is going on, what are you
doing, blah, blah, blah, so I told him the whole
thing, and he said no, that's not a violation, not a
violation.

Q.     What was the issue, you said it was --
A.     That Whitfield was not supposed to be
using his office to set up meetings for Marty and
Donna.

Q.     And then why did you call, was there
any issue about you and these meetings, I am trying
to understand --
A.     It's not about the meetings, it's
about my husband, my husband, I protect my husband.
MR. MORGAN: Why did you call?
A.     Because he's my husband. I don't want
him -- I don't want him to be accused of ethics
violations, he's my husband, I am his wife, purely,
that's the only -- why wouldn't I do it.

MR. MORGAN: We are not suggesting
that reaching out to them is something you shouldn't have done, we are trying to understand why you were reaching out to them as opposed to some representative on his staff.

A. Because I will tell you why, I want to hear it directly, I don't want to hear it through somebody else.

Q. You also mentioned that the reason why you attended the meetings was they told you you could attend the meetings.

A. No, that's something different. Okay? I was first dealing with house administration, because I don't want to play the game of telephone and have a word mistranslated by the time it gets to me. And I don't want imprecision, I want to hear it directly, that's why I called, and that's why I will always call myself, and I called Mr. Sensinbrenner back a second time, why, I can't remember, but probably to, okay, I just want to make sure that everything in this scenario is okay, and that what we are doing is okay.

It all stemmed from a staff person on Renee Elmer's staff making a statement to somebody that, you know, this isn't right, these meetings aren't right, so Mr. Sensinbrenner said from the
standpoint of Mr. Whitfield using his office to set
up meetings, we don't have a problem with that. And
he said but Connie, I am going to call the General
Counsel of House Ethics, he's a friend of mine, and
I am going to ask him to call you and I am going to
explain to him as a lawyer to lawyer what you have
said to me and then you can talk to him about it.
Because he said, because I want to talk to him about
this also, I want to talk to -- I want the two of us
to talk together, so one night at about 6 p.m., I
get a phone call from the General Counsel at the
House Ethics Committee, and he said, I have talked
with Mr. Sensenbrenner and I wanted to get back to
you because I wanted to go through with you all of
this, and make you feel comfortable that you are not
doing anything wrong. And he said I want you to
know, this is my last day on the job, I am leaving
for a private sector job but I feel so strongly that
you need to know that everything is okay, that that
is why I am calling you.
Q. Okay.
A. So he went through every single thing,
and he said it is entirely okay for Emma to be
setting up meetings. He said it is entirely okay
for Emma to be setting up meetings for Donna and
Marty and for you to attend any meeting you want, and it is entirely -- what else -- it's entirely okay for you to set up meetings for Marty and Donna. He said you are not doing anything wrong.

MR. MORGAN: Was there a discussion with him about the fact that you are a registered lobbyist.

A. Yes, he knew that, absolutely.

Q. So that was the thing that he was trying -- because he said you are not doing anything wrong, so the thing he was focusing was whether or not something was wrong with you being a lobbyist and attending these meetings?

A. Yes, but also the starting point is with Renee Elmer's office, so like what did that meeting, when they said Ed's office is doing something wrong, well, okay Ed's office, what were they doing wrong, I wanted to know, what were they doing wrong, so that's why I called Sensinbrenner and then he called said I want you to talk to this guy at house ethics, because he wanted to make sure we all agree, so he said I am going to call the guy at house ethics, and then I am going to have him call you.

Q. Who was the person you spoke with at
house ethics?

A. Whoever was the guy who left recently.

Q. Was that Dan Schwager?

A. Probably.

MR. MORGAN: Does that ring a bell.

A. Yeah, I think that's who it was. It was literally his last night on the job. Because I said I can't believe you are taking the time -- I think we talked, you know, it was in the evening. And he kept saying you are not doing anything wrong, don't worry.

MR. MORGAN: So with that second call, there was the first call where you reached out to Sensinbrenner and then you said it was a second call --

A. I don't remember. Maybe there wasn't a second call.

MR. MORGAN: This is that same October timeframe.

A. Would have been right next to each other, if there was a second call.

MR. MORGAN: Okay. Just want to make sure we have the timeframe right.

A. You know what, I'll tell you what. We had an problem with the chief -- not the chief -- we
had a problem with some policemen at -- I had a problem with some policemen at Capitol Hill, and it may have been about that, I may have been calling Sensinbrenner to say look, what was ever done about that.

Q. I am going to show you a document bates stamped HSLPOCE012822. Now my question is about, in the middle of the paragraph, it says -- this is an email from you to Holly Hazzard, says Yoho told Congressman Whitfield and me that HSUS is evil. I am not trying to get to that part, I am just trying to refresh your recollection about you and Representative Whitfield having a meeting with Yoho?

A. A meeting?

MR. MORGAN: A conversation.

A. Okay. October 19. Okay. About the video, he told Ed about the video. This guy is a veterinarian, okay, Yoho, he's a veterinarian from Florida, he's seen the results of this sorry practice to horses which basically cripples them. And he probably feels as passionate or more passionate about the bill as Ed does, and he's a freshman, so he doesn't really know that much, he's brand new.
Okay. So what is your question?

Q. Does that refresh your recollection of a meeting or conversation between you, Representative Yoho and Congressman Whitfield?

A. Ed, I think, met with Yoho and I think I was meeting Ed, and I came into the -- I think I came into the room. And that's when Yoho was saying to Ed, we have to pass this, because otherwise the Humane Society is going to be all over us, and did you know the Humane Society wants animals to have the same rights that humans have, I am standing there listening to this, and that -- and he -- that's why I know that part. And he told Ed about the video he had prepared. I never prepared a direct colleague letter for Yoho.

Q. And was this in Representative Whitfield's office?

A. No, it was somewhere like -- it was like some -- no, it was not in his office. It was like some -- some random room somewhere, there were a bunch of people running around, it may have been near a hearing room. It was very brief, it was very brief.

Q. Okay. So not a scheduled meeting?

A. No, it was not a scheduled meeting.
A. Question?
Q. The question is what prompted you to send this email that says that I am not to contact you or Emma directly --
A. Okay, well, it's wrong -- it's not wrong -- I mean it's not right, because that's not true. Because Ed -- again, in support of Ed's bill, I mean we were all supporting Ed's bill at that point. I think because of the fact that Marsha Blackburn went to -- went to Fred Upton in a rage and said I am going to file an ethics complaint against Ed Whitfield, that my reaction and because she was roaring around, you know, going to Eric Cantor and all sorts of members threatening Ed, I think I was -- I started to like the turtle putting its head in its shell.

MR. MORGAN: I see.

A. But I mean it's not true that I am not supposed to contact them in support of Ed's Bill, that's not true. If I am -- I am if I am trying to include them information about something we are all working on together, there is nothing wrong with that.
MR. MORGAN: Well, what did you understand Marsha Blackburn's complaint to be regarding?

A. Well, I have no idea. I have no idea, she's crazy.

MR. MORGAN: She was just going to file a complaint with the ethics committee.

A. She's crazy.

MR. MORGAN: But you have no idea --

A. I have no idea. She went to Fred Upton, she went to Eric Cantor, she went to all sorts of people just foaming at the mouth, just probably because there were so many co-sponsors on the bill, probably because Ed was so successful, probably because there were 51 Senators on the bill, who knows, I am guessing.

MR. MORGAN: You don't know what the subject matter of her complaint might have been?

A. How would I, how could I possibly know.

MR. MORGAN: Well, it seems like what you just said is her doing that prompted you to send this email.

A. Ethics, the word ethics.

MR. MORGAN: All you knew was ethics.
A. Ethics, it's just like with what's her names office, Ellmers, okay, what you are doing isn't right. Okay? Okay. I need to investigate, what does that mean, what are we doing wrong. So she's going to file an ethics complaint.

Q. And from that --

A. Okay, halt --

MR. MORGAN: You thought somehow that ethics complaint might involve you.

A. No, absolutely not. Look, do you know what it's like to be in the spotlight for 20 years being married to a member of congress?

MR. MORGAN: I don't.

A. Okay. You wouldn't want to do it, I assure you. Everything you do and say is completely distorted, usually ends up in the press, always negative, you are attacked for everything you do and say. Okay? So if someone makes a threat like that against my husband who I am very protective of, anything I do, I automatically just like go into a robot mode.

MR. MORGAN: Okay. I don't mean to make you defensive, I am just trying to understand --

A. I'm sorry, I just get really worked up
about this. Because there have been so many hatchet
jobs done on us, and the fact is Marsha Blackburn is
defending criminals, they are breaking the federal
law, every single one of them is breaking the law
right now.

MR. MORGAN: So was she one of the
main opponents of the PAST Act.

A. She is the main opponent. She is the
main opponent.

Q. After this email, did you stop
contacting Emma and -- I guess emailing Marty
directly or are you saying because it was okay --

A. No, first of all, this was a letter to
Marty. It basically was trying to tell him, let's
cool it. Okay? So it's as much saying to him,
like, I don't want to be apart of this right now
because of the Marsha thing. But it's sort of like
an education of him as much as my saying, look, I
don't want to -- I don't to do anything that's going
to hurt my husband. No, did I stop working on the

bill, no.

Q. Did you stop having direct contacts
with Emma and Marty?

A. Well, I talked to Emma every single
day about plane flights, fundraisers, whether or not
-- whether we are going to accept an invitation, whether we are going to go on a CODEL, no, I did not stop direct contacts with Emma.

Q. Did you stop direct contacts with her as you put it here, related to Ed's bill?

A. First of all, she's a scheduler, so I would have very little reason to talk to her about Ed's bill.

Q. Would you talk to her about scheduling meetings related to Ed's bill?

A. I don't think she scheduled any meetings since -- well, I don't know. I mean --

MR. MORGAN: Well, we are trying to understand the email better too. So --

A. Alright, what is it -- what is your question?

Q. You are saying in this email that you were going to stop contacting Emma and Marty.

A. No, that's not what I am saying.

MR. MORGAN: Directly in support of Ed's bill.

A. No, that's not what I am saying.

Q. What are you saying?

A. I said I am not to contact Emma or Marty directly in support of Ed's bill. That's me
talking, that's me. No one told me that. No one
told me that.

MR. MORGAN: So this email wasn't
something you sent after reaching out to the ethics
committee or house administration.
A. No, not at all. No, they told me
everything I was doing was okay, everything. I did
this because of Marsha Blackburn and that was me, I
am imposing that on myself, no one told me this, no
one.

MR. MORGAN: Did at any point the
ethics committee tell you it was okay for you to
contact Ed's staff in support of legislation?
A. No, that didn't come up.

MR. MORGAN: The conversations you had
with house administration and the ethics committee
were related to your ability to attend meetings that
his office had set up? I just want to make sure I
understand --
A. They said that, well, we have already
cleared that part, okay, the meetings, all of that,
that was all okay.

MR. MORGAN: Okay. We talked about
that.
A. All of that was okay. So what is your
question?

MR. MORGAN: Other issues that you discussed with ethics beyond those meetings, were there any other times that you reached out to ethics.

A. No.

MR. MORGAN: As I am sure you can imagine to the extent you or Representative Whitfield's office had communication with the ethics committee and they okayed certain things, that's very relevant to what we are looking at.

A. Oh, yeah, but this was this one conversation, because this was this guy's last night, literally on the job.

Q. In January of this year, did there come a time when Emma was working on scheduling meetings for PAST Act activities and there was push back --

A. Yes, yes, there was.

Q. Okay. And --

A. I can't remember who the meetings were with, but I remember there was -- yes, there was push back, and it was because in my opinion, she was being lazy.

Q. Did you discuss that with
Representative Whitfield about the need for her to actually schedule the meetings?

A. I think I talked to Cory.

Q. Do you recall any contacts or communications with Representative Whitfield about the need for Emma to schedule the meetings?

A. I complain about his staff on occasion, I may have said -- I may have said that -- to him that she was being -- dragging her feet.

Q. And what was his response?

A. He basically never responds to what I am saying. He just takes it in and then -- you know, a day or two later, he may say to Emma or Cory or to me something, but at the time that I am talking to him, he usually never says anything.

Q. I want to talk about different legislation quickly. Have you had contact with Representative Whitfield's staff regarding other legislation that you were working on with the Humane Society, such as the Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act?

A. Uh-uh. Well, have I had contact -- what does that mean?

Q. Asking them to -- regarding language in the bill?
A. God, I can't imagine.

MR. MORGAN: Just trying to refresh your recollection here.

Q. This is document number HSLFOCE020961. I am drawing your attention to your email to Cory that begins since you are working with Chris on the bill, can you have him delete the two words.

A. Oh, this is not the puppy mill bill.

Q. Oh, okay, okay.

A. This is not the puppy mill bill.

Q. What is this? I'm sorry, I apologize, what is this?

A. I don't know.

MS. MAY: Is this the Doctrine of the Therapy at the Veteran's.

A. Oh, this has to do with Michael Grimm.

This is Michael Grimm's bill. This bill was Congressman Michael Grimm's of New York bill.

Q. You are sending the language to Cory -- why did you send the language to Cory?

A. He was working with Congressman Grimm's -- oh, since you are working with Chris on the bill, can you have him delete the two words if appropriate after the mention of shelter dogs -- (inaudible). Who is he, I don't know who he is.
I can understand why he removed preferred before option. I don't -- I mean I don't know who he is.

Q. Okay. This is an email to Cory. Is that correct?

A. Yeah.

Q. Okay.

A. Well, this talks about the HSUS applauds Representative Grimm for seeking to help veterans and shelter dogs, press release.

Q. And in working with Chris, can you have him, is it possible that the him refers to someone by the name of Chris?

A. Chris was Michael Grimm's Legislative Director.

Q. Okay. And did you want Cory to send this information to Chris?

A. He was working with Chris on it.

Q. So was that the purpose of this email, to send this information to Chris?

A. Yeah, because I know that Grimm did -- okay, that -- I was -- okay, the Humane Society wanted shelter dogs to be eligible. Michael Grimm didn't really want that, so I -- I think was trying to tell Cory that Mike -- because I had met with the
LD in Michael Grimm's office, that even though the
Humane Society wanted shelter dogs, Michael Grimm
didn't, so I think that was why the suggestion of if
appropriate.

Q. Okay.
A. Instead of making it sound like you
have to have shelter dogs. So I was just relaying
what Chris wanted.

Q. Okay. I see. We understand that
better. Thank you.

A. Because I met with Chris a lot on this
bill because that's a personal interest I have, that
-- and Michael Grimm introduced the bill.

MR. MORGAN: Why wouldn't you send
that email to directly to Chris then or call him
directly.

A. Because I think I had just talked to
him, and I think -- I don't even know what this
refers to, the two words if appropriate, and I don't
know if it's talking about the press release or
legislation or what. I don't really know what it's
talking about. So -- I don't know. All I know is
that Grimm didn't want shelter dogs, the Humane
Society and HSLF did, I was just trying to convey to
Cory because I know Grimm looks to Ed for animal
issues that Grimm's office didn't want shelter dogs.
Q. Do you ever contact Representative
Whitfield's staff related to Representative
Whitfield signing onto bills?
A. Well, sometimes if Ed forgets and
somebody runs into him on the house floor, and they
say why are you not on this bill this year, and
again, we will be home or something, and I'll be --
Ed will say remind Cory to put me on this bill, or
if Ed was on a bill, and it's about to come up for a
vote or something like that, and he's not on it, I
will say to Cory, why isn't he on this bill this
year?
Q. Okay.
MR. MORGAN: Let me try to understand
that a little bit more. You would be then relaying
the message for --
A. Yeah, yeah.
MR. MORGAN: Is that a common
practice?
A. More common probably than I would
like.
MR. MORGAN: Okay. Does
Representative Whitfield, does he --
A. I mean his staff will tell you --
MR. MORGAN: -- himself --

A. He's very bad about that.

MR. MORGAN: -- emails --

A. No, he's not good about sending emails. He doesn't even look at most of his emails.

The biggest problem my husband has with his staff is he's so consumed with being the Chairman of the Energy and Power Subcommittee and that takes up like five or six hours, a single hearing, preparation for that takes hours. So they will all tell you he's not good as a manager, he is not good internally and Emma will wait a month to talk to him about whether he wants to respond yes or no to an invitation, so a lot of times they will call me.

MR. MORGAN: Because you are more responsive.

A. Yeah, because I am more available.

They will say Mrs. Whitfield we have been trying to get Congressman Whitfield to tell us -- well, it's just like the other day, Cory called me and said will the Congressman be able to testify, he didn't call Ed, he called me, so I mean that happens a lot.

MR. MORGAN: Okay.

Q. Has the Humane Society ever had you try to get Ed to -- sorry, Representative Whitfield
to sign onto a bill or to sign a letter or anything like that?
A. Get him to sign onto a bill? Well, maybe to mention it, you know, maybe, there is this bill coming around the corner. But, you know what, I can't get my husband to do things, he and his staff are the ones who decide, and what they care about more than anything is constituents, so that's why for example, that's why he will not support the Humane Society on certain issues, if it's contrary to his constituents' positions, views, values.
Q. In those situations where they -- the Humane Society may ask you to run something by Ed, do you speak to him about it?
A. Sorry, just one second. Good God, this says the Feds are readying criminal charges against Representative Michael Grimm? Sorry?
Q. In those situations where the Humane Society may ask you to speak with Representative Whitfield, do you run things by him to see whether or not he wants to sign on or take some type of action that they have requested?
A. It's possible, again, as an efficiency thing, it's possible, it's possible. Like are you planning to sign onto this bill, yeah, it's
possible. But I mean I ask him about all sorts of
bills, are you going to sign onto Moran's bill for X
or are you going to sign onto Tim Petri's bill for
Y.

MR. MORGAN: Has there ever been a
time where you had disagreements over what action
he should take with regards to a Humane Society
issue?

A. Probably. However, you know, I am so
acutely aware of his constituents, honestly there
are certain issues I don't touch because of his
district, I don't touch anything having to do with
farming, so for example he's opposed to the Humane
Society's position on don't use antibiotics in
cattle, Ed believes in using them. I would never
discuss that with him.

MR. MORGAN: So you have a general
sense --

A. Nor do I -- I don't work on that
stuff. I would never even go there.

MR. MORGAN: I see.

A. Anything relating to EPA, anything
relating to climate change, anything relating to oil
and gas, natural gas, they all know, I don't work on
that, ever. So it's basically dogs and horses that
I work on.

MR. MORGAN: Okay.

A. Basically that's all I work on, dogs and horses.

MR. MORGAN: And those are areas where you and Representative Whitfield tend to agree.

A. Like that, yeah. I mean I can't think of an instance when we have never not agreed on anything relating to dogs and horses, anything. But I mean the other stuff, I don't even work on that stuff, I don't even know about that stuff as far as the Humane Society and it's a lot more of their work, I mean dogs and horses are a dot in their universe.

Q. You mentioned earlier that you know Marty Irby. How long have you known him?

A. Well, that's so funny, it's not long but it's been intense. I can't remember when we first met, I knew about him, I knew of him because of the huge sacrifices he made. Cory Hicks knew him long before I did. And he talked to Marty a lot on the phone and he said, you know, this guy is unbelievable, and blah, blah, blah, and then he offered to come up here and talk about the issue as someone who lived it and who -- when he took his
position, he lost everything. So I mean that was --
I had nothing to do with that as far as how he ended up here. I had no thought about whether he should be here because I didn't know him. I thought it was sad what had happened to him.

So I can't remember the first time we met but we did, and I think he and I were in a meeting together, and he was incredibly knowledgeable and so he -- you know, he -- he was staying -- he and Donna were staying somewhere and then that time passed, and then I invited him to stay with us, because he had absolutely no money, and he was trying to find a job, and, you know, because his job had been taken away from him, so he was thinking about jobs with the Humane Society at that point.

Q. Did you help him or -- with his attempt to find a job with the Humane Society?
A. No.

Q. And why is that?
A. Why would I?

Q. You worked at the Humane Society?
A. I don't. I work at HSLF.

Q. Okay. Alright, did you attempt to have him find a job at HSLF?
A. No, I never was involved in any of his job activities.

MR. MORGAN: You didn't assist with his job search in anyway.

A. No.

Q. Including with the Congressman's office?

A. I mean I know that he applied for different jobs, I don't -- I can't tell you exactly how many, I can't tell you exactly where. I knew about the Humane Society job because it was just mentioned to me that he was being considered for a job.

Q. This is a document Bates stamped HSLFOCE --

A. Wait, I did try to help him with one -- before we look at this document, I did try to help him, I talked with Keith Dane of our office and said why don't you call the American Horse Council or the American Veterinary Medical Association and see if they will hire him because then he could continue to be an advocate for this issue and because he's so passionate about it and he could be paid.

MR. MORGAN: When he was -- we
understand he was up here in Washington, D.C. for

awhile going to these meetings, October,

November-ish. You said he didn't have any money.

He didn't have a job. Is that correct?

A. Correct.

MR. MORGAN: Do you know who was
covering his day-to-day expenses during that period.

A. I think Friends of Sound Horses was,

which is an outside group supporting the bill.

Q. Did you have any conversations with

Representative Whitfield about the fact that if Mr.

Irby went to work at his office, he could still work

on the PAST Act?

A. I think that was assumed. I mean I
don't think I would have said that because I mean --

first of all, you know, he's Ed's Press Secretary

now, so what happens with people in Ed's office, I
don't have anything to do with. I mean I don't

know. I think Justin Fareed left, I don't think

there was anybody working on the legislation the way

-- there had been a dedicated person before, so I am

sure that's why Ed wanted to hire him.

Q. But you don't recall any conversations

with Representative Whitfield concerning that?

A. Concerning what? Concerning what?
Q. Hiring Marty that such that he could be able to work on the PAST Act when he entered the congressional office?

A. It's possible that I said, oh, that would be a great idea or he would be a great advocate.

Q. Okay. The document before you HSLFOCE006209. My question to you simply is what is this dinner that is scheduled and referred to?

A. These members and spouses are attending along with you and Congressman Whitfield. I want -- I know exactly what this is. This is the annual reunion that the class of 1994 has.

Q. Why did you forward it to the individuals at the Humane Society cc Kate and Jessica?

A. What year is this? 2012? But what did I say?

Q. You didn't say anything.

A. I don't know. Because I don't really work with Kate. This is -- some of these people are out of office, I mean -- I don't know.

Q. Okay. Did you know -- well, are you aware that Sara Amundson attended the State of the Union address in 2014?
A. I am.

Q. How did that come about, did you invite her --

A. I get a ticket to every inauguration and every State of the Union. It's my ticket and I give it to people I want to give it to. One year I gave it to a woman who was dying of cancer.

And I am tired of listening to President Obama talk and I have no interest of going to either his inauguration or his State of the Union. Sara on the other hand worships the ground that he walks on, so I thought she will enjoy this.

Q. I have a question about email addresses. In the emails we received, there is one email @verizon.net. Who email address is that?

A. It's our home computer.

Q. Do you use that email address personally?

A. You mean for my personal?

Q. No, I mean do you use that email address?

A. Sometimes if this thing isn't working, sometimes I do, yeah.

Q. Does Representative Whitfield use it
as well?

A. Sometimes, not often.

Q. And then there is another email, wew

--

A. That's his personal.

Q. He uses that one?

A. Yeah, but he lost it, it's gone.

Q. Okay. Did you ever use that email address?

A. If it was something like do you want to go on this CODEL, shall I take the dogs out, have you fed the dogs, maybe.

Q. Oh, I mean you would send something from it?

A. Oh, no, no, no. No, no, no, no, no.

Q. But you do send emails from @verizon.net --

A. To whom?

Q. To anyone, well to members of Representative Whitfield's staff.

A. It's possible. As I said, if my computer is down, yeah.

Q. Okay. You complete evaluations as an employee of HSLF?

A. I go through the motions, yeah, I
don't take them very seriously.

Q. In one of your evaluations in 2011 you had a quote that says unusual willingness -- when you were self-evaluating, says "unusual willingness to sacrifice political capital and my husband's political fortunes for the sake of the HSLF?"

A. Right.

Q. What does that mean when you say husband’s political fortunes?

A. Can you hand me the document?

Q. I don't have the document.

A. Okay. You have to reread it then.

Q. Unusual willingness to sacrifice political capital and my husband's political fortunes for the sake of the HSLF.

A. Making people mad at me, making people mad at what I do.

Q. So can you explain? I just don't understand how that sacrifices his political fortunes.

A. Making other members of congress angry, so they are angry at him.

Q. Because of your work for the Humane Society?

A. Yes.
Q. What is your current salary?
A. $87,000. And I get paid that regardless of what I work on, regardless of what I work on.

MR. MORGAN: That amount is not tied to the success of any particular pieces of legislation.

A. Nothing, zero, nothing, no. If I were working on a bill related to dog kennels, I would be paid the same amount. Anything, doesn't matter what I am working on.

Q. Do you have any questions?
MR. MORGAN: I would like to go back through my notes to see.

Q. While he's looking, I just want to ask you about this, it's a document bates stamped EW4004770. I am going to ask about the statement when you say Cory, please be sure that Ed votes for the Peters amendment today.

A. This is another example of Ed and I were probably in the car, it's 11:48 a.m., is that we were talking -- wait a minute, oh, no, he was talking with Stacey. And he probably said -- well, maybe not, I don't know. I think what I was doing here, I was reminding Cory that the time before Ed
was actually -- went to the house floor and spoke on
behalf of this bill, he was one of the primary
sponsors. And probably I had just found out that it
was coming up and probably I was wanting to make
sure they were aware that it was coming up for a
vote. And that he voted that way before, so.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
Well, I want to know in general about
the ethics restrictions that -- if you had any with
respect to contacting Ed's office, so did
Representative Whitfield ever talk to you about if
there are limits or restrictions on contacting his
staff?
A. He didn't need to. I mean I knew what
the restrictions were.
Q. What are the restrictions as you
understand them?
A. I am not supposed to lobby his staff.
I am not supposed to lobby him.
Q. Okay. You can -- which question were
you saying?
MR. MORGAN: I don't know that we have
the email here, but there was an email in which I
think you referenced having a meeting with
Representative Whitfield and outside ethics counsel,
not the ethics committee but like a political
attorney, I think it was Jan Baran perhaps that was
referenced in the email?

A. It had nothing to do with ethics, it
was a personal matter. It was not a political
matter, it had absolutely nothing to do with
congress.

MR. MORGAN: And when you say you
understand you are not to lobby Representative
Whitfield or his staff, what do you understand
lobbying means in that context.

A. I am not supposed to try to influence
them to take a position on legislation on behalf of
my client, my employer, HSLF.

MR. MORGAN: Okay. At any time of
day? Does that restriction apply sort of 24 hours a
day, seven days a week, wherever you happen to be or
is it limited to not lobbying them while they are in
the office or on official time?

A. I think it's all the time.

MR. MORGAN: Okay.

Q. And have you had that understanding
since you registered to lobby in 2011?

A. What is the relevancy of that
question? I don't understand what -- I don't
understand --

Q. I am trying to understand. You said that's what your understanding is. How long has that been your understanding?

A. It's kind of like a fish in water, I don't know precisely when it started.

Q. Okay.

MR. MORGAN: Okay.

Q. Fair enough. Well, do you have anything that you think would be helpful, anything you want to clarify, any comments you would like to make?

A. No. I mean -- no, I mean you know how I feel, you can tell, I have made myself pretty clear. I think -- I think you guys have done a great job and I say that, even though it's been a horrendous stress on ten or so people, but I think you have done what you had to do, and so I don't hold any ill-will against you, but I do know several members, good men, who are choosing not to run again because of the OCE, and it's really sad to me that, you know, it is -- you know, I get upset because I just think there are better things to do than drag people.

But on the other hand, I understand
when a complaint is made even anonymously or by someone stated that they are angry and they are going to file one, you have to see it through, but I just -- you know, I just think it's unfortunate.
(Whereupon, the recording is terminated.)
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sitting 42,12
situations 4,12
64,12,18
six 37,19 63,9
slaughter 3,18,22
8,21 40,6,8
solely 2,12,24,3,7
4,13,19 5,10,22
5,25 6,5,12,8,6
8,16,20 9,14,18
14,19,21 15,7,15
15,16,20 27,21,23
28,20,23 29,1,2
38,8 39,21 50,9
50,10 58,20 60,22
61,22 64,23
64,10,13,19 65,7
66 12,17,15,18,22
67,19,15,22,14,16
society 65,14
somebody 12,25
43,21 45,7,23
62,6
soring 10,14,13,7
49,20
sorry 24,25 29,20
26,9 53,25 59,11
63,25 64,15,17
sort 54,17,76,16
sorts 28,9,34,6
51,16 52,12,65,1
sought 5,16
sound 26,23,61,6
69,8
sounds 7,8,1
speak 4,18,33,11
34,19,64,14,19
speaking 4,12 28,9
as 43
special 5,6
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EXHIBIT 39
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 8:00 PM
To: Ivy, Mary Hyslauff, Excita
Cc: Keith Dene
Subject: My Not Contacting You or Emma Directly

I have been working with you so long, I forget you are now part of Ed's staff. I am not to contact you or Emma directly in support of Ed's bill. Better to come from Sara or Keith.

Sent from my iPhone
EXHIBIT 40
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:39 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: [Redacted]

Hi, Mary.

I've been thinking about the two issues we were discussing this morning, and I had a few thoughts on them.

First, on the issue of [Redacted], I think we should consider [Redacted]. This approach has been successful in similar situations in the past and could help us achieve our goals.

Second, regarding [Redacted], I propose [Redacted]. This method has shown promise in other contexts and may be effective in our situation.

Please let me know your thoughts on these ideas. I look forward to discussing them further.

Best regards,
[Your Name]
EXHIBIT 42
EXHIBIT 43
They are establishing the presence. Never before, I think, will I see the house.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 3, 2015, at 10:45 AM, "Julie, Carol" <Julie_Habita@mail.house.gov>

Subject: The PRESS RELEASE: FISMA Review in Markup Today

They are establishing the presence. Never before, I think, will I see the house.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 3, 2015, at 10:45 AM, "Julie, Carol" <Julie_Habita@mail.house.gov>

Subject: The PRESS RELEASE: FISMA Review in Markup Today

They are establishing the presence. Never before, I think, will I see the house.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 3, 2015, at 10:45 AM, "Julie, Carol" <Julie_Habita@mail.house.gov>

Subject: The PRESS RELEASE: FISMA Review in Markup Today
tens of millions in fatalities throughout the country. In addition, the Whitfield amendment would add millions of dollars in the cost of the Farm Bill components by forcing the U.S. Department of Agriculture to hire hundreds of new employees and other personnel.

Serious problems with the language of the Whitfield amendment include the following:

- The amendment utilizes a total diversion of the signature sheet, requiring more than 500 signatures that would be deemed as having been refused, leading to a potential constitutional challenge.
- The amendment mandates the creation of a new regulatory body, which would require an act of Congress and would not allow for the expenditure of any federal funds without the explicit approval of Congress.
- The amendment requires the implementation of a new regulatory agency, which would be subject to the same constraints as other federal agencies, but would have the authority to implement new regulations without the approval of Congress.
- The amendment could lead to significant administrative costs, including the hiring of new employees, the purchase of new equipment, and the implementation of new regulations, which would require the expenditure of additional federal funds.

These concerns raise serious questions about the constitutionality and appropriateness of the Whitfield amendment. The House Committee on Agriculture should carefully consider these issues before voting on the amendment.
EXHIBIT 44
From: Comrie Herman-Whifield
To: Haystaff Evans, Haystaff@delaware.gov
Subject: HR 687

You have been doing a GREAT job

Sent from my Phone

On Oct 11, 2016, at 3:27 AM, "Haystaff, Evans "<Haystaff@delaware.gov> wrote:

> I am reaching out on the meetings that we have been putting on before the end of the month. I need to setup a meeting with your office to go over this month. Please call me with your availability or you can text me on my phone.

> Thanks,
> 
> Every

> "Original Message"
> From: Comrie Herman-Whifield <whifieldd@delaware.gov>
> Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2016 11:39 AM
> To: "Haystaff, Evans"<Haystaff@delaware.gov>
> Subject: Re: Delaware Office

> Dear,

> Please see attached paragraph below

> Thanks,
> 
> Comrie

> From: my Phone

> I just called to let you know that the same person who was with the Delaware Office is not available to do a meeting. I will call the person to let her know that please call us to set up the meeting.

Confidential Treatment Under the NonDisclosure Provisions of HR. 865 or the 110th Congress as Amended Requested
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EXHIBIT 45
From: Michael Mekarian
To: Sara Announce
Subject: Re: Mary, Anna Dukakis Politics

Have you been able to locate anything about the interview that you and I had with Anna Dukakis on Wednesday? I am looking for information on her specific involvement with the Whitfield re-election campaign and the role of the Kennedy family in Massachusetts politics.

On Dec 13, 2016, at 9:41 AM, Michael Mekarian wrote:

Hi Sara,

I am looking for information about the interview you and I had on Wednesday regarding Anna Dukakis's role in the Whitfield re-election campaign. If you have any information or notes from that interview, please share them with me.

Best,
Michael
Dear Frederick,

Thank you for your email earlier today. I appreciate the information you provided about the upcoming Healthcare.gov audit and the potential implications for businesses in the state. I agree that this is a significant issue and one that requires careful consideration.

I will definitely look into the FAQs and frequently asked questions section on the website to get a better understanding of the process and the steps businesses can take to ensure compliance.

I will also reach out to the Department of Commerce for further clarification and guidance.

Thank you for your support and for being proactive in addressing this issue.

Best regards,

[Your Name]
EXHIBIT 47

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW
OF REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD’S
FORMER STAFFER
INTERVIEW OF [REDACTED]

April 25, 2014

Present:
Kedric Payne
Nate Wright

By Telephone:
[REDACTED]
Lawrence Tabus

Transcribed by:
Stephanie Lyn Rahn, CSR
License No. X101717

**PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of the transcript are phonetic**
QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

Q.  This is Kedric Payne and Nate Wright with the Office of Congressional Ethics and we are joined via conference call with [redacted] and his attorney Lawrence Tabus. It is April 25, 2014.

A. I just want to begin with a few background questions. Can you let me know when you were employed with Representative Whitfield’s congressional office?

A. Yes, February 2013 through the end of February 2014.

Q. Okay. And during that time, what was your job title?

A. Press Secretary.

Q. And as Press Secretary, what were your duties?

A. I handled the communications and outreach effort for Congressman Whitfield.

Q. And did you have any legislative responsibilities, say a portfolio of certain issues?

A. Yes.

Q. And what were those issues?

A. They were handling agriculture issues, basic -- primarily during the government shut down
which coincided with a former staffer leaving the
office.

Q. And did the AG issues include animal
welfare issues?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So how long were you
responsible for animal welfare issues?

A. Maybe six weeks, if I had to guess. I
don't really -- I'm not sure. I didn't mark it on a
calendar.

Q. Are you familiar with the PAST Act,
the Prevent of All Soring Tactics Act of 2013?

A. Yes.

Q. And what was your role with this
legislation?

A. I would say generally tracking
co-sponsors, because I took over the issue after it
was already introduced and well circulated.

Q. Anything else besides tracking
co-sponsors?

A. Helping set up meetings, again, during
the shut down, because we were short staffed and
obviously I would say 90 percent of my job still
focused on my press duties, and answering
constituent phone calls due to the short staff. I
would try to help set up meetings with interest
groups, supporters of the PAST Act, with other
offices.

Q. Okay. And let me make sure I am
clear, you would set up meetings between other
congressional offices and interest groups?

A. Yes.

Q. Anything else that you did for the
bill?

A. Not that I can recall. I know I --
helped draft a few dear colleague letters, I think
that goes into the whole tracking co-sponsors and
gathering co-sponsors.

Q. Okay. Do you know Mrs. Whitfield?

A. Professionally, yes.

Q. And how long -- well, let me rephrase
that. When did you first meet her?

A. The first day I actually started, she
was in with the Congressman's dog.

Q. Okay. And are you aware that she
worked with the Humane Society?

A. Now or then?

Q. Then.

A. No.

Q. When did you first learn that she was
employed with the Humane Society?

A. I couldn't point to a specific date.

Q. During the time period in October of 2013 when you were working on the PAST Act, did you know she was employed with the Humane Society?

A. Yes.

Q. At that time, did you know whether she was a registered lobbyist?

A. I don't know.

Q. Just so I am clear, you are saying at that time, you didn't know, are you saying at this time you don't know what you knew then?

A. I can't tell you the specific time I found out she was a lobbyist.

Q. And are you aware she's a registered lobbyist now, currently, today?

A. Yes.

Q. During your work on the PAST Act that you described earlier, did you have communication with Mrs. Whitfield concerning that legislation?

A. Can you be more specific on communications?

Q. Absolutely. Communication ranging from emails, telephone conversations and in person conversations.
A. My initial answer is primarily email, but I guess I would want you to be more specific on emails, you mean direct one on one emails, group emails, I would say the majority -- I would say over 90 percent of my communication was through group emails to which I was not the originator of.

Q. Okay. Let's take them one by one then. With the group emails that you were on during that time period with Mrs. Whitfield, those were emails that you received from her and you were on a group of recipients?

A. Correct, yes.

Q. And then with respect to one on one emails, where she's communicating with you or you are communicating with her, what was the percentage of those?

A. I would say less than one percent.

Q. And in the remaining percentage of emails that you had, how would you describe those?

A. Just group emails where I would -- I was cc'd on a bunch of them.

Q. You said bc'd?

A. Cc'd.

Q. And just so I am clear, it seems as though I don't get the distinction between the 90
percent you mentioned that were group emails and this remaining percentage of approximately nine percent?

A. I'm sorry. Sorry, 99 percent of the emails were group emails, and one percent -- less than one percent were direct one on one. In fact, I'm not sure, aside from the one example in your email that you sent us, I can't recall if I had any other direct emails where at least one other person was not cc'd.

Q. Now let's discuss telephone calls with Mrs. Whitfield. Did you have telephone communications with her during this time period in 2013 when you were working on the PAST Act?

A. Yes.

Q. What was the nature of those calls in general, I am not expecting you to remember specifics on every call, but in general, how would you describe the nature of those calls?

A. I would say a lot of them, the ones that come to mind would be during the shut down when I was again, aside from focusing 90 percent of my time on my official press duties, another part of the time would be answering the phone because our legislative assistants were laid off, I would say
some of them would be asking for another person or
the Congressman was in the office, that she
needed to speak to or -- and it was more of well,
while she had me on the phone, do you know the
current co-sponsor number of the FAST Act, and I
feel like a lot of the time, I was just like the
middle man in connecting her to someone else.

Q. Would those phone calls also relate to
scheduling meetings with potential co-sponsors?

A. I don't remember.

Q. Okay. With the emails or -- let me
rephrase that. Your communications in general with
her during that time period, did they include
discussions on scheduling meetings with potential
co-sponsors?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And can you explain, describe
in general what was going on, what type of
information you were sharing or discussing with her?

A. With her or with the scheduling of
meetings?

Q. With her concerning the scheduling of
the meetings.

A. Just when the two interested parties
were meeting at the offices, her not being the party
but typically just two other people, not her.

Q. Were those two other people, Marty Irby and Donna?

A. Yes.

Q. And during this time period when you were working on those meetings, was it your understanding that Mrs. Whitfield could possibly attend those meetings?

A. No, but again, a majority of my efforts were focused on dealing with the press during the shut down. I think it's important to realize we were under media fire in Congress for forcing the government shut down and I spent a majority of my efforts trying to protect the congressman from bad press and being accused of starting the government shut down.

Q. Who was the staff person who was most involved in scheduling the meetings?

A. I don't know.

Q. Are you familiar with Emma Heydlauff?

A. Yes.

Q. Is she the Scheduler in the Congressman's office?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall whether or not she was
working on scheduling these meetings?

A. I believe she did have involvement,

yes.

Q. Do you recall approximately the number

of meetings that were scheduled related to this PAST

Act at that time in October 2013?

A. I don't want to speculate, because I
don't know the number.

Q. Do you know whether it was more than

50?

A. 50 or 15?

Q. 50, five zero.

A. That seems high.

Q. Okay. Did you have communications

with Mrs. Whitfield related to communications like
dear colleagues letters?

A. Yes, to check for accuracy, because

again, I was the Press Secretary, I was primarily

focused on the Congressman's external communications

publicly, so obviously I am not familiar with

legislative background or the legal language of a

bill, so I -- I had her verify -- the dear colleague
to make sure I was adequately explaining the bill

that I wanted other members of Congress to

cosponsor.
Q. Who suggested you send out the dear colleague letter?
A. I think it's just a general thing, everybody does it. Once I took over the agriculture issue briefly, I would get 20 or 30 dear colleagues a day, it's a pretty standard known practice.
Q. Did Mrs. Whitfield request that you send out a dear colleague letter?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. And any other letters that you are involved in related to the PAST Act, such as the Royce letter, do you recall discussing such letters with Mrs. Whitfield?
A. Honestly, I don't even recall the Royce letter.
Q. And from the --
A. I think it's important to remember that all -- really all of my focus was on my actual job of not -- during the shut down, but doing my job as Press Secretary.
Q. From the documents that we sent, did that refresh your recollection as to whether you had an email between you and Mrs. Whitfield discussing a "Royce letter"?
MR. TABUS: Kedric, is there a
specific Bates number document that you can identify
that he can --

MR. PAYNE: Yes, absolutely. It is
EW4001542. EW4001542.

A. Okay. And what was your question
again?

Q. The question is, after taking a look
at that email, does that refresh your recollection
as to whether you were involved in drafting a letter
that's entitled Royce letter?

A. I mean obviously I must have, it's on
there. I don't recall it but again, I am writing
press releases, I am writing talking points on the
shut down, I am writing emails, I write for a
living, so I could not -- I could not recall a
majority of the press releases that I wrote, I don't
think it's --

Q. Did Mrs. Whitfield ever request that
you write a press release?

A. No.

Q. Did she ever request that you write a
letter?

A. Not to my recollection.

Q. And did she ever request that you
write any public statement or other document on
behalf of Representative Whitfield?

A. No.

Q. I want to also draw your attention to another document that is in there, it is EW3000753.

EW3000753.

A. Okay.

Q. And in the email, Mrs. Whitfield sends it to you and Mr. Hicks and says can you set up a meeting with Yarmouth and you respond sure thing. Can you describe what the purpose of this meeting was?

A. I would assume -- actually I don't want to assume -- I don't know what the purpose -- I would say it was probably, to set up the meeting for Marty and Donna.

Q. During that time period, October 13 when this is dated and you are setting up those meetings, why would Mrs. Whitfield contact you about setting up meetings for Marty and Donna?

A. I think you have to ask her that question.

Q. We absolutely will ask her but I want to get your understanding of this email that was sent to you where you say sure thing to her request about setting up the meeting?
A. Ask the question again.
Q. Why are you receiving an email from Mrs. Whitfield to set up a meeting for Marty and Donna?
A. So Marty and Donna could advocate on behalf of the PAST Act for which they are supporters.
Q. And what was Mrs. Whitfield's role in getting the supporters for the PAST Act?
A. I don't know.
Q. Did Marty and Donna have any connection with the Humane Society?
A. I think they all were supporters of this bill.
Q. And did you have any communication with Mrs. Whitfield about her attending any meetings with Marty and Donna at this time period?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. Did you work on any additional legislation related to animal welfare issues other than the PAST Act?
A. I -- I think I did something with the horse racing doping bill but I couldn't tell you -- the name -- I couldn't tell you beyond that, I don't know what it is really about, or I don't recall
1 tracking co-sponsors or anything like that either.
2 Q. With that bill, do you recall having
3 any communications with Mrs. Whitfield?
4 A. No.
5 Q. Did you do any work on the Puppy
6 Uniform Protection and Safety Act of 2013?
7 A. No.
8 Q. The SAFE Act of 2013, the Safeguard
9 American Food Exports Act?
10 A. It is a tough one, I don't remember if
11 I am remembering it because of potential press or
12 because of legislation.
13 Q. To the extent you do remember, do you
14 recall any communications with Mrs. Whitfield on
15 that -- on that bill?
16 A. No.
17 Q. The Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act
18 of 2013?
19 A. The question what was?
20 Q. The Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act
21 of 2013, do you have any role or work that you
22 performed related to that act?
23 A. Again, I don't know. I could have
24 seen it on the house GOP communications, email
25 saying that this bill is on the floor, I guess. I
could have heard the name but I don't know why I
heard the name.

Q. And Animal Fighting Spectator
Prohibition Act, are you familiar with that?
A. No.
Q. Okay. During your time period working
with Representative Whitfield's office, did Mrs.
Whitfield ever have you working on special projects
or assignments?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And in the material that we
sent to you, there is a document bates stamped
EW4001549. Let me know when you have it.
A. I have it.
Q. And at the top it's from you to Cory
Hicks and it says Connie called and asked me on a
side project at the moment.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Can you describe what you meant with
that statement?
A. I truthfully don't recall the email.
Again, I just want to say it was in the middle of
the shut down, I get hundreds of emails a day and I
am doing double duty with answering phones and
handling this issue and obviously doing my real job.
Q. And with those emails and telephone calls that you are getting and your real job, did you receive multiple phone calls and emails from Mrs. Whitfield related to various issues?

A. Not other than what I described earlier, where I was answering the phones during the shut down and she may have called for her husband, but nothing out of what I said earlier.

Q. And you don't recall her requesting any activity from you to do anything related to the PAST Act other than what you have described with the meetings?

A. You are -- just setting up meetings for Marty and Donna?

Q. That's correct. That's correct.

A. No, I don't recall anything other than that.

Q. During that time period, October 2013, did issues arise related to press focusing on the contacts between Mrs. Whitfield’s office and Representative Whitfield’s office?

A. Yes, I believe so. I believe some papers from Tennessee had contacted us about the bill.

Q. Okay. And as you said, that was what
you were really focused on was the press, that's the
main thing you handle and is your bread and butter.

During that time period, did Mrs. Whitfield contact you related to a response that you
were preparing for the media on that issue?

A. I can't recall. I mean I think all of
my -- when dealing with the press, I usually go to
my Chief of Staff to verify accuracy of any
statements I would make publicly, because I really
truly never understood the language of this bill,
because it's not my area, it's not my bread and
butter.

Q. With respect to the contacts between
Mrs. Whitfield and the Congressman's office, were
you ever given any advice from the office on any
restrictions to those contacts?

A. Can you elaborate on what you mean by
restrictions?

Q. Was there any policy in the office on
how to handle requests from Mrs. Whitfield?

A. No, not that I can recall.

Q. Okay.

A. I am obviously being polite, it's the
Congressman's wife.

Q. Right, but were there any policies or
procedures related to her lobbying the office?

A. I don't believe so.

Q. Okay. And did you have any

collaborations with Representative Whitfield about

any ethics rules concerning her lobbying the office?

A. No.

MR. WRIGHT: This is Mr. Wright here,

I am wondering how often was Mrs. Whitfield in

Representative Whitfield's office, like how often

would she stop by?

A. Not very often.

Q. Is that once per week, daily, can you

be more specific?

A. I mean average that I worked for the

congressman, I would say far far less than a week,

once a week.

Q. So maybe like once a month?

A. If that, yes, on average over a year,

I'd say maybe -- (inaudible), I would say average if

I saw her 12 times in a year.

MR. WRIGHT: How often would she make

requests of people in the office that you were aware

of?

A. I wasn't aware -- the way the press

job is set up there, pretty much a lot of times
offices are set up where they are communications
heavy or legislative heavy where the Legislative
Director would have pretty much control over the
other employees, and that's how ours was set up,
where I basically was just in my own little world,
for lack of a better term, doing press duties.

MR. WRIGHT: Did Mrs. Whitfield ever
make a request of you to do something that you
thought was unusual or you may not want to have done
given all the other duties that you had at the time?

A. No.

MR. WRIGHT: Alright, were there ever
discussions going back to October 2013, discussions
about getting enough materials for these meetings
that were being set up?

A. I guess I don't -- what do you mean
materials?

MR. WRIGHT: So you have Mr. Irby
going around and doing a variety of different
meetings and I was wondering, were there any
discussions about we need to make sure that he has
enough materials for all of the meetings that he has
set up in the day?

A. I think so, yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Does that help you recall
at all the number of meetings that he may have been
going to?

  A. No. I do recall them preparing
packets but, I don't know the quantity of the
packets.

MR. WRIGHT: Did you think that -- you
talked about how there were a lot of staffing
constraints at the time. Did you think it was
unusual to do this kind of push to try to set up all
these meetings in October of 2013?

  A. Nothing was getting done, I don't see
why not, they weren't -- there was a shut down, they
had nothing but time.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay. And who in the
office would set the priority to do something like
that?

  A. All I could say it wasn't me, so I
don't know -- it happens outside of my scope, so I
am not sure who handled that.

MR. WRIGHT: Do you remember around
that timeframe meeting with Senator Cochran that you
attended with Mrs. Whitfield?

  A. She was -- I wouldn't say that I
attended with her, I attended with my Chief of Staff
and I believe Marty.
MR. WRIGHT: Why did you leave the office?

A. When?

MR. WRIGHT: In, I believe you said --

Q. You left in February of '14?

A. Oh, leave employment, better opportunity.

Q. And I just want to go back to the meeting with Senator Cochran. What occurred during that meeting?

A. From what I can recall, Marty just talked about why the bill was so important, drawing on his expertise as a former -- I believe he was the President of the Tennessee Walking Horse whatever, group, industry, association.

Q. And when did that meeting occur?

A. I don't know.

Q. But it was --

A. During the fall.

Q. Okay. During that October November 2013 time period?

A. Yeah, in the fall.

Q. And was Mrs. Whitfield in attendance?

A. I believe she joined afterwards, yes.

Q. You said joined afterwards, what do
you mean, she was -- when the meeting was taking
place, she was present?
A. Yes, I walked over with my Chief of
Staff and then at that time I had no idea she was
going to be attending.
MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Did you think it
was unusual that she attended?
A. No. I mean lobbyists meet with elected
officials all the time, that's how they earn their
paycheck.
MR. WRIGHT: And it wasn't unusual,
because you said you thought earlier when these
meetings were being set up and even when she
requested that you set the meeting, you said you
didn't think she was attending these meetings, so
did it surprise you at all when she was there?
A. No, because I knew like the groups,
they all had a vested interest in the bill.
Q. And you just mentioned that it did not
stand out to you because lobbyists do that every
day. So during that time period, did you know that
she was a lobbyist?
A. No, again, as I said I don't know when
I discovered she was a lobbyist, exactly.
Q. Okay.
A. But I was speaking from the knowledge I have now.

Q. From the knowledge you have now is why you didn't think it was strange at the time? Is that what you are saying?

A. Can you rephrase that?

Q. What I am unclear about, is the reason why you did not think it was strange that Mrs. Whitfield showed up and your reply was that lobbyists do that type of thing all the time and I am paraphrasing, but you did say lobbyist, so how at that time did you not think it was strange and at the same time not know she was a lobbyist?

A. Okay, a person -- I may have misspoke because I knew now she's a lobbyist. I knew the Humane Society had an interest in the bill so it wasn't a surprise for me to see her there. Again, I don't know exactly when I found out she was a lobbyist.

MR. WRIGHT: And it wouldn't surprise you if she was attending some of the other meetings that were being set up?

A. I don't know. I hadn't thought about it. I attended one other meeting and she was not present. All I remember, attending two meetings,
one she was there, and one she was not.

MR. WRIGHT: Do you remember if Mrs. Whitfield said anything during the meeting or what her involvement in the meeting was?

A. No, usually I was just on my work phone trying to keep track of press. I couldn't even tell you one thing that was said during that Cochran -- Corkran -- I don't know -- who was the Senator?

Q. Cochran.

A. Yeah, I could tell you that the topic was the PAST Act, I couldn't really tell you specifics of what was said.

Q. Why exactly were you at the meeting again, I know you said you were there to join your colleague, but what was your role in the meeting?

A. I don't think I said anything during the meeting, I think aside from the fact that I was the person handling that issue at the time, whether it was the shut down or still looking to fill the position.

MR. WRIGHT: Were there any other interactions that you had with Mrs. Whitfield at the Humane Society that stick out in your mind?

A. No.
MR. WRIGHT: Were there, you know, any other interactions with Mrs. Whitfield that might be helpful for us to know?

A. No.

Q. And were you in the office when Marty Irby was hired?

A. Was I employed by the office?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And did you interview Mr. Irby?

A. Interview for his -- I believe now he's the Press Secretary. Are you talking did him and I talk when he became Press Secretary or when he joined the office as a legislative staffer?

Q. When he joined the office as a legislative staffer around December 2013.

A. I didn't interview him, not that I remember, no.

Q. And what were his duties when he came to the office in December of 2013?

A. He took over the issues I was filling in for.

Q. So you had to transition everything over to him?

A. There really wasn't much to
transition, I basically gave him the co-sponsor spreadsheet or told him where it was located in the shared folder.

Q. What was your understanding of how he became employed with the office?

A. His expertise on the issues.

Q. And what is your understanding of Mrs. Whitfield's role in his employment with the office?

A. I don't know.

Q. Okay. Well, those are all of our questions. We do thank you again for your time. Do you have any questions for us, anything you want to clarify?

MR. TABUS: Kedric, there was one thing way back, hang on, let me go to my -- you had asked -- I think you were asking him about whether Mrs. Whitfield had him working on any activity on the FAST Act and it was like the question seem to be narrowed, and [REDACTED] answered but did you also mean, and cause [REDACTED] had testified that he also said that he had helped and worked on the co-sponsors part. I think your question was so limited, I didn't want to -- [REDACTED] you worked on helping get co-sponsors was part of your responsibility. Correct?

A. Yes.
MR. TABUS: I just wanted to make sure that was clarified that he said that to you.

MR. PAYNE: Okay. Thank you, Lawrence. So, yeah, thank you. Thank you for that clarification. Alright, anything else?

A. No.

MR. PAYNE: Alright, thank you and enjoy your weekend.

A. Alright, thank you. (Whereupon, the recording is terminated.)
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EXHIBIT 48
From: Keith Doane (humanesociety.org)
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 3:40 PM
To: Haydlauf, Emera
Subject: Senate member meetings

Erena,

Could you work on setting up member meetings next week from Tuesday through Friday for Marty and Donna? Connie says that those with asterisks below are more likely to agree to a meeting if they know she’s going to be attending.

Thanks so much.

Keith

Sessions*
Shelby
Cochran
Thune*
Boozman*
Blunt*
Heller
Cotula
Scott
Fischer
Johnson, Ron
Corker
Seno*
Colburn*
Markowski
EXHIBIT 49
From: Frederick H. Pass (frederick.pass@usa.gov)

Subject: Request for a meeting with Karen about what to do about the issue.

Dear Karen,

I am writing to request a meeting with you to discuss the following issues:

1. The current status of the project and what steps need to be taken to ensure its completion.
2. The budget allocation for the project and any necessary adjustments.
3. The timeline for the project and any potential delays.

I believe that a meeting with you would be the most effective way to address these issues.

Please let me know your availability for a meeting.

Best regards,

[Your Name]
EXHIBIT 50
EXHIBIT 51
Good morning Congresswoman and Mr. HardBarg.

I just set up a meeting for you both with Congressman Phil Roe from Tennessee regarding the Tennessee Walking Horse Breed. The meeting is next Tuesday, July 26 at 4:30pm in Congressman Roe’s office (4123 Cannon).

Thank you.

Melissa

Melissa Buchaman

Office of Congressman Phil Roe (R-TN)

2329 Rayburn House Office Building

Washington, DC 20515

Fax: (202) 225-6557

Follow Rep. Roe’s office on the web:

[mailto:HSULF_OCR_220139]
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EXHIBIT 52

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW
OF REPRESENTATIVE 1
INTERVIEW OF CONGRESSMAN [REDACTED]

April 25, 2014

Present:

Kedric Payne
Nate Wright

By Telephone:

Congressman [REDACTED]
Rob Walker

Transcribed by:
Stephanie Lyn Rahn, CSR
License No. XI01717

**PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of the transcript are phonetic**
QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

Q. This is Kedric Payne and Nate Right with the OCE and we are joined with Congressman [REDACTED] and his counsel Rob Walker. It is April 25, 2014. We have noticed the member of the False Statements Act and he said that he will supply us with the acknowledgment form.

Congressman [REDACTED], do you know Connie Harriman-Whitfield?

A. Yes.

Q. And how long have you known her?

A. I guess -- let me see, I have been in Congress five and a half years, I guess five years.

Q. And how did you first meet her?

A. You know, Mr. Payne, I don’t really recall when I first met her.

Q. Okay. And do you know that she is a lobbyist for the Humane Society?

A. Only by -- only by what you have said or what I have read, I haven’t seen any official documents that say she is.

Q. Do you recall any meetings with Mrs. Whitfield concerning issues related to animal welfare?
A. I had one, that was in July of 2012, almost two years ago.

Q. And can you describe what you recall from that meeting?

A. Basically, Mr. Payne, Congressman Whitfield has a bill on horse soring, and he knows my interests -- my interests in animal welfare, knew of it because of our family. My wife serves on the local Humane Society board and we are very active in the local Humane Society and animal welfare. He knew that and set up a meeting in our office, my office to come by and talk to me about his bill.

Q. And who attended that meeting?

A. Well, again, this is a recollection, and my recollection is myself and Congressman Whitfield, his wife Connie and my Chief of Staff was there and I also think that at that time my Legislative Assistant who is now my Communications Director now was there.

Q. And was the conversation related -- well, I should ask you, what was the conversation focused on, you mentioned that there is a bill pending, but what specifically was discussed to the best of your recollection?

A. That's a ways ago, but basically that
horse soring is an obviously a huge conflict, a very
controversial issues and the horse business is very
big in our state of Tennessee and in Kentucky. We
discussed horse soring and basically the bill, I
never did have it to this date co-sponsor the bill
yet, because of one provision in the bill, just
troubled me a little bit, basically that was it just
discussing the bill as best I recall.

Q. Was the discussion then related to you
possibly sponsoring or co-sponsoring the bill?
A. Sure, that's why they came by.
Q. And you mentioned that Representative
Whitfield set up the meeting, I don't want to
mischaracterize what you said?
A. You know, I'm not sure who set up the
meeting. My staff handles all that, obviously we
have multiple meetings every day and I have a
scheduler that does that, so probably what happened
is, typically what happens is there will be a staff
contact with our staff, and see if there is a time
available for both members, and that's how it's
typically done for anything, not just this meeting
but any meeting we have.

Q. And what was Mrs. Whitfield's role in
the meeting?
A. She was just there with him advocating for this. I know Mrs. Whitfield is very passionate, at least she was, about animal rights.

Q. Did you consider the meeting to be a meeting with Representative Whitfield or the Humane Society or with any other --

A. It was with the Congressman.

Q. Was there any follow-up after that meeting with Representative Whitfield's office or Mrs. Whitfield?

A. Now with Mrs. Whitfield, no. With the office, I think that his office contacted my office, but I don't think -- I don't -- wasn't involved in any of that. I think his staff talked to my staff.

Q. Okay. In 2012, was there any other meeting possibly in September of 2012 related to that same issue?

A. Not that I am aware of.

Q. Okay.

A. Certainly wasn't in my office, I know that.

Q. Do you recall a meeting in March 2013 with Mrs. Whitfield related to animal welfare issues?

A. No, I think that there was a meeting
scheduled, I didn’t attend that meeting because I had votes on the house floor. I think my staff did but I did not.

Q. And with -- are you familiar with the PAST Act of 2013?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did Representative Whitfield or his office have any meetings or discussions with you concerning possibly co-sponsoring that bill?

A. Not my office, and again, on the house floor which is very typical for members, we will talk about various legislation that we have, it’s an opportunity that have during votes or motions to recommit or just times that the votes have been not completed, we do discuss this, I do it frequently, I have worn everybody’s ear out on my health care bill. That could have happened. I don’t remember if it did or didn’t.

Q. Okay. And do you recall any meetings in 2013 with Marty Irby and Mrs. Whitfield?

MR. WALKER: Can you say that first name again?

Q. Marty, M-A-R-T-Y, and the last name is Irby, I-R-B-Y.

A. Irby?
MR. WALKER: Are you talking about meetings that the Congressman participated in?

Q. Yes, meetings where Congressman participated and related to animal welfare issues.

A. Mr. Payne, let me understand this correctly, with Mr. Irby and Mrs. Whitfield?

Q. That's correct.

A. The answer would be no, I didn't.

Q. Do you recall a meeting just with Mr. Irby?

A. I think he was, there was -- there have been people in who have, and again, I am going to have to rely on my staff as far as Mr. Irby, but, yes, there have been people in my office who have advocated for this bill.

Q. Okay.

A. But not with Mrs. Whitfield.

Q. Do you recall any additional meetings then with Mrs. Whitfield around that time, October 2013 or 2013 after what we have already discussed?

A. No, sir.

Q. You said no?

A. Not myself.

Q. Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: Congressman, this is Mr.
Wright here, are there any other interactions with Mrs. Whitfield and Representative Whitfield's office related to animal welfare issues that stand out in your memory?

A. No, sir.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Is there any other information that you think might be helpful for us to know about your interactions with Mrs. Whitfield and Representative Whitfield's office?

A. You know, I don't think so. I think there was, as you pointed out, I think in March of '13, there was another meeting set up which I couldn't attend because of duties on the house floor, but the answer is no.

MR. PAYNE: Okay. Well, Congressman, we thank you for your time, and Rob, if you don't have any other questions, clarifications or comments, we are done.

MR. WALKER: Just back to the transcription, you will provide a copy of that to us?

MR. PAYNE: Yes, I'll provide a copy to you basically with an errata form and you can review it and make any suggested corrections.

MR. WALKER: Alright, thanks very
much.

A. Thank you, Mr. Payne.

MR. PAYNE: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the recording is terminated.)
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EXHIBIT 53
From: Connie Burness Whiffield
To: Ed Waldfeld
Subject: "The Temperature: "Temperature Walking Horse exhibition has most spectators"

Just trying to check... I love you.

Peter

Betty

Connie Burness Whiffield

From: Connie Burness Whiffield
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EXHIBIT 54
CONFIDENTIAL

Subject to the Nondisclosure Provisions of H. Res. 895 of the 110th Congress as Amended

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MEMORANDUM OF INTERVIEW

IN RE: Senate Staffer 1
REVIEW NO.: 14-2940
DATE: April 25, 2014
LOCATION: 642 Hart Senate Building
Washington, DC 20510
TIME: 1:03 p.m. to 1:14 p.m. (approximately)
PARTICIPANTS: Kedric L. Payne
Bryson B. Morgan
Patricia Mack Bryan
Morgan J. Frankel

SUMMARY: The OCE requested an interview with the witness and he consented to an interview. The witness made the following statements in response to our questioning:

1. The witness was given an 18 U.S.C. § 1001 warning and consented to an interview. He signed a written acknowledgement of the warning, which will be placed in the case file in this review.

2. The witness is a Legislative Assistant for Senator Lamar Alexander. He has been employed in the Senator’s personal office since 2008. Prior to serving as Legislative Assistant the witness was a Legislative Correspondent for Senator Alexander.

3. The witness told the OCE that he is responsible for legislative issues related to the environment, energy, agriculture, and the Department of the Interior. The agriculture issues include animal welfare issues.

4. The witness stated that was the lead staffer for Senator Alexander for a meeting with Representative Ed Whitfield and his wife, Constance Harriman-Whitfield, that occurred around May 2012.

5. The meeting concerned legislation related to the abuse of the Tennessee walking horses. The witness stated that he considered the meeting to be a meeting with Representative Whitfield.

6. The witness recalled that the following people attended the meeting: Senator Alexander; Senator Alexander’s staffer Tom Craig; Representative Whitfield; Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield; and Representative Whitfield’s Legislative Director Cory Hicks.
CONFIDENTIAL

Subject to the Nondisclosure Provisions of H. Res. 895 of the 110th Congress as Amended

7. The witness stated that he had not met Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield prior to the meeting. He knew at the time of the meeting that she worked for the Humane Society and did advocacy work on behalf of the organization.

8. He told the OCE that during the meeting, Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield described the abuses of the Tennessee walking horses and the need for legislative action. He recalled that Representative Whitfield played a similar role and made comments similar to those made by Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield during the meeting.

9. The meeting lasted less than thirty minutes. During the next several months following the meeting, the witness had additional meetings with the Humane Society concerning the Tennessee walking horse issue that Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield attended. He also had direct communications with Representative Whitfield’s staff that included Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield.


This memorandum was prepared on May 1, 2014, based on the notes that the OCE staff prepared during the interview with the witness on April 25, 2014. I certify that this memorandum contains all pertinent matters discussed with the witness on April 25, 2014.

Kedric L. Payne
Deputy Chief Counsel
EXHIBIT 55
From: Congresswoman Whittfield
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2011 6:07 PM
To: Bachman, Michele (Michele.Bachmann@mail.house.gov)
Subject: Re: Meeting with Tea Party Heroes

Dear Michele,

I was not able to get the meeting with Tea Party Heroes. Congresswoman Elsa M. Wambua, my colleague in the Kenyan Parliament, will be at the hearing on Tuesday and will make sure the two groups have time to meet.

If you have time, I can meet with Senator Ted Cruz tomorrow to discuss the H.R. 911 legislation.

Thank you.

Best,

[Signature]

---Original message---
From: Ccretta (Ccretta) (crettita@comcast.net)
To: Bachman, Michele
Subject: Re: Meeting with Tea Party Heroes

I am sorry, but I am not able to attend the hearing. My colleague in the Kenyan Parliament, Congresswoman Elsa M. Wambua, will be there and will make sure the two groups have time to meet.

If you have time, I can meet with Senator Ted Cruz tomorrow to discuss the H.R. 911 legislation.

Best,

[Signature]
EXHIBIT 56

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW OF FORMER SENATOR
INTERVIEW OF SENATOR [Redacted]

Present:
Kedric Payne, Deputy Chief Counsel
Bryson Morgan
Senator [Redacted]

Transcribed By:
Julie Thompson
MR. PAYNE: All right. This is Kedric Payne and Bryson Morgan with the OCE, and we are joined by conference call with Senator [redacted] and his attorney Vincent Divito (phonetic). It's April 22, 2014. The Senator has been made aware that the false statement act applies, and we are going to begin the interview. Senator, do you know Connie Harriman-Whitfield?

SENATOR [redacted] (the "Witness"): Yes.

MR. PAYNE: Okay. And how long have you known her?

WITNESS: I just met her in a meeting or two, so that would have been about two and a half years ago maybe, the first time I met her; and it was only on a couple of occasions, various events for the Humane Society or, you know, office meetings that were set up.

MR. PAYNE: Okay. And did you know her to be a lobbyist for the Humane Society?

WITNESS: I knew her to be (inaudible), and Vincent asked me -- you know, told me about this (inaudible) in terms of the people. I needed someone to refresh my memory about the subject matter. So I was not aware that she was a lobbyist. She probably told me, but since a meeting with my
office -- set up a meeting (inaudible) and, you
know, I would pop in, do, you know, (inaudible)
and that sort of thing. So I'm not sure if I
knew she was a lobbyist. I think she was the
wife of a member of Congress; is that correct?
MR. PAYNE: Yes. She -- she is married to Congressman Ed
Whitfield.
WITNESS: Yeah. So I'm sure that I was aware of it at
that time.
MR. PAYNE: Can you describe these meetings, to the extent
that you remember? Approximately how many
meetings did you have with Ms. Whitfield?
WITNESS: Well, I have been very active in issues of dog
fighting/horse slaughter long before I got to
the U.S. Senate. Those are issues that peaked
my interest back when I was a state Senator back
in Massachusetts. So the only occasion I would
have met her would have been in our office
situation or at an event in which those issues
are being discussed. So I would say my total
interaction is probably two or three times, you
know. The length would vary. It was probably,
you know, 10 to 15 minutes max total.
MR. PAYNE: When you met with her, do you recall whether
Representative Whitfield attended those meetings
1 as well?
2 WITNESS: Yes, yeah. He was there, and I remember -- it
3 was -- well, first of all, there's only one
4 meeting that I have memory of, and that would
5 have been in my office in my legislative -- with
6 one of my legislative assistants I think.
7 (Inaudible) issues would have been setting it
8 up, prepping it (inaudible) speaking about the
9 issue, and I would have come in after, you know,
10 5 or 10 minutes to say hello.
11 I remember setting it up as a courtesy
12 because he was a member of Congress. So I try
13 to, you know, go meet with everybody back then.
14 The fact that he was a member of Congress, I
15 obviously wanted to, you know, at least come in
16 and, you know, shake his hand and give him a few
17 minutes and say, "Hey. How's it going?"
18 And we had a meeting (inaudible). You
19 know how they have a lot of the legislative
20 awareness days up at the, you know, the various
21 buildings. My memory is that there was probably
22 something on dog fighting. There was probably
23 something on horse slaughter, and I probably
24 went into, you know, one of the rooms where they
25 basically have the information available. So,
you know, a hundred other people would have been
in there.
MR. PAYNE: Let me make sure I understand. So there's one
meeting that was in your office with a
legislative assistant --
WITNESS: Yeah.
MR. PAYNE: -- you, and Congressman Whitfield, and Ms.
Whitfield, just the four of you?
WITNESS: There could have been a fifth, but I would say
safely it was just the four of us. Yeah.
MR. PAYNE: Okay. And what was the name of your legislative
assistant?
WITNESS: Probably Dan Diorio (phonetic) would have
handled it.
MR. PAYNE: Okay. Can you spell his last name?
WITNESS: Yeah. It's D-i -- D-i-o-r-i-o.
MR. PAYNE: Okay.
WITNESS: I-o-r-i-o, Diorio.
MR. MORGAN: Diorio.
MR. PAYNE: Okay. And then you said following that you
would have possibly seen the two of them at a
larger meeting with hundreds of people; is that
correct?
WITNESS: Well, I don't know if it was the two of them. I
do remember -- I do remember seeing her. It
would have been hundreds. It would have been --
you know, how the (inaudible), you know, there's
legislative copies in the various -- like if you
have an issue (inaudible) to sound the event
that I would have gone to, to learn more about,
you know, various issues that they were working
on.

MR. PAYNE: Okay. Going back to the meeting that took place
in your office, who actually led that meeting?

Who was leading the conversation?

WITNESS: Oh, it would have been Dan Diorio from my
office, you know, checking and, you know, asking
what the issue was. (Inaudible) I had an
interest in it anyway as a -- you know, my
daughter was a former horse owner, so she's very
keen and aware of a lot of those issues.

But Dan would have led the meeting. I
would have popped in, and then the first two
minutes was, "Hi. How you doing?" You know,
they were telling me about the history with the
Rep, you know, just finding out who, what, when,
where, the basic formalities. And the
information regarding the horse slaughter, if
I'm not mistaken, is the one issue that they
were focusing on, and they were asking for my
support because they had known, I believe of my
previous support when I was a Legislature on
those issues.
So it was -- I don't think anyone was
leading it, except, you know, Dan from my office
would have, you know, been -- we used to
(inaudible), especially when I was kind of
playing catch up all the time because we
started, you know, with the special election,
and I was just in (inaudible) meetings. So we
were like (inaudible) booked, and they were -- I
had my staff, during the meetings, I'd pop in
during the meeting, give them a courtesy thank
you. I look forward to viewing the information
later, you know, Dan will brief me. And, "It's
great to see you. Thank you very much." You
know, that's how it is.
MR. PAYNE: Okay. And do you recall the role of Mrs.
Whitfield in that meeting?
WITNESS: Yeah. I see her more as a spouse sort of at
that point, you know; that they were working on
this issue together, you know, because of an
interest in horses. So, you know, it didn't
raise my -- it didn't raise the radar at all
that she was there because, you know, we meet
with -- you know, we'll meet with pretty much anybody on any issue just, you know, as long as they set up a request. So, no, it didn't -- you know, nothing kind of peeked my interest. It seemed like a normal, everyday, you know, meet and greet, "Thank you very much," you know. Leave your information. I'll speak to Dan later. So --

MR. PAYNE: Okay. And I'm trying to make sure I understand the date of that meeting. Do you think that meeting occurred around June 2011?

WITNESS: Yeah. I have no knowledge of that, and I can't remember my names sometimes during that time period. You know, I'm not sure if we have a list somewhere of it, but I've have to refer it to Dan and his knowledge of it.

MR. PAYNE: Okay. And did that meeting result in your supporting the slaughter prevention act, horse slaughter prevention act?

WITNESS: I don't think it did. I think I was already on board anyway. That was already something -- the dog fighting bill was one that I had a lot of concern about and the horse slaughter one. It's something I had a concern about, and there was also one about -- you know, I mean, I was pretty
active in those issues (inaudible) as a state
elected official, you know. I'm not -- I'm not
a dog fighting proponent, and, you know,
(inaudible) horse slaughter, you know, I think
there are other options, you know. Adoption and
stuff like that. So I don't think it led to my
support. I think I was already on board, based
on my memory.

MR. PAYNE: Okay.

WITNESS: I think they were really coming, now that I
thinking about it -- to say, hey, thanks for
your support, you know. More of a courtesy type
of situation.

MR. PAYNE: And did you view that meeting as a meeting with
the Humane Society or as you described it, I
guess as a meeting with Representative
Whitfield?

WITNESS: Yeah. No. It would have been with Mr.
Whitfield because I had met with the head of the
Humane Society, with (inaudible) on issues. He
came in personally, you know (inaudible). So I
had already been (inaudible) with all their
legislative priorities. So, no, I didn't think
that they were representing the Humane Society.
No. It was more of a Rep to a Senator, you
know, knowing I have interest in this issue.
(Inaudible) issues (inaudible), if I'm not mistaken. So, no.

MR. PAYNE: Okay. Well, I'm checking my notes. This pretty much covers what we wanted to discuss with you.

I just want to confirm that there are no additional meetings that you recall or other communications that you had with the Whitfields concerning any type of legislation or animal welfare issues?

WITNESS: Well, not to -- to the best of my knowledge, no. Like I said, it was -- it was sometime in 2011, and we're in 2014 now, you know. If you have something to refresh my memory, but that's based on my, you know, knowledge at this point, you know. What's -- we were working on so many other things. I mean, if my memory serves me, (inaudible) involved in that. We were doing (inaudible), insider trading. I (inaudible).

There were so many other things that were a priority in terms of the legislation that we were working on and obviously running for reelection too and establishing, you know, a good record.

So, you know, if you had something to
refresh my memory, bit, no, it was just all

casual, you know, not even set up type of

things, except that one meeting in our office.

And the staff could have been in other meetings,

but I'm not -- I'm not aware of it.

MR. MORGAN: Senator, this is Bryson Morgan with the OCE.

You said that Ms. Whitfield's role in that

meeting was as a spouse. I'm wondering, do you

recall her being actively involved in the

discussion of the horse slaughter?

WITNESS: Yeah, yeah. Of course, yeah. They were both

actively -- it was more of a -- it was a

(inaudible) type of (inaudible), you know.

They're going to have horses, and you enjoy

horses too. You've owned a horse, and, you

know, what do you think of these issues. Yeah.

It was, you know, just a regular, normal, free-

flowing, you know, conversation. I had no, you

know, no rhyme or reason, no itinerary. There's

no checklist that anyone was going through.

It was just like, hey, this is the

issue. We know you had an interest in it, you

know. Thanks for supporting it and, you know,

we wanted to come over and pay you a courtesy

MR. MORGAN: Yeah. I see. Do you recall if you discussed strategy on the legislation at all or next steps on the legislation?

WITNESS: I could have -- she could have said or they could have said, you know, how do you think we could pass something like this? I have a standard kind of -- a standard recommendation for people -- like those (inaudible) who come in with 30 things that they -- you know, absolutely top priorities that they need to do, absolutely positively. There's no butts.

And I more than likely said because I saw it with everybody, "Hey, tell me your top three items," you know. Tell me the top three items, and, you know, the best way to go, you know, to attack these things is take one or two of your top priorities and go around and try to get -- you know, get the support on one of those items because, you know, everybody I know is against dog fighting, you know. So I think would be your best issue, the dog fighting bill.

If my memory serves me, we actually did that one, or they did it after I left, you know. They actually got some legislation on that issue passed. And then on this horse
slaughter, I don't know what the ultimate
outcome was on it, you know. I just don't know.
But I would have probably, as I do
with every group that comes in, whether it be
the Humane Society, or the veterans or -- that
is my approach to everything because you're not
get everything. You guys know that. Take a
couple of items, you know, you go full tilt
trying to get as much support and then move
forward.
MR. MORGAN: Right. And do you happen to recall any specific
to do items or action items coming out of that
meeting by chance?
WITNESS: No, no. I would have just said, you know, go
meet the new -- (inaudible) with everybody. You
should probably go meet the, you know, the new
Legislature (inaudible) that have just come in
and establish relationships with their staff.
If you can meet with them, which is very common,
you know, you should feel confident when you
speak with the staff because, you know, when
you're speaking to my staff, you're speaking to
me. And, you know, I get briefed every day and
(inaudible). What were their issues? What were
their concerns? What is our position
(inaudible)? You know, we have a form that we try to follow almost every day. So --

MR. MORGAN: Okay.

WITNESS: No. I don't remember like a (inaudible). I didn't tell them here are your marching orders. They didn't tell me here are your marching orders. It was like this is what I would do if it was me, and I says, you know, I'd go; and I'd work. (Inaudible) folks. You give them the information so they can make the logical decision.

MR. PAYNE: Well, that is -- those are all the questions that we have. Do you have any other information you think that may be helpful, or anything else that you wanted to share or clarify?

WITNESS: No. I -- no. Since there -- when you said -- when Vincent first told me, I had no idea who you were talking about. I didn't know who the people were. Then he said there's an issue with the horse slaughter. Oh, okay. Those people, okay. And that's how infrequent (inaudible) contact, but, you know, I tried -- tried to think since that time of anything that would be helpful certainly. And there's nothing that I, except from what I just told you, that I have
any, prior memory of. So that's about it.

MR. PAYNE: Okay. All right. Well, thank you for your
time.

WITNESS: Sure. Anytime, anytime. Something else, please
let me know.

MR. PAYNE: Okay. Will do.

WITNESS: Again, thank you.

MR. PAYNE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

MR. DIVITO: All right. See you guys. Bye.

MR. PAYNE: Okay. Thank you.

END OF INTERVIEW
EXHIBIT 57
I have already talked to Ed about this. He is willing to install to Rogers. Ed doesn't think it's a lost cause, but I am willing to push it out to hire.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 24, 2011, at 3:36 PM, "Herman-Wheeler" (humanw@willys.org) wrote:

Yes, the idea of this is a metaphor that seems to make sense, but, then, I realize that it may be a little bit more profound. I hope you find the metaphor useful and that you may come to the same conclusion!

Best,

Marc

From: Connie Herman-Wheeler
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 2:37 PM
To: Marc
Cc: "Herman-Wheeler"; "humanw@willys.org"; "Michael Martinez"
Subject: RE: possible metaphor due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (and to House Ag Approps on April 14)

Here is the rationale:

DOA has been a long time ago (50 years I think)

Enforcement until recently has been nonexistent

Congress does not like to appropriate money for laws that are not enforced.

The recent earthquakes show the law being enforced but do not any way suggest DOA has sufficient funds for enforcing the many violations that are occurring. The earthquakes are addressing only the tip of the iceberg.

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 24, 2011, at 5:01 PM, "Nancy Perry" (nancyperry@whitehouse.gov) wrote:

This was my first thought, too, Marc. I am not attached to the idea of an example of good enforcement to help, but maybe just to demonstrate what would be possible in 90% of the other cases of all the other cases of the hundreds and thousands of cases where the response, either 70% rate or not, has been so slow. I think we have to spell out very clearly what purpose that approach is providing to build our argument for more funds.

Nancy Perry
Victor President, Government Affairs
humanw@willys.org
703-529-6000 F 703-529-3502
The House Society of the United States
2400 New Jersey Avenue, NW 20595-0001
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From: Anthony (Anthony.Henderson@nedpac.org)
To: Beth (beth@nedpac.org)
抄送: Nancy (nancy@nedpac.org)

Subject: USDA budget appraisal on April 17 and House Ag appraisal on April 14

Dear Beth,

I was caught up in the middle of activities yesterday and did not have time to put together a message for you. I have been working on the USDA budget appraisal on April 17 and the House Ag appraisal on April 14.

The original message was to highlight the importance of USDA budgetary funding for the Livestock Indemnity Program (LIP) and to address concerns regarding the USDA budget. The message was intended to emphasize the need for adequate funding to support livestock farmers and ranchers.

Please let me know if you have any specific questions or if there is anything else I can assist you with.

Thank you,

Anthony

---End of Message---
From: Beth
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 4:17 PM

Confidential Treatment Under the Non-Disclosure Provisions of H.R. 855 or the 111th Congress as Amended Requested
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To: Minn. Study
Subject: RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Appropriations on April 11 (1) and to House Ag Appropriations on April 14

Yup - will do!

Sent from my Samsung J7™, a Windows Mobile® smartphone from AT&T

---Original Message---

From: Minn. Study
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 4:09 PM
To: Keith Dene
Cc: Nancy Perry, Tonia Luteutman

Subject: RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Appropriations on April 11 (1) and to House Ag Appropriations on April 14

Thanks as usual. Since the letter can be VERY close to what they've signed last year, hopefully all or nearly all can give you the green light in a matter of a few days. Please remember to ask the NSWIA to do their own again, if they don't want to co-sign the group ones.

From: Keith Dene
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 4:06 PM
To: Minn. Study
Cc: Nancy Perry, Tonia Luteutman

Subject: RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Appropriations on April 11 (1) and to House Ag Appropriations on April 14

Yes, I'll update the spreadsheet group testimony and add notes to the groups that have signed or if the part, we may need knock off (all of them by 4/1) unless we can still submit testimony on 4/17th (I could), but we'll go with whatever we have confirmed for the Senate version... and can add any changes to the House one by 4/14.

Keith

From: Minn. Study
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:40 PM
To: Keith Davis, Carolyn Schurert
Cc: Nancy Perry, Tracey Lehman

Subject: Outside testimony due to Senate Ag Appropriations on April 1 (I) and to House Ag Appropriations on April 14

Keith,

I've just found out about this deadline and am really scrambling on the group letters. I wanted to flag this to you, since it will be extremely important to have strong joint testimony submitted soon for USDA funding. Can you please get this list of theır requirements this week and reach out to all the groups for signatures (or doing theirs own), so they can be submitted by the deadline?

Senator Ag Appropriations deadline for outside testimony: April 1

House Ag Appropriations deadline for outside testimony: April 14

Thank you!

Mia/Rebecca

Deputy Director, Government Affairs Department
humanasociety.org humanasociety.org
(202) 645-4111 (202) 645-4119

The Human Society of the United States
2100 L Street, NW Washington, DC 20037
humanasociety.org http://www.humanasociety.org/
Dear Sue,

I know you’re the one to talk to. I just thought we’d ask a question. And thank you. I really appreciate your help — you went beyond. See you soon.

From: Corina Harrison-Whitefield
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2011 11:22 PM
To: Sue Amoroso
Subject: Rep. Whitefield? Honoring bill

You are so thoughtful and nice to help me. I do need to ask you if you're going to be going on an out of state trip this week or going through the office?

I will get a couple of quotes for you. He is in Ky today, Louisiana tomorrow, then Ky. Then through Sunday. What is the deadline?

Sent from my iPhone.

On May 17, 2011, at 11:47 AM, "Fara Anderson" <> wrote:

Hi Corina: We’re going to do a short story on the horse racing bill in the next issue of Human Agenda and I thought it would be great to have a report or something from Rep. Whitefield. Do you want me to just go through the office? Just want to be sure you’re aware of what’s going on.

Thanks,
Fara

From: Michael Chang
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2011 9:54 PM
To: Fara Anderson
Subject: Honoring bill

Hello Fara,

Thank you for your time this morning.

Quick question for you. I had wanted to reach out to either Rep. Whitefield or Sue. I still think the horse racing bill, perhaps put a quick quote or two in one of our short stories in Human Agenda. Would you have any thoughts, suggestions, between the two of them. See who maybe best? Also, maybe not and that doesn’t really fly. someone with me knocking it directly to their office?

Thanks again
Michael

Please find the attached letter from the Vista Society:
EXHIBIT 59
Cory just sent me the ED bill sign-on money. I have actually only been hearing about getting the ED's to sign-on, and not the Senate--I am sure they will all sign eventually but I think there has been confusion and some delay. I am not sure what all the Senate folks have been putting at the gun reform at this time.

From: Center for American Progress (CAP)  
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 11:10 AM  
To: Lauren Silberman  
Subject: Re: Deadline — ED: Ensure Chiropractors are Protected in the Voluntary Action-in-Capability (deadline 10/25)

Cory knows how ED feels about animals!

Are the parity of Rep. Hammack because they have arguments against, because only some signed the letter and/or because the few Republicans have been approached. (I think you have been working hardest on this and could use some additional help.)

I will talk to ED after he gets out of his Health Subcommittee hearing.

Best,

Cory

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2011, at 9:29 AM, "Lauren Silberman"  wrote:

Cory just called me a lot of Compאורs, at the meeting earlier and just wanted to let you know.

From: Lauren Silberman  
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 9:04 AM  
To: Center for American Progress (CAP)  
Subject: Re: Deadline — ED: Ensure Chiropractors are Protected in the Voluntary Action-in-Capability (deadline 10/25)

Hi Cory,

Hey Emma: Would be great if we could get ED to sign on tonight. So sorry for nagging it in the 2nd floor - I should have thought to send this (to you earlier). Needed to get sign-on before lunch. Forgoth and Brook have one on - and a few others it's just pending. Hoping for a few more. It's so nice to see progress!

(There's some progress when there's no drop in the floor and both (Senators) refer to Cory and followed up again with them this AM - but let me know if there's anything I can do to move the ball forward)

Akerman, Artemis, Bartlett, Bertoldi, Bode, Capuano, Carson, Conyers, Edolphs, Engel, Rush, Silver, Delgado, Gutfreund, Haktsema, Hall, Israel, Kildee, Lamborn, Langevin, Lowey, S. Maloney, Lucas, C. McCarthy, C. Miller, Moore, Moran, Nadler, Need, Oliver, Peter, Pell, Engel, Nadler, Nadler, Nelson, Sablan, Schlakman, Schiff, Sherr, Texas, Woolsey

From: Lauren Silberman  
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 9:19 AM  
To: [ Jihad for Peace ]  
Subject: Re: Deadline — ED: Ensure Chiropractors are Protected in the Voluntary Action-in-Capability (deadline 10/25)

Hi Cory,

Just wanted to check back with you on this -- the deadline was yesterday but I think they're keeping the letter open for more sign-ons this morning.

I've called both Michelle (Rep. Steny) and Colleen (Rep. Brown) (several times) for more sign-ons.

Thanks so much. W/ the support of Rep. Wolfram's support on this important letter.

Best,

Lauren

Confidential Treatment Under the Nondisclosure Provisions of H. Res. 865 or the 110th Congress (as Amended Requested)
Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity

From: The Honorable Fortney Pete Stark
Sent By: michele.scarbrough@mail.house.gov
Date: 10/4/2011

Dear Colleagues,

We invite you to join us in sending a letter to the U.S. Department of the Interior’s Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), requesting that they list chimpanzees as endangered regardless of whether they are in captivity or in the wild. The FWS is currently reviewing a rule regarding chimpanzees’ status under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) that could rectify this inconsistency.

As it currently stands, chimpanzees in captivity in the U.S. are not afforded the same protections as those in the wild. We think U.S. law should be consistent in their protection of these animals, which is why we’re urging the FWS to rectify this inconsistency and list all chimpanzees, whether in captivity or in the wild, as endangered to ensure they are more stringently protected.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Fortney Pete Stark
Chimpanzees are in danger of extinction, and the U.S. must do all it can to protect the species. Please join us in asking the FWS to provide the full protections available under the ESA to chimpanzees in captivity.

To cosign please contact Michele Scarbrough in Rep. Stark's office by email at Michele.scarbrough@mail.house.gov or by phone at 202-225-4731 or Colleen Nguyen in Rep. Israel's office by email at colleen.nguyen@mail.house.gov or by phone at 202-225-6116.

Sincerely,

/P/

Pete Stark
Member of Congress

Steve Israel
Member of Congress

Director Dan Ashe

Fish and Wildlife Service

Department of the Interior

1849 C St. NW

Washington, DC 20240

Dear Director Ashe,

We are happy to see the United States Fish and Wildlife Service initiate a scientific review of chimpanzee conservation regulations to determine whether all chimpanzees should be listed as "endangered" under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In order for the Service to meet its statutory duty to promote conservation and defend wildlife, captive chimpanzees must be consistently listed as endangered and afforded full protection under the law.

As the agency is undoubtedly aware, the current lack of ESA protection for captive chimpanzees facilitates rampant exploitation of chimpanzees in the United States, as pets, in the entertainment industry, and for invasive biomedical experiments. The U.S. is the only country (other than Galen's) that still permits biomedical research on chimpanzees. Approximately one thousand chimpanzees are kept in Laboratories in the U.S., where many languish in social isolation for years on end and are subjected to painful and stressful procedures. Many even suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder—a cruel existence for species most similar to human beings. In order to ensure that the Service meets its obligation to protect endangered chimpanzees, the agency must exercise its authority to curtail uses of captive chimpanzees that not only create gross incentives for research labs, but also undermine national and international efforts to save the species.
Furthermore, exploitation of captive chimpanzees in the U.S. causes western conservationists to lose political capital with citizen and policymakers in chimpanzee range countries in Africa. Rampant commercial use and frivolous depictions of chimpanzees in U.S. entertainment fuel demand for pet chimpanzees both domestically and abroad, contributing to poaching and trafficking of wild chimpanzees, which is a major threat to the species' continued existence. It is time for the U.S. to step up and be a leader in chimpanzee conservation by ensuring that our laws are consistent with those advocated by conservationists on the international level.

Populations of wild chimpanzees have declined by 66% in the last 30 years primarily due to habitat loss and related poaching, which is driven in part by U.S. exploitation of captive chimpanzees. We must do our part to protect these animals and ensure that they will have a long and enduring future on this earth. We urge the agency to find that upgrading the status of captive chimpanzees from "threatened" to "endangered" is warranted and to propose a rule implementing this finding.

Sincerely,

/\/

CC:
Public Comments Processing
Division of Policy and Directives Management
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 N. Fairfax Drive, MS 2042–1FD
Arlington, VA 22203
EXHIBIT 60
From: Connie Hartman-Whitfield
To: Keith C. C. Cox <cox@coxmail.m boiler.gov>
Subject: PW: Talking points on mandatory penalty protocol

Friday, March 22, 2013 12:24 PM

Yes, thank you for all of your help, Connie.

Keith

---

From: Debrah Dubin Press
To: [redacted email address]
Subject: Talking points on mandatory penalty protocol

March 19, 2013 12:19 PM

Dear [redacted name],

The Richard Palphet, Thruze Littlesman, Keith Cox

Debrah Dubin Press
Regulatory Affairs Manager
Association ofHumane Organizations for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals

---
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EXHIBIT 61
Central's all over it: Steve's working on finding the names to find the interview. Earlier today she was checking with Greg, Whitefield and the name might be Aggers' in some of USRHAF press, blog, closed of VA schools, etc. For the moment (rather today), they seem trying to keep it somewhat quiet, as to not increase the opposition. Will follow her lead on what's needed from us. Thanks, Bev!

Freda Cohn Steven  
April 18, 2013 9:15 PM  
The Whitefield, Michael Makri, Ravine, Viner, Whitfield, Carol England, Mint Lady, Jessica Ayers-Lodewick  
Em Email Subject: PM: BloodHorse.com Congress Sets Hearing on Horse Racing  
Just heard of this hearing - did we know about it - and should we plan to have someone there?

I don't know if I can make it, but can see if Sarah Spero, our PA director (jumped here) or another Equine staff can attend, unless anyone else has plans to be there.

Freda Cohn Steve  
April 18, 2013 4:12 PM  
The Whitefield  
Subject: Re: Equine.com Congress Sets Hearing on Horse Racing  
I heard you thought you would be interested in the BloodHorse.com article below.

Congress Sets Hearing on Horse Racing  
A subcommittee of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce will conduct a hearing on health and safety issues in horse racing April 25 in Pennsylvania, according to an April 19 notice.

Click here to view the full story or copy and paste the following link into your browser: http://www.bloodhorse.com/horse-racing/report/516032/congress-sets-hearing-on-horse-racing

THE OFFICIAL SECRETARIAT GAME  
LIKE THE OLYMPIC GAMES OF HORSE RACING  
ORDER NOW! 50% OFF RETAIL  
GREAT MOVIE  GREAT GAME  

Confidential Treatment Under the NonDisclosure  
Provisions of H. Res. 865 or the 110th Congress  
as Amended Requested
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EXHIBIT 63
From: Connie Herman-Whitefield (h HermanWhitefield@hr.gov)
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2012 2:41 PM
To: Michael Makarova (makarova@hr.gov)
Subject: Re: Proposed Amendments - New Full Stock Vote Terms in Two Year and Century Ownership Max Support Bill to Strengthen the Horse Protection Act

Attatch: image002.jpg

I will circulate.

Sent from my phone

On Dec 12, 2012 5:23 PM, "Michael Makarova" (makarova@hr.gov) wrote

What do you think about asking to get a floor speech on it? 

image002.jpg

FULL BLOUSE RELEASE

New Full Stock Vote Terms in Two Year and Century Ownership Max Support Bill to Strengthen the Horse Protection Act

Legislators would address the widespread cheating in Tennessee walking horse industry

Dec. 12, 2012 - A new bill sponsored by Maison du Jour Equestrian's Connie Herman-Whitefield, R- Representatives, author a measure to address the widespread practice of "cheating," the practice of using artificial aids to gain an unfair advantage in competition, by promoting the "true" performance of these horses.

Representatives Connie Herman-Whitefield, R- Tennessee and R- Tennessee and R- Tennessee, introduced HB 121, the Horse Protection Act Amendments of 2012, which would end the current, illegal practice of cheating in the Tennessee Walking Horse industry, which has been a problem for many years. The legislation has the support of the Tennessee Farm Bureau, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Horse Council, the Tennessee Walking Horse Council, and a number of other industry organizations.

The bill defines the practices of "cheating," the use of mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage in competition, and makes it illegal to use or promote the use of these aids. The legislation would also establish a mechanism for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.

The bill would also clarify that the Tennessee Walking Horse haven't been able to gain an unfair advantage in competition, "cheating," which includes using mechanical aids to gain an unfair advantage, by promoting the true performance of these horses. The legislation would also establish a system for enforcing the new law and for training and educating horse owners and exhibitors.
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From: Carrie Humann-Wilford
To: Mass. Infect.

Subject: From: P.M. on 7/16/16 3:01 PM

Carrie’s reaction to your suggestions.

Sent on my iPhone

[Image]

From: "Judy, Oak" <Oak.Belley@p/northwestern.edu>
Date: September 16, 2016 1:56 PM

To: "Carrie Humann-Wilford" <carrie.humann@northwestern.edu>, "Forest, Mary"

Subject: From: 7/16/16 3:01 PM

1. Ask that ship sold it you think I 1/2 of the questions in the one. Otherwise, do not ask the 3/4 of the 1/2 that they need or, any. These questions are key to

your thoughts on this.

Sent on my iPhone

[Image]

From: "Mary, O" <mary.o@northwestern.edu>
Date: September 16, 2016 1:56 PM

To: "Carrie Humann-Wilford" <carrie.humann@northwestern.edu>

Subject: From: 7/16/16 3:01 PM

Ask that ship sold it you think I 1/2 of the questions in the one. Otherwise, do not ask the 3/4 of the 1/2 that they need or, any. These questions are key to

your thoughts on this.

Sent on my iPhone

[Image]
EXHIBIT 66
EXHIBIT 67
Dear [Name],

I am writing to follow up on our recent conversation. You mentioned that you were interested in discussing [specific topic]. I am available to schedule a call at your earliest convenience.

Please let me know if this works for you.

Best regards,

[Your Name]
EXHIBIT 68
From: Fred Dorsey
Sent: Monday, January 15, 2016 1:34 PM
To: Maria; Connie
Cc: Fred Dorsey
Subject: House Republican Goal

Let me know if I can help in any way. Thanks.

Fred, Maria, Connie

Sent: Monday, January 15, 2016 2:42 PM
To: Fred Dorsey; Connie Freeman-Whitfield
Cc: Maria
Subject: Re: House Republican Goal

Glad to do it! I'll make it a priority tomorrow.

Fred, Maria, Connie

Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 1:43 PM
To: Connie Freeman-Whitfield
Cc: Fred

I'm afraid I agree with Linda. We've been stuffing and pushing these other groups and it would make a big difference coming from the congresswoman's office! Not about setting any work on other fronts--it's about getting it done.

Fred, Connie

Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 4:34 PM
To: Fred Dorsey; Connie Freeman-Whitfield
Cc: Maria
Subject: Re: House Republican Goal

I had thought that Linda felt (and we collectively have felt all along) that it would be best coming from Maria's office rather than AG's, but sure, I can do this. I also have a backlog, so will prioritize this ASAP.

Fred, Connie

Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 4:50 PM
To: Mary; Connie Freeman-Whitfield; Fred
Cc: Maria
Subject: Re: House Republican Goal

Can you do that, Mary? It would be good coming from you.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2016, at 1:30 PM, "Fred, Dorsey" <mfred@frederick.cc> wrote:

I agree. I think we need to ask each group if they will commit to focus their efforts on a list of members we provide or tell us which ones they will support.

Sent from my iPhone

Fred, Connie Freeman-Whitfield

On Jan 6, 2016, at 2:40 PM, "Fred, Dorsey" <mfred@frederick.cc> wrote:

The problem is not the number of members.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2016, at 12:43 PM, "Connie Freeman-Whitfield" <connie.freemanwhitfield@.house.gov> wrote:

That's great. I think it would pass.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2016, at 12:14 PM, "Mary" <mary.johnson@house.gov> wrote:

I will do this but may take a few days... I have a pile of work I'm catching up on.
From: Sara Amanpour  
sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 10:30 AM
To: Fred, John, Matt, Jody, Party
Cc: Judy Scales, Rep Brady
Subject: Rep Republicans Coal

Thank you. I really need that a “Rebalance” to force a budget agreement with some of the other players in the game. It is
likely that the three of us, not 216 good priorities they could follow up with but people are saying not to volunteer, I
know to ask wisely, but you have best coming from him so contact each party and ask for commitments.

From: Caroline Hamilton
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 2:23 PM
To: Fred, Matt
Cc: Caroline Hamilton, Sara Amanpour, Keith Donig, Rep Brady
Subject: Rep Republicans Coal

Matt,

How do you propose to do that?

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2016 at 10:11 AM, "Fred, Matt" <Fred and Matt@congress.gov> wrote:

Ask

Fred and I discussed the Republicans in the House today we need to garner on PAST. Currently we have 2 with a few
more coming but I am nothing an official response from him. We need to get 100 Republicans on the bill so we can really
use to get the bill in the next. I know we need to pass a House but let's keep it into the House until
the House have 100 Republicans within the next few weeks. Please help me focus on this area.

Thanks,
Matt
EXHIBIT 69
Let's try the last four on the list plus Greg Walden.

Thanks,
Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 9, 2013, at 3:59 PM, "Heylauff, Emma"
<Emma.Heylauff@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Mrs. Whitfield,

Since we are scheduling meetings for next week, I went through the list of Republican RAC numbers that we have not met with yet. The list is below. Please let me know if you would like me to reach out to them about a meeting.

Karton
Walden
Siskias
Scalise
Harper
Billy Long
Cassidy
Ellmers

Thanks,
Emma

Emma Heylauff
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-02)
2133 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3547
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<http://twitter.com/RepEdWhitfield>
<http://www.linkedin.com/profile/view?vkey=vztdv3>
APPENDIX C
February 21, 2014

VIA EMAIL, FAX and US MAIL

Mr. Omar S. Ashmawy
Chief Counsel
Office of Congressional Ethics
425 3rd Street, SW
Suite 1110
Washington, DC 20024

Re: Review No. 14-2940 - RESPONSE TO INITIATION OF PRELIMINARY REVIEW AND REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Dear Mr. Ashmawy:

This correspondence issues in response to your letters of January 29, 2014 and January 31, 2014 regarding the decision by the Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics (“OCE”) to initiate a preliminary review (Review No. 14-2940) into the conduct of Representative Ed Whitfield. As indicated in your January 29th communication, OCE’s review is focused on the purported joint “lobbying efforts” of Representative Whitfield and his spouse, Ms. Connie Harriman-Whitfield, in support of animal-welfare legislation, including legislation introduced by the Congressman between 2011 and the present. According to the formal statement of the nature of the review, OCE is investigating whether the actions of Representative Whitfield and his spouse constituted a violation of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives or an impermissible grant of special favors or privileges to Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s employer, the Humane Society Legislative Fund (“HSLF”), in contravention of the Code of Ethics for Government Service.

In conjunction with its decision to initiate a preliminary review of Representative Whitfield’s conduct, your office also issued the Congressman a formal Request for Information (“RFI”) in accordance with the OCE’s Rules for the Conduct of Investigations (“OCE Rules”). The specific information and materials sought through this RFI were laid out in seven itemized inquiries within your January 31st correspondence. As required by OCE Rules 7(D) and 7(E), you have subsequently asked that the Congressman respond to each of those questions and deliver relevant documents to OCE so that it may complete its preliminary report within the administratively imposed 30-day window.
Despite Representative Whitfield’s disappointment in the decision to originate a preliminary review in the present matter, the Congressman nevertheless expresses his desire to cooperate with the OCE and its staff. As such, please accept the present correspondence as an initial response to the OCE’s January 29th notice of preliminary review initiation and as a formal answer to your office’s January 31st RFI. Representative Whitfield’s specific response to each of the seven inquiries contained in the RFI are included below in the second half of this letter. Corresponding documents associated with the Congressman’s answers to those questions are also attached hereto as numbered addenda. To the extent certain information regarding Representative Whitfield’s response is not available or still being gathered from archived e-mail servers, specific notes concerning those details have been made in the answer sections of this response. As requested and as required by OCE Rule 4(A)(2), Representative Whitfield has agreed to provide a signed certification statement to your office in conjunction with his RFI response. This certification will be forwarded to OCE within the next few days.

Upon review of the present correspondence and the attached files, documents, e-mails, and other materials, it should be readily apparent to OCE that it should affirmatively vote to terminate review of the present matter and not proceed to a Second-Phase Review of Representative Whitfield’s conduct. None of the alleged actions taken by the Congressman, his staff, or his wife rise to the level of a violation of House Rules, the Code of Ethics for Government Service, or any other applicable ethical rule. In fact, there is simply no reasonable evidence to support any accusation to the contrary. Representative Whitfield’s actions on behalf of animal-welfare legislation constitute the standard public policy activities of an elected Member of the House of Representatives. The Congressman has a long history of legislative engagement and work on behalf of animal-welfare issues during his nine terms in the House, and took no actions with regard to such matters that improperly favored or benefited his spouse, the HSUS, the Humane Society of the United States (“HSUS”), the Fund for Animals (“FFA”), or any other individuals or entities.

Initial Response to OCE’s Notice of Preliminary Review Initiation

Although the primary purpose of the present letter is to offer a formal response to the RFI correspondence sent to Representative Whitfield on January 31st, it is also an opportunity for the Congressman to address the nature of the preliminary allegations lodged against him by OCE and refute any contention that his conduct with regard to animal-welfare legislation or public policy issues has somehow been ethically improper. As discussed in greater detail throughout the contents of this letter and as established by the documents provided in conjunction with this letter addenda,

1 The contents of this correspondence and the provided attachments represent only a preliminary response to the initial allegations contained in the present OCE notice and RFI. As such, Representative Whitfield hereby reserves the right to further respond to these claims and any additional ethical accusations raised by the OCE during its preliminary review. The Congressman also reserves the right to offer supplemental argument, factual support, and documentary and testimonial evidence in his defense during the course of OCE’s investigation of the present matter.
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there is absolutely no basis to believe that Representative Whitfield has committed any cognizable ethical violation.

At all times since his election to Congress, Representative Whitfield's conduct on behalf of animal-welfare matters has reflected creditably on the House and has adhered to the spirit and letter of the Rules of the House and its duly constituted committees. Likewise, all of Representative Whitfield's legislative activities concerning animal-welfare issues have been open, honest and motivated by the legitimate concern that he and his constituents share for the proper treatment of animals. At no time has the Congressman or his staff discriminated unfairly or dispensed special favors or privileges to anyone associated with animal-welfare matters, nor has he or his staff received any favors or benefits that might reasonably be construed as influencing the performance of governmental duties. Moreover, at no time during the course of the past three years has Representative Whitfield permitted his wife to lobby his office (or himself) for the purpose of influencing the Congressman's adoption, formulation, or modification of federal legislation.

In light of these facts, there is no compelling reason for the OCE to initiate a Second-Phase Review in the present matter. The preliminary review allegations, which are detailed below, are not supported by any evidence or legal precedent, and therefore do not merit further consideration. As such, the OCE should refrain from any further consideration of the announced claims and immediately vote to dismiss Review No. 14-2940.

The Scope of the Initial Review and the Nature of Representative Whitfield's Legislative and Public Policy Engagement on Behalf of Animal-Welfare Matters

The precise scope of the preliminary inquiry launched by OCE against Representative Whitfield was described in the following terms in your January 25th correspondence:

"Representative Ed Whitfield reportedly engaged in lobbying efforts jointly with his spouse, a registered lobbyist for the Humane Society Legislative Fund, in support of animal-welfare legislation, including legislation introduced by Representative Whitfield. Their lobbying efforts allegedly included joint lobbying sessions in which Representative Whitfield and his spouse met with lawmakers and congressional staff to promote legislation.

If Representative Whitfield granted special favors or privileges to the Humane Society Legislative Fund because of his spouse's position, then he may have violated the Code of Ethics for Government Service.

If Representative Whitfield permitted his spouse to lobby him or his congressional staff, then he may have violated House rules."
Based upon this factual description, it appears that OCE’s initial review is primarily focused on the nature of the alleged joint “lobbying efforts” conducted by the Congressman and his wife in support of various pieces of animal-welfare legislation introduced in the House between 2011 and the present. Specifically, OCE appears concerned that by engaging in joint lobbying with his spouse (who is publicly disclosing as a registered lobbyist for HSLF) on behalf of such bills, Representative Whitfield may have improperly granted special favors or privileges to the HSLF or other Humane Society Entities. In reality, nothing could be further from the truth.

None of the actions undertaken by Representative Whitfield or his staff in the present matter with regard to animal-welfare legislation come remotely close to qualifying as the dispensation of special favors or privileges to HSLF, HSUS or any other Humane Society Entity. The Congressman’s support for public policy initiatives and legislative proposals involving animal-welfare matters has been motivated purely by his personal desire (and the interests of his constituents) to ensure the safety and proper treatment of animals in Kentucky and across the United States. This interest in animal-welfare issues is long-standing and readily apparent upon examination of Representative Whitfield’s legislative record over the course of his nearly two decades in Congress.

Most significantly to this inquiry, the Congressman’s support for these issues long predates his wife’s lobbying activities for any Humane Society Entity. Under no circumstances can Representative Whitfield’s motivations or actions with regard to these issues be in any way ascribed to a desire to provide special favors to HSLF because of his wife’s position.

Representative Whitfield’s legislative support for animal-welfare matters dates back to his first term in the House during the 104th Congress (1995-1996), when the Congressman co-authored a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture concerning the regulation of “puppy mills”. In the terms that followed, the Congressman’s interest and dedication to animal-welfare issues became even more pronounced. During the 106th Congress (1999-2000), Representative Whitfield supported at least six different pieces of animal-related legislation and spoke about animal-welfare matters on the floor of the House. During the 107th Congress (2001-2002), the Congressman supported five additional pieces of animal-related legislation. Similarly, during the 108th (2003-2004), 109th (2005-2006), 110th (2007-2008), and 111th (2009-2010) Congresses, Representative Whitfield supported or co-

---

2 Examples of the animal-welfare legislation supported by Representative Whitfield during the 106th Congress include H.R. 2166 (regarding bear protection issues); H.R. 1275 (regarding cockfighting issues); H.R. 1887 (regarding animal crush videos); Amendments to H.R. 2466 (involving animal leg-hold trap issues); the 1999 Predator Control Amendment to H.R. 1906; and the 2000 Predator Control Amendment to H.R. 4461.

3 Examples of the animal-welfare legislation supported by Representative Whitfield during the 107th Congress include H.R. 3058 (regarding puppy mill issues); H.R. 1155 (regarding cockfighting issues); H.R. 397 (regarding bear issues); animal safety appropriations legislation for 2001; and animal safety appropriations legislation for 2002.
sponsored at least seven\(^4\), eight\(^1\), nine\(^6\), and eleven\(^7\) animal-related bills respectively. Additionally, the Congressman spoke about animal-welfare issues several times on the floor of the House during those enumerated Congresses, engaged on animal issues during various House committee and subcommittee hearings, and likewise authored several pieces of formal correspondence concerning animal-safety and protection matters. All of this legislative engagement by the Congressman on animal-welfare issues took place prior to his wife’s assumption of a lobbyist position for HS\(L\)F in 2011. In fact, much of it predated any relationship Mr. Harman-Whitfield had with HS\(L\)F, HSUS, or any other Humane Society Entity.

Since 2011, Representative Whitfield has maintained the same consistent level of support for animal-welfare legislation and passion for engagement on animal-welfare issues that he displayed between 1994 and 2010. For example, as noted in the language of RFI Request No. 4, the Congressman has either supported or co-sponsored a wide range of animal-welfare bills during both the 112\(^{th}\) and 113\(^{th}\) Congresses. In addition to those listed in your correspondence of January 31\(^{5}\), Representative Whitfield has also lent legislative support to a number of other pieces of legislation, including: H.R. 2112 (regarding lethal predator control issues); H.R. 2584 (regarding endangered species issues); and H.R. 2012 (regarding horse racing integrity and safety). In addition to these direct legislation efforts, the Congressman also authored a letter to the USDA concerning issues related to the Horse Protection Act, and spoke on a wide variety of animal-related issues in various House committee and subcommittee hearings.

\(^4\) During the 108\(^{th}\) Congress, Representative Whitfield supported or co-sponsored several pieces of animal-welfare legislation, including: H.R. 1552 (regarding the criminalization of animal fighting activities); H.R. 1563 (regarding antifreeze safety and its impact on animals); H.R. 857 (regarding horse slaughter issues); H.R. 4568 (regarding bull matters); H.R. 2691 (regarding bear baiting issues); H.R. 2673 (regarding funding for the promotion of animal fighting matters); and H.R. 1006 (regarding lion and tiger matters).

\(^5\) During the 109\(^{th}\) Congress, Representative Whitfield supported or co-sponsored several pieces of animal-welfare legislation, including the following H.R. 2744 (regarding horse slaughter issues); H.R. 2361 (regarding wild horse issues); H.R. 2569 (regarding dog issues); H.R. 817 (regarding animal fighting); H.R. 593 (regarding horse slaughter issues); various amendments regarding horse slaughter and wild horse issues; and H.R. 3258 (regarding pet evacuation and transportation issues).

\(^6\) During the 110\(^{th}\) Congress, Representative Whitfield supported or co-sponsored several pieces of animal-welfare legislation, including: H.R. 503 (regarding horse slaughter issues); H.R. 249 (regarding wild horse issues); H.R. 891 (regarding fur labeling); H.R. 137 (regarding animal fighting); H.R. 2643 (regarding polar bear issues); H.R. 1464 (regarding dog and cat issues); H.R. 1771 (regarding canine conservation issues); H.R. 2419 (regarding animal and farm issues); and H.R. 2964 (regarding primate issues).

\(^7\) During the 111\(^{th}\) Congress, Representative Whitfield supported or co-sponsored several pieces of animal welfare legislation, including: H.R. 503 (regarding horse slaughter issues); H.R. 2480 (regarding fur labeling issues); H.R. 1336 (regarding primate research); H.R. 80 (regarding primate issues); H.R. 388 (regarding canine conservation issues); H.R. 411 (regarding dog and cat issues); H.R. 1018 (regarding wild horse issues); H.R. 509 (regarding marine turtle issues); H.R. 5566 (regarding animal crush video issues); H.R. 3885 (regarding service dogs); and H.R. 343 (regarding puppy mills).
In sum, throughout his nearly two decades in Congress, Representative Whitfield has developed a clear and established record of taking keen interest in animal-welfare issues and animal-related legislation. Since the beginning of his first term in the House in 1995, the Congressman and his congressional staff have engaged in all aspects of the legislative process with regard to animal-welfare matters. This includes, but is not limited to: drafting bills and amendments on animal-rights and safety matters; communicating with fellow Members regarding various pieces of animal-welfare legislation and animal-welfare amendments; engendering support from fellow Members concerning various animal-welfare bills and animal-welfare amendments; participating in and helping to organize hearings on animal-related issues; engaging constituents and lobbyists on a wide range of animal-welfare issues; and expressing public support for animal-welfare issues in both an official and non-official capacity. All of these activities predate Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s registration as a federal lobbyist for HSLF and any other non-lobbying association she had with the Humane Society Entitles prior to 2011.

In light of this long and established record of engagement on animal-welfare issues, it should be abundantly clear to the OCE that the Congressman and his staff have always taken an active legislative role in such matters. Dating back to 1995, Representative Whitfield and his staff have energetically engaged constituents, outside interest groups, and other Members on a wide range of animal-related public policy matters. This includes taking meetings with various individuals and groups invested in animal welfare matters (including lobbyists for a wide range of animal organizations), working to formulate sensible legislative policies regarding key animal issues, and engaging other Members and their staff on legislative formulation and adoption. All of these activities were motivated by Representative Whitfield’s high level of personal concern for public policy matters involving animal welfare and his constituents’ equally-high interest in the subject matter. None of this engagement derived from a desire by the Congressman or his staff to dispense special favors or privileges to animal-welfare organizations or the individuals associated with them. In particular, none of his conduct with regard to animal-welfare issues was at all motivated by a personal desire to benefit his wife or her employer, HSLF.

As demanded by House Rules and the Code of Ethics, all of Representative Whitfield’s legislative engagement on animal-welfare issues (dating back to 1995) has been open-handed and driven by a general desire to improve the public welfare in the Congressman’s district and across the country. In turn, the Congressman and his staff have never discriminated for or against any group or individual seeking to meet or engage with his office on animal-welfare matters or legislation. Likewise, Representative Whitfield and his staff have never shied away from offering appropriate congressional aid and support to individuals or groups interested in animal-welfare matters. As a result, the Congressman and his staff have met with, communicated with, been educated by, discussed public policy priorities, and engaged in the legislative process with a plethora of animal-related groups and individuals. Included among these engaged organizations and individuals are groups such as the National Thoroughbred Racing Association, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Horse Council, the American Association of Equine Practitioners, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the American Farm Bureau, the
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Thoroughbred Owners and Breeders Association, the Jockey Club, the National Medication Testing Consortium, and the Jockeys Guild, as well as a wide range of small farmers and other individuals personally invested in animal-welfare issues. The Humane Society Entities, at issue in this matter, are yet another example of the type of organization that Representative Whitfield and his staff have engaged in this fashion.

Such conduct in connection with these organizations and individuals was and is wholly consistent with the Congressman’s constitutional role as an elected representative in Congress and is likewise extremely common among Members. Additionally, such conduct by Representative Whitfield and other Members is not unique to organizations or individuals interested solely in animal-welfare matters. As an energetic representative of the people of Kentucky’s First Congressional District, Representative Whitfield has consistently had similar contact and engagement with organizations and individuals interested in a wide range of other public policy issues, including tax and economic matters, health care and entitlement reform, energy issues, and foreign policy and trade matters. In turn, the treatment of HSLF and the Humane Society Entities by the Congressman and his staff was not unique to those organizations or the public policy matters at issue. It was simply an example of Representative Whitfield performing his job to the utmost of his ability.

In light of these facts, it is wholly improper to characterize the conduct of Representative Whitfield’s office with regard to the Humane Society Entities as anything other than normal interactions between interest groups and a Member of Congress. Representative Whitfield and his staff did not afford HSLF or any of the other Humane Society Entities special access to their office as a result of Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s position as a registered lobbyist for HSLF, nor did they engage in any interactions that had any bearing on the adoption, formulation, or modification of legislation by the Congressman. As permitted by House Rules and the Code of Ethics, the vast majority of contacts, communications and interactions between Representative Whitfield’s office and the Humane Society Entities involved either the exchange of educational information regarding animal-welfare issues, or, in instances where there was alignment of public policy priorities, the discussion of how best to grow grass roots and political support for particular legislative initiatives concerning animal welfare. In a limited number of instances, however, the interactions between Representative Whitfield’s office and the Humane Society Entities involved setting up meetings between HSLF representatives (typically Ms. Harriman-Whitfield) and federal administrative or legislative offices.

The nature of such meetings varied widely, but typically they involved the sharing of educational information regarding animal welfare issues by HSLF. In some instances, however, they

---

8 This is indicative of the fact that Ms. Harriman-Whitfield did not engage in any lobbying contacts with her husband or his staff in an attempt to influence his policy positions on animal-welfare or any other type of federal legislation.
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may have involved more substantive matters, such as the sharing of HSLF’s public policy priorities. As is characteristic of these types of administrative meetings (which are commonly setup by Members for various constituents and policy groups), HSLF representatives were often accompanied to their appointments by a member of the Congressman’s staff. In some rare occurrences (typically those involving a meeting with another Member or Senator), Representative Whitfield would also accompany the HSLF representative(s). This action is also a common one for Members of Congress, who typically attend face-to-face meetings that their staff set up with other elected officials.

In light of the above factual scenarios, there is no reasonable basis for OCE to believe that a violation of House Rules or the Code of Ethics have occurred in the present matter. Communicating and engaging with an interest group represented by one’s lobbyist spouse does not trigger an ethics violation for a Member of Congress unless such communications and engagement represent the dispensation of special privileges or benefits or involve direct lobbying contacts designed to influence the legislative positions of that Member. Such conduct did not occur in the present matter. Through communications with HSLF, Representative Whitfield and his staff were merely exchanging educational and political engagement information with an interest group of importance to his constituents. Likewise, through the actions of his office to arrange meetings for HSLF with other legislative and executive branch officials, he fulfilled the typical constitutional role common to all Members of Congress — serving as a representative “go between” for individuals and policy groups seeking to have the federal government address their public policy goals and grievances. None of this conduct, in the abstract or in relation to the activities in this matter, constitutes a violation of the ethical rules applicable to Representative Whitfield and his staff.

In weighing the permissibility of the above actions taken by Representative Whitfield and his staff with regard to animal-welfare legislation, HSLF and the Humane Society entities, it is also important to take note of the fact that the Congressman affirmatively sought to comply with his ethical obligations under the House Rules and Code of Ethics. To this end, following Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s registration as a federal lobbyist for HSLF in 2011, the Congressman and his wife sought informal advice from the House Committee on Ethics regarding the implications of her status as a lobbyist on his day-to-day representative responsibilities. In this regard, the Congressman, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield, and the Congressman’s staff all consulted the House Ethics Manual to seek advice on the limits of permissible interaction between Representative Whitfield and HSLF. Furthermore, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield independently sought informal phone guidance from HEC counsel on the ethical framework at play in this scenario.

Based upon these actions, it was determined that nothing in the House Rules or the Code of Ethics specifically prohibited Representative Whitfield and his staff from engaging in the types of activities discussed above as it relates to Ms. Harriman-Whitfield and HSLF. It was discovered, however, that as the spouse of a Member, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield was not allowed to engage in lobbying contacts directly with her husband or his staff. In light of this prohibition, it was made clear to the Congressman’s staff members that they could not have any contacts with Ms. Harriman-Whitfield designed to influence Representative Whitfield’s adoption, formulation or modification of
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legislation. Similarly, the Congressman refrained from any such communications. On information and belief, that edict has been followed by both Representative Whitfield and his staff over the course of the past three years.

**Potential Ethical Provisions at Issue in the Present Preliminary Review**

Although it is unclear at present whether or not OCE believes there is a reasonable basis to suspect that any specific House Rules or Code of Ethics provisions have been contravened by the actions of Representative Whitfield regarding animal-welfare legislation, the scope of the preliminary review discussed in your January 29th correspondence indicates that OCE is potentially weighing whether the Congressman's conduct ran afoul of three general ethical frameworks — Section 5 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service; Clauses 1 and 2 of House Rule XXIII; and Clause 7 of House Rule XXV. In this initial response to OCE's notice of preliminary review and at this early stage of your office's investigation, we will not attempt to marshal a full legal analysis of these provisions. We would, however, like to offer a basic overview of these ethical standards to illustrate why there is absolutely no basis to believe that Representative Whitfield's actions on behalf of animal-welfare legislation constitute impermissible behavior by a Member of Congress.

**Section 5 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service**

As the OCE knows well, the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives and other associated standards of conduct generally prohibit Members from using, or appearing to use, their official position for personal gain or benefit. One of the key ethical provisions implementing this proscription is Section 5 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service, 72 Stat., Part 2, B112 (1958), H. Con. Res. 173, 85th Cong. The language of Section 5 requires any person in Government service, including Members and their staff, to:

> Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not, and never accept for himself or his family, favors or benefits under circumstances which might be construed by reasonable persons as influencing the performance of his government duties.

As such, Members and their staff may not take any actions that might be construed by reasonable persons to be either a special dispensation on behalf of a third party or to be conduct improperly influenced by favors or benefits given to them by such a third party.

**Unfair Discrimination and the Dispensation of Special Favors or Privileges**

When assessing the first prong of Section 5 and seeking to determine whether a Member or staffer has unfairly discriminated through the dispensation of special favors or privileges, the House Ethics Committee ("HEC") typically looks to see if the accused individual has unethically used his or her office or position to favor the interests of a third party. In most Section 5 cases, the alleged unethical behavior under investigation by the HEC involves conduct by a Member or staff that aids
the interests of a third party through the influence of independent agencies and executive or legislative branch officials and employees. The HEC has made clear in these matters, however, including in the very first advisory opinion issued by the HEC, that standard administrative contacts for or on behalf of constituents and other similarly-situated third parties are by no means contrary to the language or spirit of Section 5.

According to HEC precedent and policy announcements, the simple act of arranging or conducting a meeting with an administrative agency or legislative official is in most circumstances an appropriate use of a Member's position or a staffer's authority. The HEC has long recognized that acting as a "go-between" or conduit between the public and administrative agencies of the federal government (or other legislative officials) is an important aspect of a Member's representative function and a staffer's employment responsibilities. Moreover, the HEC has accepted that the facilitation of administrative contact via elected officials and their staff is a logical extension of the Constitutional guarantee that all citizens have the right to petition the federal government for the redress of grievances.

Of course, when acting as a conduit between constituents or similarly-situated third parties and administrative or legislative personnel in the federal government, a Member's or staffer's conduct must be bound by certain statutory and judicial restrictions, as well as certain ethical principles. To this end, specific types of contacts by Members and staff are traditionally considered inappropriate by the HEC. Included among these improper actions are so-called ex parte communications directed at executive or independent agency officials on the merits of matters under their formal consideration. This prohibition does not, however, proscribe "general background discussions about an entire industry that do not directly relate to specific agency adjudication involving a member of that industry, or to formal rulemaking involving the industry as a whole." Nor does the proscription against ex parte communications apply to congressional status requests, which are explicitly exempted by statute, or routine inquiries or referrals by Members or staff.

In addition to these statutory and judicial restrictions on Members or staffers acting as a conduit between a Member's constituents and other federal government agencies or employees, Congress has adopted standards that recognize the legitimate role of a Member in assisting the

---

6 See Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, Advisory Opinion No. 1.
8 U.S. Const., Amend. 1.
public, while protecting both the due process rights of parties potentially affected by government action and the ability of agency officials to exercise their responsibilities. The most clear expression of those standards is in Committee Advisory Opinion No. 1, which was issued in 1970. In the language of this opinion, the HEC asserted that it is inappropriate for a Member (and by extension, a staffer) to act as a conduit between a Member's constituents and federal government agencies in a variety of different settings, including: (1) requesting information or seeking a status report; (2) urging prompt consideration of a matter; (3) arranging for interviews or appointments with constituents; (4) expressing judgments; (5) calling for reconsideration of an administrative response which may not be supported by established law, regulation, or legislative intent; and (6) performing any other service of a similar nature generally compatible with ethical rules. In blessing each of these types of administrative contacts, however, the Advisory Opinion also made clear to Members and staffers that they are at all times required to recognize that the "overall public interest ... is primary to any individual matter and should be so considered." The contents of Advisory Opinion No. 1 also spell out specific, "self-evident" standards of conduct that a Member or staffer should follow when arranging a meeting between a constituent and a federal government agency or employee. Specifically, the Member or staffer should: (1) recognize that their responsibility in this setting is to all constituents equally and not solely to the party involved; (2) pursue actions on behalf of third parties with equal diligence irrespective of political or other considerations associated with the parties; (3) understand that direct or implied suggestion of either favoritism or reprisal in advance of, or subsequent to, action taken by the agency or employee contacted is unwarranted abuse of office or authority; and (4) make every effort to ensure that any representation made in such meetings conforms with general ethical principles and the instructions of the Member.

In applying these standards to various factual scenarios, the HEC has developed a series of guidelines for avoiding improper conduct that dovetail with the ethical standards set forth in Advisory Opinion No. 1. These guidelines fall mainly into two distinct categories – guidelines regarding the nature of proper communications between Members or staffers and federal government agencies or employees; and guidelines regarding the avoidance of unfair discrimination (or the appearance of unfair discrimination) by Members or staffers when serving as conduits between constituents and federal government agencies or employees.

In the first context, the HEC (through commentary in the House Ethics Manual and in various investigations) has made it clear that factual communications between Members or staffers and federal government agencies or employees must avoid any indicia of undue influence. While

15 See 2008 House Ethics Manual at 305.
16 See Committee Advisory Opinion No. 1.
17 Id.
what constitutes undue influence varies from factual setting to factual setting, the HEC has generally required that there be at least some "probative evidence" of a "revels or threat to ... officials" in order to reach a determination that improper influence was applied by a Member or staffer. At the same time, the HEC has asserted that a finding of influence cannot be based purely on "inference", "circumstance", or on the "technique or personality" of the Member or staffer.

Bearing these principles in mind, the HEC’s general advice on avoiding the appearance of undue influence when communicating with government agencies and employees has been for Members and staffers to avoid endorsing factual matters they do not know to be true and to leave substantive assertions of fact to the individual constituents or third-parties involved in the meetings. Additionally, the HEC has urged Members and staffers to refrain from allowing personal interest in or support for the issues or matters being discussed by constituents or third parties from becoming improper advocacy for their positions. The expression of general interest in or support for constituent issues and matters is, in and of itself, generally permissible for Members and staffers. Overseas interest or unwarranted support, however, could be indicative of undue influence.

The second set of guidelines mentioned above relate to the avoidance of unfair discrimination (or the appearance of unfair discrimination) by Members of staffers when serving as conduits between constituents and federal government agencies or employees. Under these guidelines, it is imperative that Members and staffers approach their role of conduit equally for all constituents. Considerations such as political support, party affiliation, or campaign contributions should not affect either the Member’s or staffer’s decision to provide assistance to a given constituent or the quality of the aid given by the Member or staffer. While this means that a Member or staffer should not discriminate in favor of political supporters, it equally means that a Member or staffer should not discriminate against such supporters. To this point, the HEC has proclaimed that "the fact that a constituent is a campaign donor does not mean that a Member is precluded from providing any official assistance." Provided there is no quid pro quo situation at play, a Member or staffer "is free to assist all persons equally." In providing such assistance, however, Members and staffers should always be mindful to avoid the appearance of impropriety. According to the language of the

12 Id.
31 Advisory Opinion No. 1.
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House Ethics Manual, this means "taking care not to show favoritism" to political supporters and campaign donors over other constituents.43

The Acceptance of Special Favors or Benefits

When assessing the second prong of Section 5 and seeking to determine whether a Member or staffer has taken official action for personal benefit, the Committee will take into consideration three different factors: (1) the nature of the benefit provided45; (2) the people or entities that could benefit from the official action45; and (3) the Member’s or staffer’s motive in taking the action47.

When determining a Member’s or staffer’s motive in taking official action, the HEC typically asks whether there is "direct evidence" that the congressman or staffer "had any such improper motive."48 We will not delve any further into these standards at this time, but can provide additional precedential applications of Section 5’s second prong should OCE believe that such issues arise in the present matter. We do not believe, however, that the Congressman’s activities in the present dispute involve any reasonable concerns about the acceptance of such special favors or benefits.

Clauses 1 and 2 of House Rule XXIII

Although not specified in the preliminary review statement included in your office’s January 29th correspondence, it is readily apparent that OCE’s current investigation may involve an assessment of whether Representative Whitfield violated the ethical provisions contained within Clauses 1 and 2 of House Rule XXIII. These "catch all" ethical provisions apply equally to Members, officers, and employees of the House and are often the basis of OCE and HEC scrutiny. We will endeavor to address both briefly in turn below with an eye toward explaining why neither is applicable in the present matter.

House Rule XXIII, Clause 1

The language of House Rule XXIII, Clause 1 is one of the broadest ethical provisions applicable to Members and their staff. Specifically, its language mandates that "a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House ... conduct himself at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House." As written, this phrasing sheds little light on the proper application of Clause 1 to various factual settings. Legislative history and historical

46 See Graves at 19; Sikes, at 28.
47 St. Germain, at 43.
48 Id.
precedent, however, clarify that Clause 1 is typically invoked only in those situations involving "flagrant" official or personal conduct, or behavior that constitutes an abuse of one's official position.\(^{24}\) As mandated by House Resolution 451 passed during the 110\(^{th}\) Congress, this includes alleged criminal conduct associated with Members and their staff.

With this interpretive framework in mind, the HEC and full House have chosen to invoke Rule XXIII, Clause 1 in investigating or disciplining members only in those settings where there is clear evidence of egregious conduct unbecoming of the public trust. This includes scenarios involving the following forms of flagrant behavior by Members and staff: (1) failure to report campaign contributions; (2) making false statements to the HEC; (3) criminal convictions for bribery, conspiracy, racketeering, and obstruction of justice; (4) accepting illegal gratuities; (5) filing false federal income tax returns; (6) inflating the salaries of congressional employees to enable them to pay for the personal, political and congressional expenses of Members; (7) accepting gifts from persons in violation of the House gift rules; (8) engaging in inappropriate sexual relationships or making improper sexual advances; (9) improperly influencing the activities of police officers or judges; (10) engaging in a pattern of behavior involving the improper conversion of campaign funds to personal use; (11) performing campaign work in an official congressional office on official time; (12) making statements that impugn the reputation of the House; (13) failing to cooperate with HEC fact-finding activities; (14) personally threatening a Member or staffor; and (14) offering political endorsements in exchange for legislative support.\(^{25}\) Conduct that does not rise to the level of ethical flagrancy demonstrated by these anecdotal behaviors does not traditionally meet the standards of a Clause 1 violation under House Rule XXIII.

\textit{House Rule XXIII, Clause 2}

Like Clause 1 discussed above, Clause 2 of House Rule XXIII is one of the broader ethical standards applicable to Members and their staff. Specifically, the language of Clause 2 mandates that "a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer or employee of the House shall adhere to the spirit and letter of the Rules of the House and to the rules of duly constituted committees thereof." Its purpose, according to the pertinent legislative history at the time of its adoption, is to emphasize the importance of decorum in congressional dealings and to provide the House with a means of dealing with troubling conduct that does not necessarily fit within the boundaries of existing ethical rules.

Regardless of the intended purpose of the rule, Clause 2's practical effect has been to broaden the enforceability of already-existing provisions within the House Rules and the Code of Ethics for

\(^{24}\) In interpreting Clause 1 of the Rule XXIII when first adopted, the Select Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the 96th Congress noted that this standard was included within the Code to deal with "flagrant" violations of the law that reflect on Congress as a whole, and that might otherwise go unpunished.

Government Service. This phenomenon is a direct result of the HEC's traditional approach to applying the provision. Explicitly, the HEC has customarily interpreted Clause 2 to mean that "Members, officers, and employees may not do indirectly what they would be barred from doing directly." This understanding of the clause prevents individuals from knowingly circumventing the spirit of a given ethics provision by engaging in behavior that skirts the line of compliance with the letter of the law. Likewise, this interpretation of Clause 2 prevents individuals from enabling ethical violations through ancillary activity on behalf of others. This broadening effect does not, however, operate in a manner that proscribes behavior otherwise deemed permissible under House Rules or the Code of Ethics.

Clause 7 of House Rule XXV

Although not specified in the preliminary review statement included in your office's January 29th correspondence, it is readily apparent that OGE's current investigation may also involve an assessment of whether Representative Whitfield violated the ethical standards set forth in House Rule XXV, Clause 7. This recently-enacted provision of the House Rules requires that a Member prohibit his or her staff from having any lobbying contacts with the Member's spouse if he or she is a federally-registered lobbyist. Specifically, the language of Clause 7 reads as follows:

"A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall prohibit all staff employed by that Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner (including staff in personal, committee, and leadership offices) from making any lobbying contact (as defined in section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995) with that individual's spouse if that spouse is a lobbying under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 or is employed or retained by such a lobbyist for the purpose of influencing legislation."

Under this general prohibition, Members with spouses who are registered federal lobbyists under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (LDA) are obligated to prohibit their staffers from engaging in any formal "lobbying contacts" with such spouses. Effectively, this proscription prevents the staff of a Member covered under Clause 7 from engaging in any oral, written or electronic communications with the Member's lobbyist spouse when such communications involve formal attempts to influence the Member's formulation, modification or adoption of federal legislation (including draft legislative proposals). The prohibition does not, however, stretch any farther.

Clause 7 does NOT limit the ability of a Member's staff to engage in communications with the Member's lobbyist spouse when such interactions involve matters other than the Member's formulation, modification or adoption of legislation. For example, Clause 7 does NOT operationally restrict communications between a Member's lobbyist spouse and the Member's staff when such
interactions involve public policy matters wholly unrelated to existing or potential legislation. Likewise, Clause 7 does NOT constrain the ability of a Member's staff to communicate with the Member's lobbyist spouse when such interactions involve discussions regarding political or public policy engagement with other government officials (including other Members of Congress). Finally, Clause 7 does not prohibit the staff of a Member from engaging in communications with the Member's lobbyist spouse if such interactions involve conduct specifically exempted from the definition of "lobbying contacts" under Section 3(b) of the LDA.3

In sum, the prohibition set forth in House Rule XXV, Clause 7 is fairly narrow and well-defined. The provision is not designed to be an outright prohibition on policy communication between a Member's lobbyist spouse and a covered Member's staff. Rather, it is intended to be a targeted safeguard against the exercise of undue influence over a Member's legislative decision-making by his or her lobbyist spouse.

Representative Whitfield's Legislative Engagement on Animal-Welfare Matters Does Not Constitute a Violation of Applicable Ethical Provisions

Looking at the precise language of the Code of Ethics for Government Service, House Rule XXIII, and House Rule XXV, as well as the above-described commentary on their proper legal application, it should be relatively clear to OCE that the actions of Representative Whitfield and his staff in this matter fall well short of any congressional ethics violations. There is simply no evidence to suggest that any of the conduct at issue in this matter reasonably rises to the level of a violation of Section 5 of the Code of Ethics, Clauses 1 and 2 of House Rule XXIII, or Clause 7 of House Rule XXV. In turn, OCE should vote to dismiss the present investigatory matter prior to the initiation of a Second-Phase Review.

In the Section 5 context, there does not appear to be any reasonable basis for OCE to believe that Representative Whitfield violated either the first or second prong of the provision. Although Congressman Whitfield and his staff engaged in a variety of communications with representatives of HSFL regarding animal-welfare issues, helped HSFL arrange for administrative meetings with various administrative and legislative officials concerning such matters, and took some independent legislative action that aligned with the interests of HSFL, such conduct is wholly within the bounds of Section 5.

3 The Section 3(b) exemptions include a wide range of communications, including (but not limited to) the following: those made by a representative of a media organization if the purpose of the communication is gathering and disseminating news and information to the public; those made in a speech, article, publication or other material that is distributed and made available to the public; those involving a request for a meeting, a request for the status of an action, or any other similar administrative request; those involving information provided in writing in response to an oral or written request by a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official; and other similar contacts.
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The first prong of Section 5 prohibits a Member and his staff from engaging in conduct that represents the dispensation of special favors or privileges to third parties. The HEC, however, has made it clear that even-handed treatment of constituent groups and individuals sharing common public policy goals is NOT a Section 5 violation. Given that Representative Whitfield and his staff engaged in communications, meetings, and other administrative activities with HSLF in the same fashion as they have for other constituent groups and individuals, there is no Section 5 concern at play. The Congressman and his staff did not discriminate in favor of HSLF with regard to the office’s activities on animal-welfare issues, nor did it endeavor to disadvantage HSLF due to its employment of his wife. Representative Whitfield and his staff simply offered HSLF the same level of access, engagement and diligence that they offer other similarly-situated groups or individuals. Such behavior is purely permissible under the Code of Ethics and not a valid grounds for pursuing additional investigation of Representative Whitfield.

Unlike the first prong of Section 5, the second prong of the provisions prohibits a Member or staffer from accepting benefits or privileges in a fashion that reasonably leads one to believe that there is an improper influence of governmental duties. In the present matter, there is absolutely no foundation to suspect that Representative Whitfield or any of his staffers received any benefits or favors in exchange for their activities on behalf of animal-welfare matters. As detailed at length above, Congressman Whitfield has long been concerned about animal-welfare issues and legislation associated with such issues. In light of this fact, there is absolutely no basis to presume that there was any other motive at play in any of the legislative or administrative actions taken by his office with regard to such matters. Without compelling evidence of an improper motive or financial interest, OCE has no reasonable grounds to pursue a Section 5, prong two allegation against Representative Whitfield or his staff.

In the Rule XXIII context, there does not appear to be any reasonable basis for OCE to believe that Representative Whitfield violated either Clause 1 or Clause 2 of the provision. Although Congressman Whitfield and his staff engaged in a variety of communications with representatives of HSLF regarding animal-welfare issues, helped HSLF arrange for administrative meetings with various administrative and legislative officials concerning such matters, and took some independent legislative action that aligned with the interests of HSLF, such conduct does not come close to rising to the level of a violation of House Rule XXIII.

As discussed previously in this response, the HEC has only found violations of Clause 1 in instances where Members or their staff engage in conduct that represents an egregious breach of the public trust, and has only found violations of Clause 2 in circumstances where Members or their staff engage in behavior that openly attempts to circumvent other ethical provisions through indirect action. None of the allegations at play in the present matter come close to running afof either clause. The range of activities under review in the present investigation simply do not involve the types of criminal behavior, misuse of office, and the other wholly unethical conduct reserved for Clause 1 cases. Likewise, there is simply no evidence to support any claim that Representative Whitfield or his staff sought to circumvent other provisions of the House Rules or the Code of Ethics.
through indirect action. In turn, there is no affirmative basis for the OCE to proceed in investigating a potential Clause 2 claim under House Rule XXIII.

Finally, in the Rule XXV context, there does not appear to be any reasonable basis for OCE to believe that Representative Whitfield or his staff violated Clause 7 of the provision. Although Congressman Whitfield and his staff engaged in a variety of communications with representatives of HSDF regarding animal-welfare issues, helped HSDF arrange for administrative meetings with various administrative and legislative officials concerning such matters, and took some independent legislative action that aligned with the interests of HSDF, such conduct does not implicate the lobbying limitations set forth in House Rule XXV, Clause 7.

As described in greater detail earlier in this response, the language of House Rule XXV, Clause 7 prevents the staff of a Member from engaging in any oral, written or electronic communications with the Member's lobbyist spouse when such communications involve formal attempts to influence the Member's formulation, modification or adoption of federal legislation (including draft legislative proposals). The prohibition does not, however, limit the ability of a Member's staff to engage in communications with the Member's lobbyist spouse when such interactions involve matters other than the Member's formulation, modification or adoption of legislation. Given the fact that none of the communications at issue in this matter between Ms. Harriman-Whitfield and her husband's office (including the Congressman himself) involved attempts to influence Representative Whitfield's legislative priorities or activities, there is no basis for OCE to investigate or proceed under a Clause 7 theory in this case. It is simply not a violation of the House Rules for a Member or his staff to communicate with the Member's lobbyist spouse about matters that do not qualify as direct lobbying contacts. Educational, strategic, and administrative communications involving animal-welfare public policy issues and basic outreach to other Members of Congress on animal-welfare subjects are not direct lobbying contacts designed to influence the legislative positions of Representative Whitfield or his staff. In turn, there is no need for OCE to proceed with the present investigation under a theory that Representative Whitfield may have run afoul of the provisions of Rule XXV, Clause 7.

**Formal Response to OCE Request for Additional Information**

Despite Representative Whitfield's rejection of the initial allegations raised by OCE in its notice of preliminary review, the Congressman stands fully committed to cooperating with your office and aiding in its initial investigative efforts. As such, and as requested in your January 31st correspondence, Representative Whitfield and his staff have undertaken due diligence efforts to provide thorough and complete responses to each of the seven initial inquiries contained in the formal RFI. In order to ease review, each response statement is presented in conjunction with the appropriate investigative request. The contents of these replies and the exhibits represent the Congressman's verified written responses to the OCE's current questions. For the sake of confirmation, however, Representative Whitfield will submit a signed certification statement to your office in due course.
Requests and Responses

1. Please provide the name, title, and contact information for each current or former employee of your congressional office whose work duties concerned animal welfare and protection issues from 2011 to present.

In accordance with the specifics of this Request, Representative Whitfield has compiled a list of all employees (current or former) whose work duties within the Congressman’s office between 2011 and the present concerned animal welfare and protection issues. The name, title, and personal contact information for those individuals is set forth in the roster document attached hereto as Addendum #1.

2. Please provide the name, title, and contact information of each individual retained or employed by the Humane Society Legislative Fund, the Humane Society of the United States, or the Fund for Animals (collectively, “Humane Society Entities”) with whom you or your congressional staff communicated concerning legislative issues from 2011 to present.

In accordance with the specifics of this Request, Representative Whitfield has compiled a list of all individuals retained or employed by any of the various Humane Society Entities who had contact with the Congressman or his staff regarding legislative issues between 2011 and the present. The name, title, and personal contact information for those persons is set forth in the roster document attached hereto as Addendum #2.

3. Please provide all files, correspondence, emails (including official and personal email accounts), notes, and other documents related to any of the Humane Society Entities from 2011 to present. Such documents include, but are not limited to, all correspondence between you and your congressional staff with individuals employed or retained by one or more of the Humane Society Entities.

Representative Whitfield and his staff are performing a thorough and complete search of all files, correspondence, emails, notes, and other documents in their possession, custody and control that fit the applicable timeframe (2011 to present) and can reasonably be classified as related to any of the Humane Society Entities. An initial round of documents deemed relevant to this Request are attached to this correspondence as Addendum #3. They have also been Bates labeled for OCE’s reference moving forward.

The files, correspondence, emails, notes, and other documents provided in Addendum #3 represent the sum of all materials presently available for production to OCE in regards to Request #3. Due to breadth of the present request, however, Representative Whitfield and his staff require more time to examine e-mail correspondence and backdated files, and to produce such documents for OCE’s review. The Congressman and his staff will proceed with this review and production in an
efficient a manner as possible, and pledge to provide OCE with additional relevant documents on a continuous, rolling basis. We apologize for any inconvenience caused by the delay associated with this process, but the message-by-message review required to respond to this request in a proper fashion mandates additional time reviewing backdated e-mails and files. Once this ongoing inspection is concluded, however, Representative Whitfield will provide immediate notice to OCE as to the completeness of its response.

4. Please provide all files, correspondence, emails (including official and personal email accounts), notes, and other documents possessed by you or your congressional staff related to the following bills: Safeguard American Food Exports Act of 2013 (H.R. 1094); Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act of 2013 (H.R. 183); PAST Act of 2013 (H.R. 1518); Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act of 2013 (H.R. 847); Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act of 2013 (H.R. 366); Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act of 2011 (H.R. 2492); American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act of 2011 (H.R. 2966); Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act of 2011 (H.R. 1513); Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act of 2011 (H.R. 1733); Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act of 2011 (H.R. 198); Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act of 2011 (H.R. 835); and To Amend the Horse Protection Act of 2012 (H.R. 6388).

Representative Whitfield and his staff are performing a thorough and complete search of all files, correspondence, emails, notes, and other documents in their possession, custody and control that fit the applicable timeframe (2011 to present) and can reasonably be classified as related to any of the listed pieces of legislation. An initial round of documents deemed relevant to this Request are attached to this correspondence as Addendum #4. They have also been Bates labeled for OCE's reference moving forward.

The files, correspondence, emails, notes, and other documents provided in Addendum #4 represent the sum of all materials presently available for production to OCE in regards to Request #4. Due to breadth of the present request, however, Representative Whitfield and his staff require more time to examine e-mail correspondence and backdated files, and to produce such documents for OCE's review. The Congressman and his staff will proceed with this review and production in an efficient a manner as possible, and pledge to provide OCE with additional relevant documents on a continuous, rolling basis. We apologize for any inconvenience caused by the delay associated with this process, but the message-by-message review required to respond to this request in a proper fashion mandates additional time reviewing backdated e-mails and files. Once this ongoing inspection is concluded, however, Representative Whitfield will provide immediate notice to OCE as to the completeness of its response.

5. Please provide a list of all meetings that you or your congressional staff arranged or attended with Ms. Harrisman-Whitfield or any other person acting on behalf of one or more of the present Humane Society Entities with Members or staff of Congress from 2011 to present, including, but not limited to, meetings concerning the bills listed in Request No. 3. For each meeting, provide the date, location, attendees, and a brief description of the nature of the meeting.
In accordance with the specifics of this Request, Representative Whitfield has compiled a list of all meetings with Members or congressional office staff that the Congressman or his staffers arranged or attended between 2011 and the present with Ms. Harriman-Whitfield or any other representative of a Humane Society Entity. The date, location, attendees and a brief description of those meetings deemed responsive to this Request are set forth in the document attached hereto as Addendum #5.

The details provided in this list represent the most accurate and thorough information available to Representative Whitfield and his staff based upon relevant scheduling, meeting, and e-mail records informed by personal recollection. However, due to the incomplete nature of those records and the natural effect of time on personal recollection, the attendee and description information for certain meetings may be less detailed than for others. To the extent this phenomenon occurs in the attached listing, Representative Whitfield and his staff have attempted to identify the unconfirmed or ambiguous data for OCE’s reference.

6. Please provide a list of all events you attended that one or more of the Humane Society Entities sponsored or hosted from 2011 to present. For each event, provide a description of the nature of the event, the date of the event, and the names of any of your congressional staff who attended the event. Such events include, but are not limited to, receptions, dinners, fundraisers, and award ceremonies.

In accordance with the specifics of this Request, Representative Whitfield has compiled a list of all events sponsored or hosted by any of the Humane Society Entities that the Congressman attended between 2011 and the present. The date, location, and a brief description of those events deemed responsive to this Request are set forth in the document attached hereto as Addendum #6. As requested, the entries for each event also contain the names of any Whitfield congressional staffers who attended the event in conjunction with the Congressman.

The details provided in this list represent the most accurate and thorough information available to Representative Whitfield and his staff based upon relevant scheduling, meeting, e-mail records, informed by personal recollection. However, due to the incomplete nature of those records and the natural effect of time on personal recollection, the attendee and description information for certain events may be less detailed than for others. To the extent this phenomenon occurs in the attached listing, Representative Whitfield and his staff have attempted to identify the unconfirmed or ambiguous data for OCE’s reference.

7. The OCE requests the opportunity to interview you and the individuals listed in response to Request No. 1 at a mutually convenient time.

In conjunction with Representative Whitfield’s desire to cooperate with the OCE’s preliminary review activities, the Congressman will take all reasonable steps to make sure he and his
current congressional staff are available for investigative interviews with your office. To the extent possible during this preliminary review period, Representative Whitfield will also undertake all due efforts to aid the OCE in arranging any necessary interviews with former congressional staffers listed on Addendum #1. However, given the Congressman's lack of employment authority over such individuals, he cannot guarantee either their timely availability or cooperation in the present matter.

**Conclusion**

In light of the arguments, analysis and evidentiary materials presented in this Response, we do hereby request that OCE vote to dismiss the present review because there is no reasonable basis to believe Representative Whitfield's violated House Rules, the Code of Ethics for Government Service, or any other relevant ethical provisions. As briefly described in the contents of this correspondence, it is readily apparent that the Congressman's legislative engagement on behalf of public policy matters involving animal-welfare issues is wholly permissible under federal ethics laws. Such activities are part and parcel of a Member's representative responsibilities in Congress, and do not run afoul of ethical standards without clear, probative evidence of undue influence, favoritism, discrimination, an improper tangible benefit, or a motivating conflict of interest. No such proof exists in the present matter because no such influence, favoritism or discrimination occurred, and no such benefit or motivating conflict was involved.

Should the OCE continue to have any additional questions or concerns regarding the subjects at issue in this letter, or any other topics associated with the current inquiry, please do not hesitate to contact me. It is my sincere hope, however, that OCE will review the evidence and legal analysis provided in this correspondence and gathered through your office's preliminary inquiry, and affirm that the Congressman engaged in no wrongdoing whatsoever.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Stefan C. Passantino
J. Randolph Evans

SCP
Addendum
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Request #1 — Representative Ed Whitfield - Current and Former Staff Members with Responsibility for Animal-Welfare Issues

Mr. Cory Hicks
Chief of Staff (former Legislative Director)
202-225-3115
Handled animal-welfare issues from 2011 through January 2013.

Mr. Taylor Booth
Legislative Director
202-225-3115
Handles animal-welfare issues solely related to the Great Ape Protection Act. Such responsibilities began in February 2010 and continue to the present.

Mr. Justin Fareed
Legislative Aide (no longer works for the office)
Personal cell: 805-705
Handled animal-welfare issues from January 2013 through September 2013.

Mr. Chris Pack
Press Secretary
202-225-3115
Handled animal-welfare issues from October 1, 2013 through December 2, 2013.

Mr. Marty Irby
Congressional Aide
202-225-3115
Currently handles animal-welfare issues. Took over this responsibility on December 2, 2013.

Ms. Emma Heydlauff
Scheduler
202-225-3115
Began work with office in August 2012. Handled some meeting scheduling for animal-welfare issues.
Addendum
Request #2 – Relevant Employees of Humane Society Entities Who Communicated with Whitfield Staff from 2011 through the Present

Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) Employees

Mr. Wayne Pacelle
President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

202-285-

Mr. Keith Dane
Vice President, Equine Protection

202-452-

Ms. Jen Lonergan
Equine Protection Programs Coordinator

202-452-

Ms. Valerie Pringle
Equine Protection Specialist

202-452-

Ms. Stephanie Twining
Public Relations and Communications Director

202-452-

Mr. Eric Swafford
Director, Rural Outreach

202-452-

Ms. Holly Hazzard
Senior Vice President of Programs and Innovations

202-452-

Ms. Cheryl Jacobsen
Deputy Director, Equine Protection

202-452-
Ms. Cherle Beattie  
Former Behavior Manager at the Kentucky Humane Society  
Phone number unknown  

Ms. Mimi Brody  
Director, Federal Affairs  
@humanesociety.org  
202-955-5555  

Humane Society Legislative Fund (HSLF) Employees  

Sara Amundson  
Executive Director  
@hsif.org  
202-676-5555  

Dane Waters  
Political Director  
202-676-5555  

Connie Harjiman-Whitfield  
Senior Policy Adviser  
@humanesociety.org  
202-676-5555  

Jaqueline Tiaga  
Office Coordinator  
@hsif.org  
202-676-5555  

The Fund for Animals (TFAS) Employees  

Mr. Ben Callison  
Director of Cleveland Armory Black Beauty Ranch – A Division of The Fund for Animals  
@humanesociety.org  
903-469-5555
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See:
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Attachment Provided
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See:
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Request #5—Listing of Meetings Arranged or Attended by Representative Whitfield and/or his Staff with Ms. Harriman-Whitfield or Other Humane Society Entity Staff - 2011 to Present

Monday, March 14, 2011
Constituent Thank You Dinner
Agenda: No set agenda, but some discussion of horse racing drug issues occurred
Listed Attendees: Congressman Whitfield, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield, Cory Hicks, and Counsel to the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing & Trade
Notes: This constituent dinner was not legislative in nature, but did involve some discussion of horse racing drug issues. Ms. Harriman-Whitfield attended in her capacity as Representative Whitfield’s spouse and as Vice Chairman of the Kentucky Horse Racing Commission, and was not attending on behalf of the Humane Society Entities. Counsel to the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing & Trade attended as a guest of another invitee and not for any legislative or public policy purposes.

Thursday, April 28, 2011
Meeting with Kevin Cummins – Legislative Staffer for Senator Tom Udall
Agenda: HR 1733 – Interstate Horse Racing Improvement Act
Listed Attendees: Ms. Harriman-Whitfield and possibly one representative from Congressman Whitfield’s office. If a Whitefield staffer was in attendance at the meeting it was likely Cory Hicks, but it cannot be confirmed at present.
Notes: Ms. Harriman-Whitfield attended this meeting at the specific invitation and request of Mr. Cummins, who asked her to appear in her capacity as former Vice Chairman of the Kentucky Horse Racing Commission. Ms. Harriman-Whitfield did not attend on behalf of HSFL or the Humane Society Entities, and her appearance at the meeting was not directly “arranged” by Representative Whitfield or his staff.

Wednesday, June 8, 2011
Meeting with Senator Scott Brown
Agenda: Horse Slaughter Legislation
Listed Attendees: Congressman Whitfield and Ms. Harriman-Whitfield.
Notes: Ms. Harriman-Whitfield attended but did not speak during the meeting.

---

1 Please note that the list provided in this addendum is based upon the electronic schedules available at present to Representative Whitfield and his staff. Should relevant, supplemental information become known at a later date, edits to this document may need to be made.
Thursday, May 24, 2012
Meeting with Senator Lamar Alexander
Agenda: Tennessee Walking Horse Legislation
Listed Attendees: Congressman Whitfield, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield, and Cory Hicks.
Notes: Ms. Harriman-Whitfield attended but did not speak during the meeting.

Wednesday, July 25, 2012
Meeting with Congressman Phil Roe
Agenda: Tennessee Walking Horse Issues
Listed Attendees: Ms. Harriman-Whitfield and Cory Hicks

Tuesday, November 12, 2013
Hearing Prep for House Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade (CMT) Subcommittee Hearing on Horse Soring and the PAST Act
Agenda: Witness Prep for House CMT Subcommittee Hearing on Horse Soring and the PAST Act
Listed Attendees: Ms. Harriman-Whitfield, Cory Hicks, and Justin Fareed
Notes: Ms. Harriman-Whitfield and Representatives from other organizations supporting the PAST Act, such as the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), American Horse Council (AHC), American Association of Equine Practitioners (AAEP), and the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), attended this prep session, but did not actively participate. Ms. Harriman-Whitfield, like the other attendees from outside organizations, simply observed the witness preparation, which was handled by House CMT Subcommittee staff.

Wednesday, November 13, 2013
House Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade (CMT) Subcommittee Hearing on Horse Soring and the PAST Act
Agenda: Horse Soring and the PAST Act
Listed Attendees: Ms. Harriman-Whitfield, Cory Hicks and Chris Pack
Notes: Ms. Harriman-Whitfield and other representatives from organizations supporting the PAST Act, such as ASPC, AVMA, AHC, AAEP, and HSUS, attended this public hearing. Ms. Harriman-Whitfield and the other outside organization representatives sat in the public gallery of the committee room and played no direct role in the hearing itself.

Tuesday, November 19, 2013
Meeting with Senator Thad Cochran
Agenda: PAST Act
Listed Attendees: Ms. Harriman-Whitfield, Cory Hicks and Chris Pack
1100

Notes: This meeting was arranged by Former U.S. Senator Joe Tydings, the primary author of the original FAST Act. Senator Tydings invited Cory Hicks and Chris Pack to attend, and separately requested the same of Ms. Harriman-Whitfield. Representative Whitfield did not attend this meeting.
Addendum
Monday, December 5, 2011
Dinner for the Humane Society of the United States' National Advisory Council
The Sulgrave Club, Washington DC

Representative Whitfield attended this event as Ms. Harriman-Whitfield's spouse. The event, which was open to HSUS members, was a dinner honoring the good-will ambassador efforts of HSUS' National Advisory Council. Ms. Harriman-Whitfield facilitated access to the venue for the event, but neither the Congressman nor his wife played any official role in the dinner. No staff members in the Congressman's office attended this event.

1 Please note that the list of events provided in this addendum is based upon the electronic schedules available at present to Representative Whitfield and his staff. Should relevant, supplemental information become known at a later date, edits to this document may need to be made.
APPENDIX D
July 31, 2014

By Email & Messenger Mail

Thomas A. Rust, Esq.
Chief Counsel and Staff Director
Committee on Ethics, U.S. House of Representatives
1015 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6328

Re: Response to Office of Congressional Ethics Referral of Matter No. 14-2940

Dear Mr. Rust:

I write on behalf of my client, Representative W. Edward Whitfield. I appreciate the opportunity to respond to the report and findings of the Office of Congressional Ethics (“OCE”) in regard to Matter No. 14-2940. The initial complaint against the Congressman for his work on animal welfare issues, which was filed by persons with a financial interest in opposing pending legislation that has drawn overwhelming bipartisan support in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, should be viewed with great skepticism. OCE failed to rigorously investigate that complaint and challenge its assertions. For the reasons explained in more detail below, the OCE report also fails to establish any ethical violation by Representative Whitfield. The House Committee on Ethics (“the Committee”) should therefore dismiss this matter.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Representative W. Edward Whitfield has been a longstanding and passionate supporter of animal welfare legislation since his first days in the U.S. House of Representatives. Since his first term in Congress in 1995-1996, he has sponsored or co-sponsored dozens of bills designed to protect horses, dogs, and other animals. He and his staff have also worked tirelessly to advocate for animal welfare legislation.

None of the animal welfare bills that Representative Whitfield has sponsored during his almost two decades in Congress stands to benefit him financially in any way. Nor does the legislation carry significant political benefits. The animals affected by the laws obviously cannot vote, and the animal welfare groups that support the laws are often under-funded and even unpopular among Representative Whitfield’s party. Yet the Congressman continues to support such legislation as a matter of his own personal conscience, so long as it aligns with his constituents’ views.

For years, one of Representative Whitfield’s key legislative priorities has been the Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (“PAST Act”). That bill, which the Congressman and his staff drafted and which he personally sponsored, aims to eradicate the cruel and inhumane practice of horse soring. Soring involves inflicting excruciating pain on horses in order to achieve the “Big Lick” gait that is prized in certain circles of the Tennessee Walking Horse community. As with all of his other work relating to animals, Representative Whitfield derives no financial benefit from his support of the PAST Act. His advocacy of the bill stems from his own strongly-held beliefs, the interests of his constituents—the vast majority of whom oppose horse soring—and his desire to protect the health and safety of the abused horses.

As a result of the concerted efforts of Representative Whitfield and his staff, the PAST Act has garnered nearly unprecedented support in both houses of Congress. As of the date of this letter, the bill has 304 co-sponsors in the House of Representatives—approximately 70% percent of all Members. It also has another 57 co-sponsors in the Senate. And even more unusual in today’s political climate, the bill draws support from a broad bipartisan coalition of lawmakers. Indeed, over one-third of the bill’s current co-sponsors are Republicans.

Representative Whitfield’s wife, Connie Harriman-Whitfield, is a dedicated animal welfare advocate in her own right. But first and foremost, she is a trusted confidant of her husband and one of his most important personal and political advisors. In her role as his spouse, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield frequently provides her husband with guidance and administrative assistance, and counsels him on how to serve his constituents and manage his office. For both the Congressman and his wife, the interests of Representative Whitfield’s constituents are the paramount concern. Indeed, whenever necessary, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s advice to her husband includes recommendations that conflict with her employer’s priorities.
In addition to being her husband’s trusted confidant, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield also works for the Humane Society of the United States (“Humane Society”). Since 2011, she has been a registered lobbyist for the Humane Society Legislative Fund (“HSLF”). In that capacity, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield has met with various Members of Congress about numerous animal welfare bills that the Humane Society supports, including the PAST Act. She has also communicated with Representative Whitfield and his staff regarding strategies for pursuing their shared interest in the PAST legislation. These communications involved standard efforts at coalition-building in support of a bill that Representative Whitfield had already drafted and sponsored.

In late 2013, after the PAST Act had already drawn significant support in Congress, several members of the Performance Show Horse Association (“PSHA”) filed a letter of complaint against Representative Whitfield. The members of that organization have a vested financial interest in opposing passage of the PAST Act. Indeed, the signatories to the PSHA letter have personally been found responsible for numerous violations of the Horse Protection Act (“HPA”), including brutal forms of horse soring. The PSHA complaint was referred to OCE, which conducted a preliminary and second-phase investigation. OCE then issued a report stating that Representative Whitfield may have permitted his wife to have improper lobbying contacts with him and his staff, and may have granted special favors to Ms. Harriman-Whitfield and her employer.

These allegations are unfounded, and the Committee should promptly dismiss this matter. Representative Whitfield’s legislative record demonstrates that he has been a staunch supporter of animal welfare bills, including the PAST Act, since well before Ms. Harriman-Whitfield became a lobbyist for HSLF. Representative Whitfield discharges his duties independently of HSLF and all similar lobbying organizations. He sponsors, advocates, and votes only for those bills that serve his legislative agenda and the interests of his constituents—even when that brings him into opposition with the positions of the Humane Society or its lobbyists. And when he works with the Humane Society, he does so to advance his own legislative interests, not to provide any special favors to the organization or Ms. Harriman-Whitfield.

None of Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s communications with Representative Whitfield or his staff amounted to improper lobbying contacts. The relevant ethical rules and standards do not forbid all communications between a lobbyist spouse and a Member of Congress or his staff. Rather, they prohibit contacts that are designed to produce a change in legislative positions. But in the vast majority of communications identified by OCE—including with regard to the PAST Act—Ms. Harriman-Whitfield and Representative Whitfield’s staff discussed ways to implement the Congressman’s own longstanding positions. These communications were not designed to, nor did they, persuade Representative Whitfield or his staff to formulate new policy positions or alter their conduct or beliefs. On other occasions, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield acted as a personal confidant and messenger for Representative Whitfield, providing trusted advice to the Congressman and delivering information to his staff when he was too busy to do so.
himself. Such communications are the ordinary conduct of a Congressman’s spouse, not improper lobbying contacts.

OCE’s report and findings to the contrary rest on an incomplete view of the record and cherry-picked communications that have been lifted out of context. Throughout its report, OCE fails to acknowledge Representative Whitfield’s longstanding history of support for animal welfare legislation. Moreover, many of the communications identified by OCE as examples of Ms. Harriman-Whitfield “lobbying” on behalf of HSLF were in fact the exact opposite. For example, the OCE report cites an email from Ms. Harriman-Whitfield concerning a bill to regulate cage size for egg-laying hens. The Humane Society supports this so-called “Egg Bill,” but Ms. Harriman-Whitfield advised her husband not to sign onto it because it was unpopular among key constituents in his District. Such communications could not be further from improper “lobbying contacts” on behalf of HSLF.

A complete review of the record also reveals that Representative Whitfield and his staff did not grant any special favors or privileges to Ms. Harriman-Whitfield or the Humane Society. All actions taken by the Congressman and his staff in furtherance of the PAST Act were attributable to his status as a chief sponsor of the bill, not his wife’s employment by HSLF. The relevant meetings were often organized on behalf of individuals and organizations other than Ms. Harriman-Whitfield and the Humane Society. Indeed, Representative Whitfield and his staff members frequently prioritized the interests of other advocacy groups—including other animal welfare groups—above those of the Humane Society. And in any event, setting up meetings between interested organizations and other Members of Congress is not a “special favor.” Instead, it is the routine work of a Representative seeking to serve his constituents and advance his legislative agenda.

Finally, Representative Whitfield’s staff and Ms. Harriman-Whitfield each sought and adhered to advice from Congressional Ethics Counsel. Far from revealing attempts to skirt ethical boundaries, the record thus demonstrates a good faith effort on behalf of all involved to comply with House Rules and other ethical standards.

Representative Whitfield remains committed to assisting the Committee in resolving this matter. However, because the OCE report does not establish any ethical violation, the Congressman respectfully requests that this matter be dismissed.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Representative W. Edward Whitfield has been a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives since January 1995. In that time (and in many cases, long before his wife became a lobbyist for the Humane Society), he has been a sponsor or co-sponsor of dozens of bills related to the protection of animals, including horses.1

1 A list of the animal welfare bills that Representative Whitfield has sponsored or co-sponsored is attached as Appendix I ("App. I. Whitfield Animal-Welfare Bills").
Among other official actions related to horse welfare, Representative Whitfield has proposed legislation to combat the practice of horse soareing, a brutal process used to achieve the "Big Leck" gait in Tennessee Walking Horses. Horse soareing involves applying caustic chemicals to a horse's front legs or hooves, using chains or other physical devices on its forelegs, or tightly affixing horseshoes to its hooves in such a way that walking causes the horse exerting pain.\(^2\) Horse soareing has been illegal since the passage of the Horse Protection Act in 1970,\(^3\) but the practice continues today due to poor enforcement.

In late 2010, Representative Whitfield urged the U.S. Department of Agriculture ("USDA") to complete a report on horse soareing. When the USDA failed to implement its report's recommendations, Representative Whitfield drafted and introduced the PAST Act to increase investigations of and penalties for horse soareing.\(^4\)

Representative Whitfield married Constance Harriman-Whitfield in 1990.\(^5\) Ms. Harriman-Whitfield served as Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks in the Department of the Interior in the administration of President George H.W. Bush.\(^6\) In that role, she was instrumental in the enactment of a world-wide ban on the trade of elephant ivory. Ms. Harriman-Whitfield also formerly served as vice-chair of the Kentucky Horse Racing Authority and chair of the Kentucky Equine Drug Research Council, where she worked to strengthen laws concerning the administration of drugs to racehorses.\(^7\)

Ms. Harriman-Whitfield began work at the Humane Society in 2007. In 2011, she transitioned to the Humane Society Legislative Fund as a senior policy adviser. In the latter role, she registered as a lobbyist in January 2011, and she began lobbying on behalf of HSLF in October 2011.\(^8\) Representative Whitfield's opposition to horse soareing and his advocacy of anti-soareing measures thus pre-dates his wife's employment as an HSLF lobbyist.

---

4 Representative Whitfield originally introduced the PAST Act in 2012 (during the 112th Congress) as H.R. 6388 --- "To amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes."
7 Id.
8 HSLF 112A Lobbying Registration Statement (Exhibit 1 at 14-2949, 0001-04). Unless otherwise noted, all citations to exhibits throughout this letter are to the exhibits appended to OCE's report and findings.
Due to Representative Whitfield’s longstanding interest in horse welfare, the PAST Act quickly became one of the highest legislative priorities for Representative Whitfield and his staff. The Congressman and his staff members have devoted significant time and attention to the bill since it was first introduced in the House. Their work has included meeting with other Members of Congress and with the numerous animal welfare groups that support passage of the PAST legislation. As a result of Representative Whitfield’s efforts, the PAST Act has drawn widespread support in Congress. Over 300 Members of the House have already co-sponsored the bill, including 114 Republicans. Together, these Members represent approximately 70% of the total membership in the House. Fifty-seven Senators have also sponsored or co-sponsored the bill. And hundreds of veterinary and animal welfare organizations, law enforcement groups, horse organizations, and horse industry professionals have endorsed the PAST Act and advocated for its passage.

As a lobbyist for one of those groups, the Humane Society of the United States, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield has been active in meeting and educating other Members of Congress about the PAST Act and the practice of horse souring. In the course of her work for the HSFL, she emailed and called members of Representative Whitfield’s staff. In those communications, she engaged in the common practice of coalition-building for a bill that Representative Whitfield already strongly supported. She did not contribute in any way to drafting the PAST Act, and she was not responsible for Representative Whitfield’s initial decision to sponsor it.

At other times, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield provided assistance to Representative Whitfield in her role as his spouse. She often helped him and his staff manage his calendar and correspondence. She also advised him on certain political decisions and on how to best serve his constituents—even when that advice conflicted with the Humane Society’s priorities. For example, although the Humane Society supported the so-called “Egg Bill,” she advised Representative Whitfield against signing onto it.

---

11 Tr. of Interview of Representative Whitfield’s Chief of Staff, Apr. 24, 2014 (Exhibit 7 at 14-2940-0388).
14 A complete list of all of the organizations and individuals who endorsed the PAST Act as of July 8, 2014 is attached as Appendix 4 (“App. 4 Endorsements for the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act”).
15 Tr. of Interview of Representative Whitfield’s Wife, Apr. 25, 2014 (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940 0378-79, 0390).
16 Id. at 14-2940 0355-56.
17 Id. at 14-2940 0360, 0379-81, 0406-09.
18 Exhibit 12 at 14-2940 0181.
Similarly, although officers of the Humane Society wanted to testify in support of the PAST Act, she worked to prevent that in order to avoid jeopardizing the bill’s chances of passage.\footnote{17}

In December 2013, several members of the Performance Show Horse Association, which is based in Tennessee, sent a letter of complaint to the U.S. House Committee on Ethics.\footnote{18} Between them, the signatories to that letter are responsible for approximately fifty violations of the HPA, including numerous brutal examples of horse soring.\footnote{19} These individuals use soring tactics to obtain a competitive advantage at Tennessee Walking Horse shows. Their use of abusive soring practices produces an unnaturally high-stepping gait in their horses, and that gait is often rewarded by victories at horse shows that include large cash prizes.\footnote{21} The PSHA members who signed the letter of complaint thus have a vested financial interest in preventing passage of the PAST Act.

The Committee on Ethics forwarded the PSHA letter to OCE, asking for a preliminary review.\footnote{22} OCE conducted a preliminary and second-phase investigation that spanned January to April 2014.\footnote{25} During the OCE investigation, McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP represented Representative Whitfield. The Congressman’s prior counsel submitted a letter to OCE on his behalf, which is part of the record in this ongoing investigation.\footnote{26}

The OCE Board voted to refer the matter to the Committee on Ethics on June 10, 2014, and the Committee sent a letter to Representative Whitfield on June 11.\footnote{27} Representative Whitfield then retained Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP to

\footnote{17} Exhibit 19 at 14-2940, 0201-02.
\footnote{18} Letter from Performance Show Horse Association to Representative K. Michael Conaway and Representative Linda T. Sanchez, Dec. 27, 2013.
\footnote{19} See, e.g., USDA Citation to Gayle Holcomb, Mar. 30, 2013, available at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/foia/enforcement_actions/2014/January/HPA-70966-MS-14001-AC_70966_Holcomb find_102313.pdf (describing an APHIS Veterinary Medical Officer finding that a horse that Ms. Holcomb rode to a third-place finish in a 2013 horse show was scarred and sored); USDA Citation to Mickey McCormick, Aug. 27, 2011, available at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/foia/enforcement_actions/2013/April/HPA-70966- TN30308-AC_McCormick_70966_findapp_0432013.pdf (finding that Mr. McCormick entered a horse in a show whose legs were padded for acetate, acid and other substances used in horse soring). Appendix 5 to this letter lists the HPA violations by the signatories to the PSHA letter (“App. 5 [HPA Violations by Signatories to PSHA Letter]”).
\footnote{20} See American Veterinary Medical Association, Soring in Horses, Feb. 15, 2012, available at https://www.avma.org/kb/ResourcesFAQs/Pages/Soring-in-Horses.aspx (“Many judges continue to use judging criteria that encourage soring practices. . . . Events that feature ‘natural’ horses have much lower monetary rewards than events that . . . feature[] word horses.”).
\footnote{21} OCE Report 14-2940, 5–9.
\footnote{22} Id. ¶¶ 10-11.
\footnote{23} Letter from Stefan C. Passantino to Omar S. Aghaawy, Feb. 21, 2014.
\footnote{24} Id. ¶ 14: Letter from House Committee on Ethics to Representative W. Edward Whitfield, June 11, 2014.
represent him before the Committee. This letter constitutes Representative Whitfield’s response to the OCE report and findings.

RULES AND STANDARDS AT ISSUE

OCE alleges that Representative Whitfield: (A) may have permitted Ms. Harriman-Whitfield to have lobbying contacts with him and his staff; and (B) may have granted special favors to Ms. Harriman-Whitfield and her employer. OCE further alleges that Representative Whitfield’s actions may have violated House Rules, the Code of Ethics for Government Service, the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, and the House Ethics Manual.

To adopt or recommend a sanction to the House of Representatives for a violation of any of the applicable ethical rules or standards, the Committee must find facts supporting that violation by clear and convincing evidence.

1. Lobbying Contacts

A. Relevant Rules and Standards

1. House Rule 25, clause 7: “A Member . . . shall prohibit all staff employed by that Member . . . (including staff in personal, committee, and leadership offices) from making any lobbying contact (as defined in section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995) with that individual’s spouse if that spouse is a lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 or is employed or retained by such a lobbyist for the purpose of influencing legislation.”


3. House Ethics Manual: “Special caution must be exercised when the spouse of a Member or staff person, or any other immediate family member, is a lobbyist. At a minimum, such an official should not permit the spouse to lobby either him- or herself or any of his or her subordinates. . . . Furthermore, a recently enacted provision of the House rules (House Rule 25, clause 7) requires that the Member prohibit his or her staff

26 Id. ¶ 11, 18-21, 70-71.
29 Id., Rule XXIII, Clause 2.
from having any lobbying contacts with that spouse if such individual is a registered lobbyist or is employed or retained by a registered lobbyist to influence legislation.\(^{60}\)

4. The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 ("LDA"): A lobbying contact is "any oral or written communication (including an electronic communication) to a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official that is made on behalf of a client with regard to . . . the formulation, modification, or adoption of Federal legislation (including legislative proposals). . . . [H]owever, "[t]he term ‘lobbying contact’ does not include a communication that is . . . a request for a meeting, a request for the status of an action, or any similar administrative request, if the request does not include an attempt to influence a covered . . . legislative branch official."\(^{61}\)

B. Analysis

The restriction in House Rule 25, clause 7—along with the cross-referenced definition of a "lobbying contact" in the LDA—is narrow and well-defined. It specifically prohibits a lobbyist spouse from attempting to influence a Member of Congress or his or her staff member with respect to the formulation, modification, or adoption of legislation. The clause does not forbid a lobbyist spouse from engaging in any communications whatsoever with the Member or his congressional staff. Indeed, the LDA exempts from the definition of "lobbying contacts" certain administrative communications, such as requests for meetings, that do not aim to influence a legislative official’s views. Read in context and as a whole, therefore, the LDA and House Rule 25, clause 7 are concerned with contacts that intend to alter or change a legislator’s position on legislation.

House Rule 23, clause 2 indicates that no Member should knowingly skirt the line of compliance by means of a hyper-technical interpretation of a Rule. The language serves as a reminder to adhere to both the letter and the spirit of the Rules. However, the Rules themselves still govern, and nothing in House Rule 23, clause 2 evinces an intent to expand the substantive prohibitions contained within those Rules. Instead, the Committee typically interprets House Rule 23, clause 2 simply to mean that "Members, officers, and employees may not do indirectly what they would be barred from doing directly."\(^{62}\)

\(^{60}\) House Ethics Manual at 245.


\(^{63}\) House Ethics Manual at 17.
II. Special Favors

A. Relevant Rules and Standards

1. Code of Ethics for Government Service, Section 5: “Any person in Government service should . . . [s]ever discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not. . . .”

2. House Ethics Manual: “The prohibition against doing any special favors for anyone in one’s official capacity is a fundamental standard of conduct, and it applies to an official’s conduct with regard to not only his or her spouse or other family members, but more broadly to any person.”

B. Analysis

Section 5 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service forbids the granting of special privileges and favors, but does not prohibit standard contacts with other federal officials or members or similarly-situated third parties. A Member and his staff are well within their rights to arrange meetings for constituents and other interested persons who wish to petition Congress or the government. In determining whether a Member has granted special favors or privileges, the House Committee on Ethics looks to see if the Member has unethically used his office or position to favor the interests of a specific third party.

The House Ethics Manual’s prohibition of special favors stands for the broad principle that a Member of Congress must use the power of his office to help every person—whether spouse, family member, or constituent—in the same manner. Thus, by definition, any action taken on behalf of an individual or organization cannot be a “special favor” if the Member takes the same or similar actions on behalf of other similarly-situated groups.

---

* See Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, Advisory Opinion No. 1 (Jan. 26, 1970) (“The Committee is of the opinion that a member of the House of Representatives, either on his own initiative or at the request of a petitioner, may properly . . . arrange for interviews; appointments; express judgments; . . . and perform any other service of a similar nature in this area.”)

* See Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, Advisory Opinion No. 1. (“A Member’s responsibility in this area is to all his constituents equally and should be pursued with diligence irrespective of political or other considerations.”).
DISCUSSION

1. Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s communications with Representative Whitfield and his staff were not lobbying contacts because she sought to advance his own longstanding interests and never attempted to change his positions on legislation.

A. Representative Whitfield’s commitment to animal welfare legislation long predates his wife’s employment by the Humane Society.

Representative Whitfield has been an unapologetic supporter of various animal welfare laws from his very first days as a Congressman. First elected in November 1994, Representative Whitfield has been either a sponsor or a co-sponsor of multiple animal welfare bills in each and every Congress of which he has been a Member.33 As detailed in a prior submission to OCE, in most Congresses, Representative Whitfield has sponsored more than half a dozen such bills.34 In his very first term in the House, he co-authored a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture concerning the regulation of “puppy mills.” He then sponsored the “Puppy Protection Act” several years later, as a Member of the 107th Congress.35 Other animal welfare legislation that Representative Whitfield has supported during his nearly two decades in Congress include bills designed to: end the use of steel-jaw leghold traps on animals; protect wild horses and prohibit the shipment and sale of horses to be slaughtered for human consumption; encourage the use of dogs by certain members of the Armed Forces and veterans; prohibit the importation of products made with dog and cat fur; make it a felony to bring a minor child to a dogfight or cockfight; and provide protections for a wide variety of other animals, including elephants, bears, and great apes.36

None of these bills stands to benefit Representative Whitfield financially in any way. And in many cases, the legislation carries little political up-side. The affected animals, after all, obviously cannot speak or vote, and the animal welfare groups that support the laws are often under-funded and even unpopular among Representative Whitfield’s party. Yet the Congressman supports such legislation as a matter of his own personal conscience. And crucially, he did so for six terms— or twelve years— prior to the beginning of his wife’s employment with the Humane Society in 2007.

33 See Appendix 1 (“App. 1. Whitfield Animal-Welfare Bills”) for a list of animal welfare bills that Representative Whitfield has personally sponsored or co-sponsored during his time in Congress. See also Letter from Stefan C. Passantino to Omar S. Ashnawy, Feb. 21, 2014, at 4-5 & nn.2-7 (collecting animal welfare legislation that Representative Whitfield has voted for or otherwise supported from the 104th through 113th Congresses).

34 Id. at 4.


36 See App. 1. Whitfield Animal-Welfare Bills (collecting such proposed legislation).
In a February 2014 letter to OCE, Representative Whitfield’s prior counsel chronicled the Congressman’s impressive record on animal welfare issues, including the bills that he supported before 2007. But OCE failed to mention these bills anywhere in its report. To focus solely on the Congressman’s record since 2007—as OCE has—is both incomplete and misleading. OCE’s narrow focus overlooks the fact that Representative Whitfield supports legislation like the PAST Act due to his own longstanding commitments and beliefs, not outside influences from his spouse or any other third party. Had OCE reviewed the record more thoroughly, the only appropriate conclusion to draw would be that the Congressman’s support of the PAST Act and other animal welfare legislation was independent of his wife’s employment.

8. Representative Whitfield only advocates for bills that align with his interests and serve his constituents, independent of his wife’s or the HSFL’s positions.

The percentage of Representative Whitfield’s legislative activity devoted to animal welfare legislation has remained consistent to a statistically significant degree throughout his time in Congress—both before and after his wife’s employment by the Humane Society. Appendix 2 to this letter depicts the number of animal welfare bills that Representative Whitfield has sponsored or co-sponsored as a percentage of his total legislative activity. The differences in means from 1995 to 2006—before Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield started at the Humane Society—and from 2007 to 2014—after she began working there—are negative 1.3% for sponsorships and positive 1.3% for co-sponsorships. This means that, on average, Representative Whitfield sponsored 1.3% fewer animal welfare bills after his wife began working for the Humane Society, but co-sponsored 1.3% more. In each case, the difference is not statistically significant. In other words, Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield’s employment by the Humane Society had no impact on the number of animal welfare bills to which Representative Whitfield affixed his name.

Indeed, Representative Whitfield’s biennial Humane Society “score” has actually gone down since his wife took a position with the organization. And despite being the chief sponsor of the PAST Act, the Congressman’s scores have sunk by more than twenty percentage points since Ms. Harriman-Whitfield became a registered lobbyist for HSFL. These low scores are attributable to Representative Whitfield’s failure to

---

44 Letter from Stefan C. Passantino to Omar S. Ashnawy, Feb. 21, 2014, at 4-5.
45 See App. 2 Representative Whitfield Legislative Activity. Statistical significance was measured by running a two-sample, two-tailed test with unequal variances. The Stata output demonstrates that the sponsor and co-sponsor t-scores were 0.76 and 0.15, respectively (rounded to two digits). Each of these values is well below 1.96, the widely accepted standard for statistical significance corresponding to a p-value of less than 0.05.
46 As is the case with many advocacy organizations, the Humane Society Legislative Fund publishes an annual “scorecard” that lists how often lawmakers vote for or against a slate of bills in which the organization is interested. The HSFL scores dating back to the 109th Congress are available at http://www.hsfl.org/our-work/humane-scorecard.html. The scorescards for the 104th through 108th Congresses are attached at Appendix 3 (“Append 3 HSFL Scorecards”).
47 A list of Representative Whitfield’s HSFL scores can be found at Appendix 3.
support certain animal-related bills that would be unpopular with constituents in his District. For example, in the HSLF scorecard for the 112th Congress (during which Ms. Harriman-Whitefield first began lobbying for HSLF), Representative Whitfield received a score of 54—the second-lowest numerical score he has ever received. That low score was due to his refusal to support caps on agricultural subsidies or to take anti-hunting positions in votes on the Sportsman’s Heritage Act.46

The simple facts that Representative Whitfield’s HSLF scores declined after his wife became a Humane Society lobbyist and that his legislative priorities remained independent of the HSLF’s positions should be sufficient to refute any allegations of improper lobbying. In fact, the Congressman’s legislative record reveals that he has consistently refused to support Humane Society legislation that is at odds with his or his constituents’ views. For example, the Humane Society supported federal legislation that would regulate cage size for egg-laying hens.47 Representative Whitfield and his staff, however, knew that the so-called “Egg Bill” was unpopular in his District and did not make economic sense for his constituents, many of whom make their living in the farming industry.48 As a result—and consistent with Ms. Harriman-Whitefield’s own advice—the Congressman has never signed on to the Humane Society-supported Egg Bill.49

Ms. Harriman-Whitefield also understands that the Congressman cannot support certain Humane Society policies because of conflicting priorities in his District, as such, she typically does not even speak to him about them.50 For example, she has not discussed the Humane Society’s objection to the use of antibiotics in cattle because of his constituents’ strongly stated opposition to the Humane Society’s position on that subject.51

By contrast, anti-soring legislation is a priority for Representative Whitfield and his staff for reasons unrelated to the Humane Society’s views: namely, the legislation aligns with the Congressman’s own long-held interests, and his constituents do not oppose it. A December 2012 poll demonstrated that a majority of Kentucky citizens—including a majority of Kentucky Republicans—support legislation that would increase penalties for

48 Exhibit 12 at 14-2940: 0156; see also Exhibit 7 at 14-2940: 0156.
50 Exhibit 3A at 14-2940: 0408.
51 Id. at 14-2940: 0408-09.
violations of the HPA. A small but vocal minority—largely comprised of individuals and organizations with a financial stake in horse soring—opposes the legislation. Yet Representative Whitfield has long made it a priority in his office as a matter of his own personal conscience. And he has taken the lead in advocating for the bill’s passage because he understands that the interests and knowledge available in his office render him well positioned to do so.

Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s work on the PAST Act was thus not designed to “lobby” Representative Whitfield to change or even develop his legislative positions in any way. Instead, it was in line with the Congressman’s own longstanding views as well as those of a significant majority of the constituents whom he serves.

C. Representative Whitfield has passionately supported anti-soring policies since at least 2004, and his staff worked in accordance with his beliefs, not those of Ms. Harriman-Whitfield.

Since at least 2004, Representative Whitfield and his staff have tried to combat the abusive practice of horse soring. The Congressman first urged the USDA Office of Inspector General to complete a report on horse soring. When the USDA finally published its blistering findings, Representative Whitfield—upon the recommendation of former Senator Tidings—co-authored a letter to Secretary Vilsack urging him to implement the report’s recommendations and conduct further rulemaking. These actions, the Congressman hoped, would address the HPA’s enforcement problems without the need for further legislation. Unfortunately, the USDA did not act. Representative Whitfield decided that additional legislation was needed, and his Chief of Staff personally drafted the PAST Act in early 2012.

Representative Whitfield’s positions on animal welfare generally and the PAST Act specifically were well known to his staff. The Congressman’s Chief of Staff, [Footnotes]


[5] Id. at 14-2940, 0138, 0145.

[6] Id. at 14-2940, 107-08.

[7] Id. at 14-2940, 107.


[9] Id. at 14-2940, 0116.


Cory Hicks, has described Representative Whitfield as “passionately believe[ing] in the humane treatment of animals.”42 In his interview with OCE, Mr. Hicks described support for animal welfare legislation as “a long-standing position in our office”43 and the PAST Act as “one of [Representative Whitfield’s] biggest priorities.”44 Mr. Hicks therefore understood that his work on the PAST Act was performed at the behest of and for the benefit of Representative Whitfield—not Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield or HSLF.

The Congressman’s scheduler—one of his most junior staff members—likewise understood that her extra work on the PAST Act stemmed from the Representative’s passion on the issue, not the Humane Society or its lobbyists.45

In fact, Representative Whitfield specifically hired one staff member who had demonstrated an extraordinary commitment to the PAST legislation. In autumn 2013, Marty Irby came to Washington, D.C. for more than a month to speak to lawmakers about the ongoing practice of horse sorning within the Tennessee Walking Horse community.46 Mr. Irby’s family had been “deeply entrenched” in the sorring culture, and his public opposition to the practice cost him his marriage, his business, and contact with much of his family, including his father.47 After demonstrating his devotion to the issue, Representative Whitfield hired Mr. Irby to fill a vacancy on his staff and to help steer the PAST Act through Congress.48

All of the work of the Congressman’s staff relating to the PAST Act—with the exception of some legislative drafting—occurred before Ms. Harriman-Whitfield started to actively lobby for HSLF.49 And in drafting the bill, Mr. Hicks consulted numerous organizations aside from the Humane Society—including the American Horse Council, the American Veterinary Medical Association, and the American Association of Equine Practitioners—to discuss the bill’s language.50 Ms. Harriman-Whitfield herself did

---

42 Id. at 14-2940, 0145.
43 Id.
44 Id. at 14-2940, 0138.
45 Tr. of Interview of Scheduler, Apr. 24, 2014 (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940, 0300, 0316).
46 Tr. of Interview of Congressional Aide, Apr. 24, 2014 (Exhibit 22 at 14-2940, 0211-16).
47 Id. at 14-2940, 0217-18; see also Christine Willie, This Man Refuses To Be Intimidated By Threats After Trolling On Horse Abuse, The Huffington Post (Nov. 10, 2013), http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/11/19/tennessee-walking-horse_s_4299886.html. The media covered the personal costs associated with Mr. Irby’s public support of the PAST act.
48 Exhibit 22 at 14-2940, 0220.
49 The effective date of Ms. Harriman-Whitfield lobbying registrant is January 1, 2011, but even OCE recognizes that she did not begin lobbying until October 2011, when she transferred to the Humane Society Legislative Fund payroll. See OCE Report 14-2940, p. h.n. 5.
50 Exhibit 7 at 14-2940, 0109.
not contribute to drafting the Act, and she had no influence on Representative Whitfield’s initial decision to support the legislation.71

Thus, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s communications with the Congressman’s staff regarding the PAST Act did not constitute improper “lobbying contacts.” As explained above, House Rule 25, clause 7 and the LDA prohibit communications which are intended to change the position of a lawmaker or Congressional staff member.72 But with regard to the PAST Act, each staff member was acting in accordance with Representative Whitfield’s long-held principles and advancing a policy that the Congressman had himself been promoting since at least 2004. One Whitfield aide had already lost his family and his profession as a result of his opposition to horse racing. To suggest—as OCE does—that Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s emails or other communications changed the position of this or any other staff member—let alone Representative Whitfield himself—with regard to anti-sorng legislation is entirely unfounded.

OCE’s contrary conclusion depends on a misreading of the relevant ethical rules. The OCE report concludes that Representative Whitfield’s wife may have improperly lobbied him because she communicated with him and his staff “about drafting bills, selecting potential bill co-sponsors, and scheduling meetings with congressional offices.”73 Yet with respect to the PAST Act, the OCE report fails to acknowledge the undisputed testimony that Ms. Harriman-Whitfield did not contribute to drafting the bill’s language.74 And the other two categories of conduct—identifying potential co-sponsors for an already-drafted bill and scheduling meetings to gather additional support for that bill—do not meet the definition of prohibited lobbying contacts. To the contrary, such communications are examples of the ordinary coalition-building process that is part and parcel of any effort to get legislation passed.

Because Ms. Harriman-Whitfield worked alongside Representative Whitfield and his staff to advance a bill that he already strongly supported, her communications cannot qualify as improper “lobbying” of the Congressman or his office.

D. Communications regarding other legislation were consistent with Representative Whitfield’s past positions, and the Congressman and his staff made decisions independent of the Humane Society and its lobbyists.

As indicated in the OCE report, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield also communicated with various staff members about animal welfare bills other than the PAST Act. However, the OCE report fails to cite (or even acknowledge) multiple sources—all contained within the record it compiled—that demonstrate that those were bills that Representative Whitfield had supported in previous Congresses.

71 Exhibit 38 at 14-2940 0355-56.
72 See supra at pp. 8-9.
73 OCE Report 14-2940, ¶¶101, 103.
74 Exhibit 38 at 14-2940 0355-56.
For example, the OCE report cites an email from Ms. Harriman-Whitfield to Mr. Hicks asking him to add the Congressman as a co-sponsor of the Puppy Mill Bill.57 But during his interview with OCE, Mr. Hicks explained that Representative Whitfield had been an original sponsor of that legislation in 2001, more than ten years prior to Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s email.58 Accordingly, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s communication was not a “lobbying contact” designed to alter his legislative position. The same is true for the Horse Slaughter Bill; the Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act; the Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act of 2013; and the Polar Bear Amendment.7

Moreover, in making political and legislative decisions, Representative Whitfield and his staff deliberated on his official positions independently of HSLF influence. For example, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield asked the staff to help implement the Congressman’s desire to sign onto the Animal Welfare Enforcement Funding Letter in 2012.59 The Congressman had signed the letter in the past, but the letter presented new challenges in an environment where Republican lawmakers were wary of advocating for any government spending.59 Representative Whitfield and Mr. Hicks decided—indpendently of the Humane Society’s views—that it was important for the Congressman to continue to support funding to enforce animal welfare laws.60 Once again, this decision was made in accordance with Representative Whitfield’s own legislative priorities, free from any undue influence by the Humane Society.

E. Other communications amounted to Ms. Harriman-Whitfield acting as a confidant and messenger assisting the Congressman in his work.

Ms. Harriman-Whitfield herself also sometimes provided trusted political advice and guidance to Representative Whitfield in her capacity as his spouse. This advice often included recommendations that ran contrary to the Humane Society’s interests. For example, as explained above, the Humane Society supports the “Egg Bill,” which would impose a federal standard regulating the size of cages for egg-laying hens.61 But Ms. Harriman-Whitfield advised Representative Whitfield against signing on to that legislation because she recognized that many of his key constituents—particularly farmers—were opposed to it.62 Incredibly, the OCE report cites this exchange as an example of a

57 OCE Report 14-2940, 5:38 (citing Exhibit 20 at 14-2940, 0205).
60 Exhibit 21 at 14-2940, 0207.
61 Exhibit 7 at 14-2940, 0143-44.
62 See id. at 14-2940, 0144-45; Exhibit 21 at 14-2940, 0207.
63 See supra note 49.
64 Exhibit 12 at 14-2940, 0181.
“lobbying contact” on behalf of the Humane Society. In reality, it is exactly the opposite. Ms. Harriman-Whitfield was looking out for Representative Whitfield and his constituents in a manner that was consistent with being the Congressman’s wife, not a lobbyist.

Similarly, the OCE report cites a series of emails between Ms. Harriman-Whitfield and Representative Whitfield’s Chief of Staff concerning a potential hearing in support of the PAST Act. But the report completely misses the fact that those emails reflect the Humane Society’s strong desire to “testify . . . at the upcoming hearing.” Yet Ms. Harriman-Whitfield communicated with Representative Whitfield’s staff about preventing such testimony because the unpopularity of the Humane Society with certain Members of Congress would “stop any chances of moving the bill further.”

These communications are a far cry from improper “lobbying contacts” on behalf of HSLF. Rather, they are routine communications by a Congressional spouse whose primary interest was in serving as a sounding-board for her husband and providing him with valuable political guidance—even if that guidance ran counter to her employer’s priorities. The Committee would create a dangerous precedent if it were to find that such common communications between a husband and wife involve improper “lobbying.”

Finally, in certain other instances, Representative Whitfield also utilized his wife as a messenger between him and his staff. The OCE report assumes—without any supporting evidence—that these were communications from Ms. Harriman-Whitfield in her professional capacity. But the record reveals that they were instead examples of a busy subcommittee Chairman—and someone who admittedly has difficulties keeping up with email—asking his wife to help manage his schedule. Significantly, this is how Representative Whitfield’s staff understood these communications: as notes from a spouse, not as directives from a lobbyist.

Indeed, the communications identified in the OCE report are only a small fraction of the messages that Ms. Harriman-Whitfield relayed on her husband’s behalf. OCE has cherry-picked the emails dealing with animal welfare legislation in an effort to make it appear as though Ms. Harriman-Whitfield lobbied for HSLF. But as the documents attached in Appendix 6 to this letter reflect, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield also frequently communicated with the Congressman’s staff about a wide range of topics having nothing to

---

51 OCE Report 14-2940, ¶ 37 & n.23.
52 Id. ¶ 37 & n.30.
53 Id. ¶ 37 & n.30.
54 Id. at 14-2940, 0202.
55 Id. at 14-2940, 0201.
56 Exhibit 38 at 14-2940, 0407.
57 Exhibit 38 at 14-2940, 0406-08.
58 See Exhibit 7 at 14-2940, 0119.
do with animals.\textsuperscript{101} For example, she helped keep track of the schedule for votes on legislation of all kinds, including bills in which the Humane Society had no interest.\textsuperscript{103} She was also involved in discussions concerning how to manage Representative Whitfield’s public image (including his social media presence),\textsuperscript{104} helped to maintain the Congressman’s positive personal relationships with his constituents and with other Members and their staffs,\textsuperscript{105} assisted in planning events for Representative Whitfield’s staff,\textsuperscript{106} and organized the Congressman’s calendar and his travel schedules.\textsuperscript{107}

In each of these instances, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield acted in her role as Representative Whitfield’s spouse, not as a lobbyist. And taken in context, these communications demonstrate that Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s goal was always to help her husband discharge his duties and serve his constituents, not to lobby him on behalf of the Humane Society.

\* \* \*

In sum, because none of the communications identified by OCE involved Ms. Harriman-Whitfield attempting to influence or change the Congressman’s positions on legislation, they did not constitute prohibited “lobbying contacts” under the House Rules.

II. Neither Representative Whitfield nor his staff performed any special favors for Ms. Harriman-Whitfield or the Humane Society.

A. All actions in furtherance of the PAST Act were taken because Representative Whitfield was the chief sponsor of the bill and did not relate to Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s position with the Humane Society.

The bulk of the allegations that Representative Whitfield and his staff performed “special favors” for the Humane Society involve the scheduling of meetings with Members of Congress regarding the PAST Act.\textsuperscript{108} But once again, these meetings were ordinary coalition-building efforts in connection with a bill that Representative Whitfield himself had already drafted and sponsored. And the record demonstrates that Representative Whitfield’s staff worked to push the bill forward because of the

\textsuperscript{101} See App. 6: Concise Harriman-Whitfield Emails. Note that Appendix 6 includes only a representative sample of the hundreds or thousands of emails and other communications that Ms. Harriman-Whitfield has exchanged with Representative Whitfield’s staff during his time in Congress.

\textsuperscript{103} \textit{Id.} at App. 6: 000001-05 (showing Ms. Harriman-Whitfield asking whether Representative Whitfield will support the Customs Trade Facilitation and Enforcement Act and tracking the schedule for votes on a variety of other non-animal welfare bills).

\textsuperscript{104} \textit{Id.} at App. 6: 000006-11.

\textsuperscript{105} \textit{Id.} at App. 6: 000012-15.

\textsuperscript{106} \textit{Id.} at App. 6: 000016-17 (discussing logistics for a Christmas party for the staff).

\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Id.} at App. 6: 000018-30.

Congressman’s own passion for the issue, not out of a desire to confer any special privileges on HSLF or its lobbyists. 87

The requests to set up meetings relating to the PAST Act frequently came straight from the Congressman himself. 88 Moreover, the staff viewed most of the meetings as being set up for two citizen advocates from Tennessee who had particular expertise on the subject of horse soring, not for the Humane Society or HSLF. 89 Indeed, Representative Whitfield’s scheduler also set up meetings for several other pro-PAST organizations, such as the American Horse Council and the American Veterinary Medical Association. 90 These other stakeholders were often more involved in the process than the Humane Society, 91 and in each instance, the staff also informed them of the advocacy meetings they had scheduled with other Members of Congress. 92

The involvement of these other stakeholders demonstrates that Representative Whitfield was not conferring any “special privileges” on the Humane Society. He and his staff were working with a broad coalition of interested groups to advocate for the passage of a bill that serves Tennessee Walking Horses generally, not any animal welfare group in particular. 93 In the course of their work to support the PAST Act, the Congressman and his staff treated the Humane Society just like all of the other animal welfare organizations that were helping to promote the PAST legislation. And because they were all working together to achieve “one of [the Congressman’s] biggest priorities,” 94 Representative Whitfield and his staff would have taken the exact same steps even if Ms. Harriman-Whitfield had not been employed by HSLF. 95

The OCE report also details instances where Ms. Harriman-Whitfield met jointly with Representative Whitfield and another Member of Congress. 96 But none of these other meetings amounted to the provision of a “special favor” for Ms. Harriman-Whitfield or her employer. In some instances, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield joined the meetings

87 See, e.g., Exhibit 30 at 14-2940:0130; Exhibit 7 at 14-2940:0138.
88 Exhibit 7 at 14-2940:0138-39.
89 Id. at 14-2940:0137-38. Tr. of Interview of Representative Whitfield’s Former Staffer (Exhibit 47 at 14-2940:0494-95).
90 Exhibit 7 at 14-2940:0109, 0136-37.
91 See id. at 14-2940:0113.
92 Id. at 14-2940:0138.
93 Indeed, Representative Whitfield and his staff were attempting to assemble as broad a coalition as possible. As of July 8, 2014, more than 200 horse organizations, veterinary and animal health organizations, law enforcement groups, and individuals had pledged their support for the PAST Act. A list of those endorsements is attached as Appendix 4 ("Appendix 4: Endorsements for the Prevent All Soring Tactics [PAST] Act").
94 Exhibit 7 at 14-2940:0138.
95 See OCE Report 14-2940, ¶¶ 82-94.
because she had a personal friendship with the Member involved. In most instances, she never disclosed her affiliation with the Humane Society or even spoke about the PAST Act, and the Members viewed her as attending only in her capacity as Representative Whitfield’s spouse. But even when she did speak about the issue, she did so as part of a joint coalition-building effort to support a bill that was already a top legislative priority for the Congressman. In each instance, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield was in the room either in her personal capacity as the Congressman’s wife or her professional capacity as one of the most knowledgeable advocates on the issue. Neither circumstance constitutes the granting of an unusual or “special” favor.

Finally, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s salary—which accrues to her independently of her husband and is not tied to the outcome of any particular piece of legislation—had no influence on Representative Whitfield’s or his staff’s decisions. The OCE report cites no evidence to the contrary and provides no reason to believe that passage of the PAST Act would result in any financial benefit for either the Congressman or his wife. Indeed, the chain of causation that would lead to any such benefit is highly speculative and attenuated at best. And most importantly, any allegation that Representative Whitfield granted “special favors” with his wife’s salary in mind is flatly contradicted by the facts that: (a) he supported animal welfare legislation and the PAST Act long before his wife’s employment by HSLF; (b) the Humane Society scored him lower once his wife became a lobbyist for HSLF; and (c) he and his staff took the same actions on behalf of numerous other animal welfare groups.

II. Representative Whitfield takes similar actions on other legislation and arranges similar meetings for advocacy groups in connection with other bills.

The Humane Society of course served as one of many supporters of the PAST Act, and Ms. Harriman-Whitfield was one of HSLF’s chief advocates. As such, the Congressman’s staff had to work hand-in-hand with her and her organization in an effort to shepherd the bill through Congress. But this is not indicative of any sort of “special favor.” Rather, it is an example of the typical coalition-building process by which legislation progresses through our system of government. As a representative of the House Administration Committee stated in a call to Mr. Hicks, if Representative Whitfield could not freely coordinate a legislative campaign—including setting up meetings for interested organizations—there would be no reason for him to be in Congress.

Indeed, Representative Whitfield frequently engages in similar coalition-building efforts with other advocacy groups, including setting up meetings for those groups in connection with non-animal welfare bills that he supports. For example, Representative Whitfield introduced a bill in the 113th Congress known as the Caring for Coal Miners Act.

89. See Exhibit 38 at 14-2940 0383.
90. Id. at 14-2940 0383-84. Tr. of Interview of Former Senator (Exhibits 56 at 14-2940 0326-29).
91. Exhibit 38 at 14-2940 0418.
92. Exhibits 7 at 14-2940 0125.
which ensures continued health care coverage for miners in danger of losing their benefits, as a result of the bankruptcy of Patriot Coal Company. In the course of their work to pass that bill, Representative Whitfield and his staff exchanged hundreds of emails with interested organizations, such as the United Mine Workers of America, the affected coal companies, and several lobbyists. The Congressmen’s staff coordinated numerous meetings on behalf of these groups, including meetings with other Members of Congress. The staff members also participated in strategy discussions regarding the bill and developed plans to convince others to support it.

In other words, the actions that Representative Whitfield and his staff took with regard to the PAST Act were typical of the efforts that they make in connection with any legislation the Congressmen sponsors. And although the volume of meetings and communications concerning the PAST Act was high, that simply reflects the fact that Representative Whitfield considers the PAST Act extremely important. In addition, the PAST Act requires extra effort and attention because as an animal welfare bill, it does not draw support from any well-financed industry group that could independently advocate for its passage. To the contrary, the bill has encountered strong opposition from those in the Tennessee Walking Horse industry who have a financial interest in horse cloning, such as the signatories to the PSHA letter. As a result, Representative Whitfield and his staff had to take the laboring oar in working to get the PAST Act passed. But as the record reveals, they did so because of the Act’s significance to Representative Whitfield’s constituents and his legislative agenda, not out of a desire to provide the Humane Society with any “special favors.”

C. Far from giving the Humane Society “special favors,” Representative Whitfield frequently refutes their requests and does not allow the organization to be the lead advocate for his animal welfare bills.

Moreover, even with respect to animal welfare legislation, Representative Whitfield often required the Humane Society to take a backseat in terms of access and attention to other groups that he thought would be better advocates for his bills. Mr. Irby—who took over as the lead staffer on the PAST Act in December 2013—estimated that of all of the advocates he spoke to about that bill, Ms. Harriman-Whitfield ranked eighth or ninth on the list of his most frequent contacts. He also indicated that at least half of the

---


11 See, e.g., App. 7, Caring for Coal Miners Act Coalition-Building Communications at App. 7 000021-39. As with Appendix 6, Appendix 7 includes only a representative sample of the relevant communications.

12 Id. at App. 7, 000034-75.

13 Id. at App. 7, 0000676-100.

14 See Exhibit 7 at 14-2940:0138.

15 Exhibit 22 at 14-2940:0241-44.
meetings that Representative Whitfield’s office set up in October and November 2013 regarding the PAST Act were for organizations other than the Humane Society or HSLF.116

In fact, on several occasions, Representative Whitfield and his staff refused requests made by Humane Society employees. For example, Michael Markarian, the Chief Program and Policy Officer at the Humane Society and President of HSLF, expressed a desire for someone from the Humane Society to testify at a hearing about the PAST Act.117 But instead of agreeing to the request, as he presumably would have if he were trying to do “special favors” for the group, the Congressman’s Chief of Staff took steps to prevent such testimony. He told another Member of Congress that the Humane Society’s involvement “will stop any chances of moving the bill further.” and encouraged Representative Whitfield to relay that same message in his own communications.118 Thus, far from giving the Humane Society any special access or privileges, the Congressman’s staff often kept the group at arms-length.

And that arrangement makes perfect sense in light of the political realities of the situation. After all, Representative Whitfield is a Republican lawmaker trying to persuade other Republicans to join an animal welfare bill. Many of those other Republicans are not supporters of the Humane Society, and having a Humane Society spokesperson or officer at the table is likely to do more harm than good for the Congressman’s agenda.119 As a result, there is absolutely no incentive for Representative Whitfield or his staff to confer any special privileges on the Humane Society above and beyond what any other similarly-situated group would receive.

III. Representative Whitfield’s staff and Ms. Harriman-Whitfield acted in accordance with advice from Congressional Ethics Counsel.

Finally, Representative Whitfield’s staff was cognizant of possible ethical concerns and took active measures to prevent ethics infractions. Mr. Hicks, the Congressman’s Chief of Staff, understood that Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s profession could pose a problem for the Congressman. Accordingly, he implemented an office-wide policy under which any potentially problematic communications from Ms. Harriman-Whitfield had to be run by Mr. Hicks, and then passed along to the Congressman for a final decision if necessary.120 This policy ensured that any professional communication from Ms. Harriman-Whitfield would receive an “extra layer of scrutiny.”121

116 Id.
117 Exhibit 19 at 14-2940 0201:02.
118 Id. at 14-2940 0201.
119 See Exhibit 8 at 14-2940 0093.
120 Exhibit 7 at 14-2940 0133.
121 Id. at 14-2940 0154.
If Mr. Hicks was ever unsure about a specific communication or request, he would call the House Ethics Committee to request legal advice. In fact, Mr. Hicks regularly consulted with the House Ethics and House Administration committees to ensure that the Congressman’s office was “walking as far away from the line as possible.”122 He recalled having one conversation with House Ethics Counsel specifically about the PAST Act,123 but he would also call about other potential issues regarding Ms. Harriman-Whitfield’s role as a lobbyist, including trips and events.124 As a result of advice he received during those calls, Mr. Hicks understood that Ms. Harriman-Whitfield was within her rights to meet with other Members and to advocate on behalf of bills, so long as she did not improperly lobby Representative Whitfield or his staff.125 The actions taken by Representative Whitfield and his staff were thus directly in line with legal advice from House Ethics Counsel.

Ms. Harriman-Whitfield was similarly cautious; as Representative Whitfield’s spouse, she is concerned, first and foremost, with protecting her husband. She understood that she was not to attempt to lobby or influence Representative Whitfield or his staff. And, just as the Congressman’s staff did, she consulted House Ethics Counsel whenever she had a question or concern. Ms. Harriman-Whitfield spoke with both Mr. Schweizer from the House Ethics Committee and Mr. Sensenbrenner from the Committee on House Administration.126 She spoke with them at length until she was confident that all of her practices complied with House Rules.127

In its report, OCE never disputes that Representative Whitfield’s staff and Ms. Harriman-Whitfield sought advice on how to comply with House Ethics Rules. They each consulted with the Committee’s counsel and then complied with the advice and recommendations they received. As such, Representative Whitfield, his staff, and Ms. Harriman-Whitfield should all be granted deference with regard to their actions taken pursuant to that advice.

Representative Whitfield and his staff remain committed to complying with the letter and spirit of all relevant ethical rules. If the Committee now views any of the previously approved conduct as transgressing those ethical boundaries, the Congressman will take immediate steps to comply with the Committee’s guidance and prevent any future violations. But because Representative Whitfield and his staff members acted in accordance with legal advice and their own good faith understanding of House rules, no ethical violation should be found at this time.

122 Id. at 14-2940 0124-25: 0129-30.
123 Id. at 14-2940 0131.
124 Id. at 14-2940 0131-32.
125 Id. at 14-2940 0129.
126 Exhibit 38 at 14-2940 0387-92.
127 See id.
CONCLUSION

The record compiled by OCE reflects no basis for finding an ethical violation by Representative Whitfield. Ms. Harrison-Whitfield’s communications with Representative Whitfield and his staff were in furtherance of a shared interest in animal welfare legislation generally and the PAST Act in particular. The Congressman has a longstanding history of supporting such legislation, and his staff acted in accordance with his policies and directives, not those of his spouse or her employer. The relevant communications were not designed to influence Representative Whitfield’s views in any way and thus were not prohibited “lobbying contacts.” Likewise, the Humane Society and HSLF received no “special favors” or privileges as a result of Ms. Harrison-Whitfield’s employment. To the contrary, the Congressman and his staff treated both of those groups just as they would any other similarly-situated organization engaged in similar coalition-building efforts.

It is unfortunate that those with a financial stake in continuing the horrific abuse of Tennessee Walking Horses have resorted to baseless ethical complaints like this one as a political tool. It is particularly unfortunate that they have sought to use the House Ethics Committee as part of a strategy to prevent passage of an Act that enjoys overwhelming bipartisan support in Congress. Representative Whitfield nonetheless stands ready to assist the Committee in any way as it completes its work on this matter. But because the record falls far short of establishing an ethical violation, the Congressman respectfully requests that this matter be dismissed.

Sincerely,

Beth A. Wilkinson
1. Representative Ed Whitfield, declare (certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury that the
response and factual assertions contained in the attached letter dated July 31, 2014,
relating to my response to the June 11, 2014, Committee on Ethics letter, are true and correct.

Signature: [Signature]

Name: Representative Ed Whitfield

Date: July 31, 2014
Appendix I. Whitfield Animal-Welfare Bills

104th Congress (1995-1996)
During the 104th Congress, Representative Whitfield co-sponsored the following bills:
and the Animal Drug Availability Act of 1996.”

105th Congress (1997-1998)
During the 105th Congress, Representative Whitfield sponsored H.R. 3689 – “Land
Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998” (among other things, the Act directs the
Secretary of Agriculture to create multiple areas in the designated land for wildlife
habitat conservation). He also co-sponsored H.R. 1176 – “To end the use of steel jaw
leghold traps on animals in the United States.”

106th Congress (1999-2000)
During the 106th Congress, Representative Whitfield co-sponsored: H.R. 453 – “Pet
(Title III allocates funds for wildlife conservation and restoration); H.R. 765 – “To
amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to cover birds of the order Ratitae [striches,
cranes, rails] that are raised for use as human food”; H.R. 1202 – “Captive Exotic Animal
Protection Act of 1999”; H.R. 1275 – “To amend the Animal Welfare Act to prohibit the
interstate movement of live birds for the purpose of having the birds participate in animal
fighting”; H.R. 1581 – “To end the use of steel-jawed leg hold traps on animals in the
Protection Act of 1999”; H.R. 2929 – “Captive Elephant Accident Prevention Act of
1999.”

107th Congress (2001-2002)
During the 107th Congress, Representative Whitfield sponsored H.R. 3058 – “Puppy
Protection Act.” He also co-sponsored: H.R. 325 – “Fishable Waters Act of 2001”
(estabishes grant program for states with approved fisheries habitat protection,
restoration, and enhancement programs); H.R. 397 – “Bear Protection Act of 2001”; H.R.
1155 – “To amend the Animal Welfare Act to strike the limitation that permits interstate
movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is
lawful”; H.R. 1187 – “To end the use of steel-jawed leghold traps on animals in the
– “Animal Drug User Fee Act of 2002” (allows the Secretary of Health and Human
Services to collect a fee to more quickly process animal drug approval applications).

During the 108th Congress, Representative Whitfield sponsored H.R. 3484 – “Puppy
Protection Act of 2003.” He also co-sponsored: H.R. 857 – “American Horse Slaughter
1131

“Don’t Feed the Bears Act of 2003” (requires the Secretary of Interior to better enforce the regulations that prohibit the feeding and baiting of wildlife in national parks); H.R. 1532 – “Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2003”; H.R. 1904 – “Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003” (among other things, directs the Secretary of Agriculture to enhance forest ecosystems to promote recovery of threatened and endangered species); H.Res. 507 – “Encouraging citizens to be mindful of the contribution of horses to the economy, history, and character of the United States and expressing the sense of Congress that a National Day of the Horse should be established.”

109th Congress (2005-2006)

During the 109th Congress, Representative Whitfield sponsored H.R. 6158 – “To amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to require, as a condition to the consent for off-track wagering, that horsemen’s groups and host racing commissions offer insurance coverage for professional jockeys and other horseracing personnel, and for other purposes” (among other things, the amendments prohibit a person from entering a horse in any race if such horse has been given anabolic steroids, and require the development of a drug testing regime). He also co-sponsored: H.R. 297 – “To restore the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros”; H.R. 503 – “To amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes”; H.R. 537 – “National Fisheries Mitigation Coordination Act” (directs the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers to pay the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service mitigation costs associated with carrying out the fishery mitigation plan for water development projects); H.R. 817 – “Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2005”; H.R. 2669 – “Pet Animal Welfare Statute of 2005” (requires dealers and pet stores to provide the Secretary of Agriculture with records relating to the purchase or acquisition of dogs and cats); H.R. 4151 – “Equine Equity Act of 2005” (allows owners to depreciate horses and get livestock assistance for feed); H.R. 5145 – “To authorize the National War Dogs Monument, Inc. to establish a national monument in honor of military working dog teams”; H.Amdt. 236 (amendments to agricultural appropriations bill to prohibit funding for inspection of horses to be slaughtered for horse meat).

110th Congress (2007-2008)

During the 110th Congress, Representative Whitfield co-sponsored: H.R. 137 – “Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007”; H.R. 249 – “To restore the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros”; H.R. 503 – “To amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes”; H.R. 891 – “Dog and Cat Fur Prohibition Enforcement Act”; H.R. 2175 – “To amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to require, as a condition to the consent for off-track wagering, that horsemen’s groups and host racing commissions offer insurance coverage for professional jockeys and other horseracing personnel, and for other purposes”; H.R. 3327 – “Federal Dog Protection Act”; H.R. 5534 – “Bear Protection Act of 2008”; H.R. 6278 –

111th Congress (2009-2010)


112th Congress (2011-2012)


113th Congress (2013-present)

### Appendix 2: Representative Whitfield's Legislative Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Co-Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104th (1995-1996)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105th (1997-1998)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106th (1999-2000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107th (2001-2002)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108th (2003-2004)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109th (2005-2006)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110th (2007-2008)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111th (2009-2010)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th (2011-2012)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th (2013-2014)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Sponsor</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference in Means: -1.3%


Note: Co-Sponsorship numbers include both bills and Congressional Resolutions.

### T-test for Sponsor (Stata Output)

```
ttest var2, by(var1) unequal
```

Two-sample t test with unequal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff | -0.08 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.13 | 0.13 |

t = 0.331 | 0.331 | 0.331 | 0.331 | 0.331 | 0.331 |

Ho: diff = 0 | 0.6150 | 0.6150 | 0.6150 | 0.6150 | 0.6150 |

Ha: diff < 0 | 0.6150 | 0.6150 | 0.6150 | 0.6150 | 0.6150 |

Ha: diff > 0 | 0.3850 | 0.3850 | 0.3850 | 0.3850 | 0.3850 |

Satterthwaite's degrees of freedom = 5.6013
**T-test for Co-sponsor (Stata Output)**

Two-sample t test with unequal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>95% Conf. Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.0370409</td>
<td>.0066874</td>
<td>.0093317</td>
<td>.0189018 - .0551799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0923485</td>
<td>.0061416</td>
<td>.0122933</td>
<td>.0330496 - .151658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.0422389</td>
<td>.0048026</td>
<td>.0151273</td>
<td>.0314996 - .0532262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| diff | -.0153076 | .0041986 | -.0227594 | .0061082 |

E.g. diff = 0  Satterthwaite's degrees of freedom = 7.99995

H0: diff < 0  H1: diff `> 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.0743  Pr(T > t) = 0.1526  Pr(T > t) = 0.8237

H0: diff = 0  H1: diff `> 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.0215  Pr(T > t) = 0.1526  Pr(T > t) = 0.8237

H0: diff > 0  H1: diff `< 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.9785  Pr(T > t) = 0.1526  Pr(T > t) = 0.8237
### Human Society Lobby Scores for Representative W. Edward Whitfield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>HSLF Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104th (1995-1996)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105th (1997-1998)</td>
<td>No numerical score assigned; Rep. Whitfield supported 2 of 5 HSUS bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106th (1999-2000)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107th (2001-2002)</td>
<td>No numerical score assigned; Rep. Whitfield supported 5 of 9 HSUS bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108th (2003-2004)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109th (2005-2006)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110th (2007-2008)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111th (2009-2010)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th (2011-2012)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th (Midterm)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Humane Scorecard
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The 106th Congress in Review

There is little doubt that the face of animal welfare has picked up over the past two years. The 106th U.S. Congress, which spanned January 1999 through December 2000, yielded 15 separate pro-animal legislative measures, more than ever before. Along with the numerorous victories for animals, there were some failures and plenty of unfinished business to concern our attention in the future.

The Victories
Companion Animals
- Dog and Cat Ban: Strong legislation to ban the import, transport, and interstate sale of dog and cat fur products in the United States was included in a trade package. Public Law (PL) 106-474, signed by President Clinton in November 2000, bans the sale of dog and cat fur products in the United States.
- Fur Takers: The 106th Congress also passed legislation to ban the sale of dog and cat fur products.

Aircraft Transport: In March 2000, Congress adopted some provisions of the Safe Air Travel for Animals Act (S.1511), a law concerning the Federal Aviation Administration. The modified provisions, originally introduced by Sen. Frank Lauseng (D-NJ) and Rep. Robert Menendez (D-NJ) and helped by Rep. Peter DeFazio (D-OR), require airlines to (1) produce monthly reports of all incidents breaching animal laws, injury, or death; (2) consumers can compare safety records; and (3) improve animal care training for baggage handlers. The airline industry blocked other provisions that would have required cargo holds to be scrutinized for climate control and ventilation and allow stronger penalties for the loss of animals than for ordinary baggage.

Military Dogs: PL 106-426, signed into law in November 2000, allows retired military dogs to be adopted rather than euthanized.

Cruelty Issues
- Crush Violence: Introduced in December 1999, PL 106-419 bans gratuitous and commercial gratuities from depictions of animal cruelty, including pornographic videos of women torturing and cruelly treating to death animals such as kittens, puppies, chickens, and other non-human animals. Rep. Richard Gephardt (D-MO) led the way, with key help from Sen. Joe Lieberman (D-CT) and Sen. Bob Smith (R-RI).

- Federal Law Enforcement: Solved into law in August 2000, PL 106-264 authorizes more and mandatory jail time of up to six years for wildlife poaching, smuggling, or killing a federal police dog or horse. Thanks go to Rep. Jerry Weller (R-IL) and Sen. John Floyd (R-GA).

Wildlife
- Great Apes: PL 106-426, signed into law in November 2000, authorizes $5 million annually to grant for local wildlife projects in Africa and Asia to protect critically endangered chimpanzees, bonobos, gorillas, and orangutans.

This scorecard is published by The Humane Society of the United States and The Fund for Animals. It was compiled by the American Humane Association, American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Animal Protection Institute, Friends of Animals, and Society for Animal Protection Legislation.

(For more information, visit www.humane.org)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1</td>
<td>Description 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2</td>
<td>Description 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 3</td>
<td>Description 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 4</td>
<td>Description 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 5</td>
<td>Description 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**House Issues**
The 106th Congress in Review

In the 106th Congress, the line between what once seemed like clear distinctions between Democrats and Republicans in Congress was blurred. In the past, the party of the president has often been the majority party, allowing it to control the agenda and pass legislation favorable to its policies. However, in the 106th Congress, this dynamic was reversed, with Republicans in the majority. This was due in part to the retirement of key Democratic leaders and the lack of a clear-cut opposition. As a result, the Congress was able to pass legislation that was more moderate and less ideologically driven. The 106th Congress also saw the rise of new leaders, such as Speaker of the House Dennis Hastert (R-IL), who were able to bring about significant legislation.

What You Can Do

Get your voice heard by contacting your elected representatives. Whether it's a member of Congress or a state legislator, they need to hear from you. They rely on their constituents to keep them informed and they are accountable to us. So make sure to let them know how you feel about an issue.

The Humane Society of the United States

Advocating for the protection of all animals

Support our work by making a donation today.

www.humanesociety.org
The Humane Scorecard

A Project of The Humane Society of the United States and The Fund for Animals

The 107th Congress: A Work in Progress

As we take stock of the 107th Congress to date, we see major achievements and serious setbacks for animal protection issues. The First Session of Congress yielded substantial progress by securing funding to carry out a wide range of federal animal protection programs. In the latter half of 2001, the House and Senate took up the massive farm bill dealing with U.S. agricultural policy. We were successful in getting a number of animal protection measures included in the House and Senate bills. But when the farm bill was completed in April 2002, it was a serious disappointment, delivering only one major victory, the measures that did not make into the farm bill at the last minute in the 107th Congress. We offer this scorecard as a snapshot of a work in progress and to identify issues worthy of additional action before adjournment in fall 2002.

Funding

Our biggest victories come during the annual appropriations process, when Congress takes up the spending bills that fund government operations. Here are some highlights from 2001 in the Fiscal year (FY) 2002 budget.

Animal Welfare Act Amendments: Congress approved a record increase of $5.15 million to better enforce the key law intended to ensure minimum humane standards of care for millions of animals at approximately 10,000 sites, including puppy mills, laboratories, zoos, circuses, and research.

New funding, provided in the Agriculture Appropriations Act, Public Law (PL) 107-76, allows the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to hire additional inspectors; strengthen follow-up investigations; and identify even unhealthen operations and other illegal activity. Broad bipartisan support helped with this victory: 28 senators led by Sens. Rick Santorum (R-PA) and John Kerry (D-MA) re-signed a letter calling for increased funding, while 115 representatives led by Reps. Christopher Smith (R-NJ) and Bob Goodlatte (R-VA) signed a parallel letter in the House. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Sen. Robert Byrd (D-WV) and Rep. Ralph Hall (D-TX) and key members including Sens. Ted Kennedy (D-MA) and Secretaries William Daley (D-IL), Henry Huntsville (R-AL) and Dan P Spero (D-TX) lent their powerful support to make this funding boost a reality.

Humane Slaughter Act Amendments: Sen. Robert Byrd (D-WV) secured $1 million in the FY 2001 Supplemental Appropriations Act, PL. 107-76, and additional unspecified resources in the Agriculture Appropriations Act, PL 107-76, to begin addressing the USDA's woeful disregard of this law, which requires that livestock be rendered unconscious before slaughter. While the Humane Slaughter Act has been law since 1958, in recent years a presetential lack of enforcement and increasing corporate pressure to speed up slaughterhouse assembly lines have resulted in animals being hung on hooks, skinned, dismembered, and dismembered while still conscious. In several instances, unannounced inspections on the Senate floor, Sens. Byrd highlighted these and other animal protection concerns.

Breeding Species Conservation Fund: Programs to protect endangered wildlife and habitats also get record funding. A total of $77 million was provided to assist local conservation efforts for threatened and endangered species, black bears, cougars, eagles, great apes, and many other imperiled birds, reptiles and amphibians. Seventeen senators led by Sens. James Jeffords (R-VT) and Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) and 26 representatives led by Reps. James Sensenig (R-OH) and Joe Baca (D-CA) lent their support to make this funding boost a reality.

The scorecard is published by THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES and THE FUND FOR ANIMALS. It has been prepared by THE AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION, AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS, AMERICAN ANIMAL WELFARE ASSOCIATION, AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF ANIMALS, AMERICAN WILDLIFE CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF REPTILES AND AMPHIBIANS, AMERICAN PETS ASSOCIATION, AMERICAN PET SUPPLY ASSOCIATION, AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS, AMERICAN WILDLIFE CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF ANIMALS, AND AMERICAN WILDLIFE CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION.

When this scorecard was printed, on 12 November 2001, the 107th Congress was still in session.

Note: This scorecard was updated on page 3
The 107th Congress: A Work in Progress

In 1991, the United States Congress passed the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities Act, which established the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). These organizations were tasked with promoting the arts and humanities in the United States through grants and other forms of support.

However, in recent years, funding for these organizations has faced significant cuts. In 2011, President Barack Obama proposed a budget that would cut the NEA budget by 15%. This prompted a significant backlash from advocates for the arts, who argued that the NEA was vital to preserving and promoting American culture.

The NEA and NEH have also faced criticism for their funding decisions. Some critics argue that the organizations favor certain types of art and prevent others from receiving funding. This has led to debates over who should be funded and how the organizations should be structured.

Despite these challenges, the NEA and NEH continue to play an important role in American culture. They provide funding for a wide range of projects, from individual artists to community-based arts programs.

A Note on the Scorecard

Many animal protection bills never receive a recorded vote in Congress. Some are referred to subcommittees and never emerge. Others are introduced by members of Congress who support animal rights but never make it to the floor for a vote. This is a problem because it prevents the public from knowing which lawmakers support animal welfare legislation.

To address this issue, the Animal Rights Scorecard was established. It rates lawmakers based on their voting record on animal welfare bills. The scorecard is updated regularly and provides a clear picture of who is supporting animal rights in Congress.

In conclusion, the NEA and NEH are vital organizations that support American culture. Despite challenges, they continue to play an important role in promoting the arts and humanities. The Animal Rights Scorecard provides a useful tool for tracking lawmakers who support animal welfare legislation.
The 107th Congress: A Work in Progress

Rep. Sherrod Brown (D-OH), to stop factory farms from using feeding practices that compromise animal health. Rep. Thomas Reynolds (R-NY) introduced a bill to restrict the sale of horsemeat for human consumption, although the market for U.S.-produced horsemeat is primarily foreign.

What You Can Do
On these and other issues, the powerful influence of industry voices can far exceed that of millions of Americans like you. We hope you will study this newsletter and use it as a tool to ensure that your legislators support your interests in Washington, D.C. Call your legislators and urge them to pass legislation that would protect pets. A uniform charitable trust system would protect pets.

Pet Pals: H.R. 1738, introduced by Rep. Earl Blumenauer (D-OR), to allow individuals to establish charitable remainder trusts for companion animals under a uniform national system.
The 108th Congress in Review

The 108th Congress made some significant progress on key issues, such as wildlife, farm animals, and animal welfare reform. However, a significant setback occurred when the House of Representatives rejected an amendment to ban the use of "stunner" cattle in livestock operations. This rejection, along with other legislative actions, highlights the ongoing challenges in addressing animal welfare issues.

Funding

During the 108th Congress, which ran from January 2003 to December 2004, Congress allocated significant funds to support animal welfare efforts. The appropriations bills for the Department of Agriculture included $3.5 million for FY 2003 and $5 million for FY 2004. These funds were intended to support programs aimed at improving animal welfare conditions and promoting ethical treatment.

The Good News

Humaneness / Methods of Slaughter /Art Enthusiasm

Thanks to the leadership of Rep. Barney Frank (D-MA), who has consistently championed the cause, Congress directed the USDA to spend $3.5 million in FY 2003 and $5 million in FY 2004 on animal welfare improvements. These funds supported programs to improve animal welfare conditions and promote ethical treatment methods.

This report was prepared by The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS). You can find out more about our work at humane.org.
The 108th Congress in Review

over the past six years in cumulative total of $32 million in new dollars to the program, amounting to an increase from a budget of about $10 million during the 108th to more than 100 inspectors today.

The USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) is the department's chief law enforcement agency to work with state and local law enforcement to crack down on illegal animal fighting, including dogfighting, cockfighting, and hog fighting. This funding was sought by the bipartisan group that supported FSA funding. In addition, Rep. Earl Blumenauer (D-OR) and Tom Tradition (D-CA) offered floor amendments during House consideration of the Agriculture Appropriations bill to secure these funds. In 2002, their amendment was approved by a vote of 222 to 178. Their amendment was opposed by a voice vote.

In reaction to the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) Public Health and Operations staffs of the FSIS Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), the agency has developed new regulations to address the problem of animal cruelty. The new regulations require that animal abuse be a crime to be prosecuted under federal law.


The USDA was encouraged to use some funding for medical treatment of livestock and other predators in the Great Lakes region.

For preventing livestock loss to wolves and other predators in the Great Lakes region.

Wolves Bureau: Sen. Tim Hagan (D-ID) secured a total of $390,000 over three years (FY 02-FY 04) for the USDA's Wildlife Service to conduct wolf research.

Access to Information about Inspected Facilities. The USDA's Office of Inspector General (OIG) has been investigating the USDA's inspection program and the handling of animal abuse reports.

The Bad News

Wild Harriers and Wolves: A surprise move to speed up the process of allowing wolves to prey on livestock.

USDA's Office of Inspector General: The USDA's Office of Inspector General (OIG) has been investigating the USDA's inspection program and the handling of animal abuse reports.

The Good News

Noonan's Hysteria (D-CA) introduced legislation in FY 04 and FY 05 to strengthen the USDA's enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act. The legislation was passed by a vote of 222 to 178. The amendment was opposed by a voice vote.

Factory farms aren't exempt from emulsions-reporting requirements—nor now.

The USDA's Office of Inspector General (OIG) has been investigating the USDA's inspection program and the handling of animal abuse reports.

The USDA's Office of Inspector General (OIG) has been investigating the USDA's inspection program and the handling of animal abuse reports.
The Migratory Bird Treaty, "Roeber" Act denues federal protections to 113 migratory bird species—including teens who may be killed (Insert arbitrary) whether they're causing damage or not.

Other Victories

New Feds. on Feds. Congress moved legislation in December 2003 banning scientific and hunting commerce in lions, tigers, leopards, cheetahs, jaguars, and cougars for the first time. The potential danger to the public — shown by a number of fatal shootings — and the inhumane treatment of many big cats has led to public pressure for swift and unanimous approval of PL 108-181. An estimated 8,000-10,000 big cats are privately owned in the United States — more than exist in the wild. They're often confined to small enclosures and are claimed to be inhumane by keepers. Displayed in roadside zoos, they often suffer injuries from fighting and poor living conditions. Injuries from fighting and poor living conditions.

The legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sens. Richard Burr (R-NC) and George Vitter (R-NC) introduced the legislation, which has been little debated or impossible to enforce, was introduced by Sens. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) and John Durbin (R-Ill.) and Sen...
The 108th Congress in Review

continued from page 3

Downer Ban—Hanging In the Balance

Downer Animals: The 108th Congress considered but failed to enact a ban on the use of human food of downer cattle—those too sick or injured to walk. Downer cattle are known to be at higher risk for BSE (bovine spongiform encephalopathy or "mad cow disease") and other transmissible diseases, such as E. coli infections and salmonellosis. They are also subject to some of the worst cruelty in industrial agriculture—when thickened, dragged with chains, prodded with electric shocks, or pushed with bulldozers in order to move them to slaughterhouses. Reps. Gary Ackerman (D-NY) and Steve LaTourette (R-OH) offered an amendment to the FY 04 Agriculture Appropriations bill—which fell three votes short of passage in July 2003—to prohibit the USDA from spending funds to certify beef from downers. Then the Senate approved a parallel amendment offered by Sen. Dennis Skakel (R-IL) in November 2003. But Republicans led by Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN) blockaded the provision during Senate conference negotiations on the FY 04 omnibus bill. Just a few weeks before the first U.S. case of BSE—a downed dairy cow whose skull had already been sent to markets—was announced by the USDA. When that case came to light in December 2003, the USDA promptly answered its administrative ban on the use of any downer cattle or beef products as a central component of the agency’s strategy to protect the public from BSE. Industry groups were virtually unanimous in initially praising the USDA ban. But several members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees soon began criticizing the ban, suggesting that it was overly burdensome on industry and that downer cattle should again be allowed in the food supply. They claimed that animals who are anesthetized due to injury, rather than illness, pose no threat to public health.

Public comments received by the USDA on its downer policy widely dispute this argument. More than 99 percent of the comments called on the USDA to strengthen and expand its downer ban to cover more animals, not just those suffering from fracture, paralysis, or broken bones (the USDA’s report analyzing the comments is available at http://fsis.fda.gov/ops/SfIS/PDP/ 2004_56_19_rept_031104a.pdf). Commenters representing families of BSE victims, and food safety groups such as McDonald’s and Wendy’s, stated that a system of differentiating healthier from sick downers would be reckless. They said that it’s difficult—not impossible—to accurately determine why an animal has become unconscious, because injury and illness are often intertwined. An animal may stumble and break a leg because he or she is weak or diseased. And downed animals dragged to slaughter suffer terribly regardless of the reason they’re unable to walk, especially when they’re hauled by their broken limbs. The current ban on all downer cattle has removed any financial incentive to haul such animals alive and suffering—

The USDA’s ban on the use of downer cattle for human consumption protects people and removes financial incentives for farmers to drug sick and injured cows to slaughterhouses—but industry lobbyists continue their efforts to weaken the ban.

Sea Turtles: In July 2004, Pl. 108-266 was signed into law, authorizing $45 million a year for international conservation projects to protect nesting sites and habitats for sea turtles and to help curb shark attacks on the illegal trade in turtle shells, meat, and eggs. Sea turtles are especially vulnerable to exploitation because of their late maturation and migratory patterns through many international waters. Six of the world’s seven sea turtle species are listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, and poachers pose a major threat, killing cauliflowers in butcher the animals as they come ashore or to steal their eggs. Rep. Wayne Gilchrest (R-MD) and Sen. James Jeffords (LTV) championed this legislation and moved it forward to enactment.

Congress appropriated $5 million a year for international conservation projects to protect sea turtle nesting sites and habitats.
A resolution officially condemning Canada’s commercial seal hunt—the largest marine mammal slaughter in the world—was introduced in the Senate.

and it encourages better animal husbandry and handling practices to keep cows from becoming stressed in the first place. Yet some industry lobbyists and legislators continue to push for USDA for exemptions. This line of argument came up again at Agriculture Committee hearings in early 2005, just after the discovery in Canada of two more RFD cows—both involving dairymen, one of whom had slipped on ice and injured his leg. Congress should quit challenging the USDA’s bans and make it a matter of permanent law—to protect the public and animals. Sen. Alaska and large, Alaska’s senators and Representatives plan to reintroduce their current legislation in the 109th Congress.

What Else Lies Ahead

Some Key Priorities

**Animal Fighting.** Sens. John Ensign (R-NV) and Arlen Specter (R-PA) introduced S. 382 and Sen. Mark Green (R-TN) and Reps. Bruce Bartlett (R-NC), introduced H.R. 817 to establish (step-three of the first tier) a federal ban on fighting pit bulls for the violations of the federal animal fighting law covering dogfighting, cockfighting, and hog-dog fights and to set a minimum and to reaffirm the feelings of animal advocacy groups. The Senate took up the first tier in September 2004, thanks to the efforts of Sens. Roy Blunt (R-MO), Lisa Murkowski (R-AK), and Sen. Jon Kyl (R-AZ), and the American Veterinary Medical Association, and more than 30 other states and local police and animal shelters organizations. In April 2005, the Senate unanimously approved S. 382.

**Humane Poultry Slain.** Since the 1980s, federal law has required that animals be stunned unconsciousness before slaughtering, but this most basic requirement doesn’t apply to 95 percent of all animals slaughtered for food—nine billion animals a year—because it doesn’t. The livestock industry is arguing to get legislation introduced to explicitly exclude chickens, turkeys, and other currently laid eggs under the Farm Bill Methods of Slaughter Act. Sens. Wayne Allard (R-CO) is taking the lead on this issue in the Senate.

**Puppy Mills.** Sens. Erik Sundeen (R-PA) and Richard Durbin (D-IL) introduced S. 1139 and Reps. Jim Costa (D-CA) and Sam Farr (D-CA) introduced H.R. 2699—the P.L. Animal Welfare Act (P.LA)—a bill that protects puppies and kittens from being sold by large breeder operations and sold into the Internet through newspaper ads.

**Humane Slaughter:** Sens. John Ensign (R-NV) and John Specter (D-PA) introduced a bill to introduce a humane slaughter legislation in the Senate to provide the livestock, processing, purchase, sale, or distribution of animals to be slaughtered for human consumption. Sens. Specter, Ensign, Bill Whitley (R-KY), and Nick Rahall (D-WV) also led a successful amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations Bill in June 2001 to ban USDA approval of inhumane or cruel means of killing animals for slaughter.

**Canned Bears:** Sen. Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ) introduced S. 304 and Rep. Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) and Christopher Shays (R-CT) introduced H.R. 1516, the Canned Bear Hunting Act, to prohibit interstate and foreign commerce of captive exotic animals in the U.S. and to “canned bear” operations for the entertainment of captives and canned Canadian bears. Sens. Carl Levin (D-MI) and Ben Nighthorse Campbell (R-CO) introduced S. Res. 33, a resolution urging the Canadian government to end its commercial seal hunt. The Canadian government in 2005 affirmed the slaughter of more than 300,000 seals, many of which are killed in just seven weeks of the seal hunt.

A Note on the Scorecard

Many animal protection issues never receive a recorded vote in Congress. Some are enacted by voice vote, and some languish because they promote legislation that would make it easier to save animals from suffering and death. For this reason, the scorecard is limited to a few select issues that have the potential to have a significant impact on animal welfare. The scores are given as a percentage of the total number of items counted five for the Senate, ten for the House. For example, a senator who voted against three of the ten scored items receives a score of 70, and a representative who voted against two of the ten scored items receives a score of 80. Members who voted for all sponsored pro-animal legislation received a “score of 100,” whereas those who voted against all sponsored pro-animal legislation received a score of 0. Members who voted for some sponsored pro-animal legislation received a “score of 90.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Meetings Held</th>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Budget Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>Steve Gallion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>John Walsh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>Mike Johanns</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>Dean Heller</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>Robert Menendez</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>Sherrod Brown</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>Jim Inhofe</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>Ron Wyden</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>John Cornyn</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>Thad Cochran</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>Mike Enzi</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SENATE**

- **A+** indicates a vote for an amendment to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee report on the budget resolution bill. The Senate agreed to the amendment by a vote of 51 to 49.

**SENATORS' LETTER**

A+ indicates that the member signed a letter to the President, with bipartisan support, urging passage of the Agriculture Appropriations Bill. The letter was signed by 47 senators, and 35 of those were A+ candidates. The letter was delivered to the President by hand, and the senators are all A+ candidates. The letter is available at [this link](http://www.senate.gov).
### House Scored Items

#### Animal Fighting Penalty

A V indicates cosponsorship of H.R. 1303 introduced by Rep. Jim Costa (D-CA) to ban cockfighting.

N.S. indicates cosponsorship of H.R. 1303 introduced by Rep. Jim Costa (D-CA) to ban cockfighting.

**HOUSE KEY TO CHARTY**

- SF: Sponsor
- V: Vote on floor in favor of bill
- N: Vote on floor in opposition to bill
- S: Speak on behalf of pro prior to legislation during floor debate
- X: Exempt from floor amendment
- A: Amends or otherwise brings bill to floor action
- D: Amends or otherwise brings bill to floor action

**House Scored Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The Speaker of the House generally doesn't vote
- Delegations from other countries are not included
- Bills are numbered sequentially from the date of introduction
- Sponsorship counts votes in favor of the bill
- Speaker's vote is unavailable
The 108th Congress in Review

While Congressmen Sean Jemmott (R-VA) and Van Buren (D-AR) and Reps. Scott and Bedingfield (D-NC) and Karl Hammerschmied (D-OR) played key roles in the 108th Congress during eliminations work on a multiple transportation package, seeking provisions to encourage state planners to consider using wildlife management, underpasses, and other wildlife-friendly designs in highway planning. These efforts will continue as Congress implements the transportation authorization bill for 2007.

Sierra Reps. Gary Ackerman (D-NY) and Mark Udall (D-CO) introduced H.R. 2567 and Sen. George Voinovich (R-OH) and Sen. Chris Dodd (D-CT) introduced S. 1190 to require release of a biennial report to the House Natural Resources Committee and other interested members on the activities of the Department of the Interior during the previous year’s fiscal year. This bill also mandates that the Secretary of the Interior issue a report to the House Natural Resources Committee and other interested members on the activities of the Department of the Interior during the previous year’s fiscal year.

What You Can Do

Seek the release of a biennial report to the House Natural Resources Committee and other interested members on the activities of the Department of the Interior during the previous year’s fiscal year.

Nonhuman primates don’t belong in the pet trade.

Primate and Other Animal Welfare Reform Johnson (D-VA) and Rob Newsom (R-NC) introduced H.R. 1521 - the Captive Primate Safety Act - to prohibit the sale, purchase, import, re-export, possession, or transportation of nonhuman primates from being shipped across state lines for the pet trade. These animals aren’t suitable pets. Yet, 100,000 are purchased online. The bill would be a great way to protect these animals from being mistreated in the pet trade.

Help shape a more humane Congress - tell legislators how you feel about their records.
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## Endorsements for the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act

**Horse Organizations**

1. American Competitive Trail Horse Association
2. American Horse Council
3. American Quarter Horse Association
4. American Morgan Horse Association
5. American Paint Horse Association
6. American Saddlebred Horse Association
7. Appaloosa Horse Club
8. Arizona Coalition for Equines
9. Carolina Walkers, Inc. (South Carolina)
10. Delaware Equine Council
11. Equine Voices Rescue & Sanctuary (Arizona)
12. European Tennessee Walking Horse Association
13. Feria Foundation for Frisian Horses
14. For The Tennessee Walking Horse
15. Friends of Sound Horses
16. Frisian Horse Association of North America
17. Gateway Walking Horse Association (Missouri)
18. Highland Equestrian Conservancy (Michigan)
19. Idaho Horse Council
20. International Frisian Show Horse Association
21. International Walking Horse Association
22. Maryland Horse Council
23. Michigan Horse Council
24. Minnesota Horse Council
25. Missouri Horse Association (Kentucky)
26. National Plantation Walking Horse Association
27. National Walking Horse Association
28. Natural Walking Horses (Europe)
29. New York State Horse Breeders Association
30. New York State Horse Council
31. New York State Plantation Walking Horse Club
32. Northern California Walking Horse Association
33. One Horse at a Time, Inc. (Kentucky)
34. Pennsylvania Equine Council
35. Pennsylvania Pleasure Walking Horse Association
36. Pinto Horse Association of America
37. Plantation Walking Horse Association of California
38. Plantation Walking Horses of Maryland
39. Professional Association of Therapeutic Horsemanship International
40. Professional Horsemens’ Association of America
41. Pure Pleasure Gaited Horse Association (Oklahoma)
42. Rio Verde Roquelettes (Arizona)
43. Rodos Mountain Horse Association (Kentucky)
44. Sound Trails and Rails Society (Georgia)
45. South Carolina Horse Council
46. South Dakota Quarter Horse Association
47. Southern Comfort Gaited Horse Club (Idaho)
48. Speck Up For Horses, Inc. (Kentucky)
49. Tennessee Walking Horse Exhibitors Association of Montana
50. Tennessee Walking Horse Association of New Jersey, Inc.
51. Tennessee Walking Horse Association of Oklahoma
52. Tennessee Walking Horse Exhibitors Association of Oregon
53. Tennessee Walking Horse Heritage Society
54. Texas Horse Council
55. United Pleasure Walking Horse Association (Missouri)
56. United Professional Horsemens’ Association
57. United States Equestrian Federation
58. Walking Horse Association of Michigan
59. World Walking Horse Association
60. Yankee Walkers/Gaited Horses of New England (Maine/New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island/Connecticut, and Vermont)

## Veterinary and Animal Health

1. American Veterinary Medical Association
2. American Association of Equine Practitioners
3. National Association of Federal Veterinarians
5. Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association
6. Veterinarians for Equine Welfare
7. Alabama Veterinary Medical Association
8. Alaska Veterinary Medical Association
9. Arizona Veterinary Medical Association
10. Arkansas Veterinary Medical Association
11. California Veterinary Medical Association
12. Colorado Veterinary Medical Association
13. Connecticut Veterinary Medical Association
14. Delaware Veterinary Medical Association
15. District of Columbia Veterinary Medical Association
16. Florida Association of Equine Practitioners
17. Florida Veterinary Medical Association
18. Georgia Veterinary Medical Association
19. Hawaii Veterinary Medical Association
20. Idaho Veterinary Medical Association
21. Illinois Veterinary Medical Association
22. Indiana Veterinary Medical Association
23. Iowa Veterinary Medical Association
24. Kansas Veterinary Medical Association
25. Kentucky Veterinary Medical Association
26. Louisiana Veterinary Medical Association
27. Maine Veterinary Medical Association
28. Maryland Veterinary Medical Association
29. Massachusetts Veterinary Medical Association
30. Michigan Veterinary Medical Association
31. Minnesota Veterinary Medical Association
32. Mississippi Veterinary Medical Association
33. Missouri Veterinary Medical Association
34. Montana Veterinary Medical Association
35. Nebraska Veterinary Medical Association
36. Nevada Veterinary Medical Association
37. New Hampshire Veterinary Medical Association
38. New Jersey Veterinary Medical Association
39. New Mexico Veterinary Medical Association
40. New York State Veterinary Medical Association
41. North Carolina Veterinary Medical Association
42. North Dakota Veterinary Medical Association
43. Ohio Veterinary Medical Association
44. Oklahoma Veterinary Medical Association
45. Oregon Veterinary Medical Association
46. Pennsylvania Veterinary Medical Association
47. Puerto Rico Veterinary Medical Association
48. Rhode Island Veterinary Medical Association
49. South Carolina Association of Veterinarians
50. South Dakota Veterinary Medical Association
51. Tennessee Veterinary Medical Association
52. Texas Veterinary Medical Association
Veterinary and Animal Health (continued)

53. Utah Veterinary Medical Association
54. Vermont Veterinary Medical Association
55. Virginia Veterinary Medical Association
56. Washington State Veterinary Medical Association
57. West Virginia Veterinary Medical Association
58. Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association
59. Wyoming Veterinary Medical Association
60. Donna Preston Moore, DVM, former head of USDA’s Horse Protection Program
61. Tracy A. Turner, DVM, MS
62. Michelle Abraham, Resident, New Bolton Center, University of Pennsylvania School of Veterinary Medicine
63. John C. Narron, DVM, ABVP(Ed)
64. Susan Ratts, DVM
65. Angela M. Dion, DVM

Animal Protection

1. American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
2. Animal Law Coalition
3. Animal Legal Defense Fund
4. Animal Protection Voters (New Mexico)
5. Animal Welfare Institute
6. Best Friends Animal Society
7. Dakin Humane Society (Massachusetts)
8. Equine Welfare Alliance
9. Horses for Horses Coalition
10. Horse Harbor Foundation (Washington State)
11. Horse Haven of Tennessee
12. Humane Society Legislative Fund
13. Humane Society of Utah
14. Michigan Horse Welfare Coalition
15. Missouri Alliance for Animal Legislation
16. Nevada Farm & Equine Center, Massachusetts SPICA
17. Oregon Horses Welfare Council
18. Richmond Friends of Animals (Virginia)
20. Second Chance Ranch (Washington State)
21. Tennessee Voters for Animal Protection
22. Texas Humane Legislation Network
23. The Humane Society of Missouri
24. The Humane Society of the United States
25. Virginia Alliance for Animal Shelters
26. Virginia Equine Welfare Society
27. Virginia Federation of Humane Societies
28. Virginia Beach Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals

Horse Industry Professionals

1. Bill Harlin, Past President, Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders and Exhibitors Association and owner of Harlin Stable Farm
2. Clay Harlin, former Senior Vice-President, Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders and Exhibitors Association
3. Marty May, Past President, Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders and Exhibitors Association
4. Chuck Callis, Past Executive Director, Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders and Exhibitors Association
5. Georgia Wroblewski, professional equestrian sponsored by Ancon International
6. Rick Wills, MT, Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders and Exhibitors Association director, former VP Pleasure Horse Division
7. Susan Kayne, host of “Unbridled” television show
8. Pat Parelli, founder of Parelli Natural Horsemanship
9. Tom Stey, Best of America by Honaback, trail riding TV show
10. Jan Ebeling, dressage trainer, member of the 2012 Olympic dressage team for the USA and co-founder of Rafaata
11. Dr. April Austin, USDFA Bronze, Silver and Gold medalist
12. Monty Roberts, award-winning trainer, best-selling author of The Man Who Listens to Horses
13. Carl Biddix, former member of Walking Horse Trainers’ Association
14. Pam Reband, MD, Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders and Exhibitors Association director, former Vice President
15. Eric Gray, walking horse farrier
16. Leslie Desmond, natural horsemanship clinician and author
17. Dr. Rebecca Gimenez, Technical Large Animal Emergency Rescue
18. Gael Bonquis, dressage and eventing coach
19. Karl Mikolik, former Chief Rider, Spanish Riding School, Austria and USDFA Hall of Fame
20. E. Allen King, Synonymous Horsemanship
21. Steffen Peters, American Olympian and FEI rider
22. Shannon Peters, dressage Instructor and FEI rider
24. Heather Barklow, Equine Connections, LLC
25. Diane Seg, Connected Riding Sealer Instructor
26. Anita Adams, dressage trainer and FEI rider
27. Mary Werning, dressage trainer and FEI Rider, USDFA Medalist
28. Maria Lisa Eastman, Rainbows Equine Assisted Services
29. Dr. Christine Teichburg, equine and human chiropractor
30. Gigi Nutter, USDFA Gold Medalist, dressage trainer, owner Touch-Mid Farms
31. Lisa Kelly Simmons, Past Director of the United States Upstate Federal
32. Gaye Fingerhut, MA, CMT, USDFA Regional Champion Rider
33. Michelle Andrews Sabal, equine therapy program director
34. Holly Mason, Equine Biomechanics Specialist, author of Rolling Home Top Life
35. Terri Hailey (author, the Phantom Stallion series)
Public Opinion in Key States with Largest Tennessee Walking Horse Industry

A poll conducted in December 2012 by Mason-Dixon Polling & Research found that 75% of Tennessee voters and 69% of Kentucky voters support federal legislation to strengthen the Horse Protection Act by ending the current, failed system of industry self-policing, banning the use of chains and stacks (devices implicated in the soring process) on horses at shows, and increasing penalties for violating the law.

Legislators

Sponsor of original Horse Protection Act of 1970: Former Senator Joseph Tydings
Current bipartisan opponents of the PAST Act: 57 Senators on S. 1406 / 297 Representatives on H.R. 1518 (354 total)

Celebrity Endorsements

1. Alyssa Milano, actress, Charmed, Project Runway All-Stars
2. Priscilla Presley, film and TV actress, Dallas, The Naked Gun
3. Emmylou Harris, singer-songwriter and 12-time Grammy winner
4. Keshia Chante, platinum recording singer-songwriter
5. Vagga Mortensen, actor, The Lord of the Rings
6. Wendie Malick, actress, Hot in Cleveland
7. Loretta Swit, stage and TV actress, MASH
8. Jillian Michaels, trainer on The Biggest Loser
9. Mark Miller, musician, Sawyer Brown
10. Lynn Anderson, singer-songwriter
11. Jenna Morasca, actress, model, grand prize winner of Survivor: The Amazon
12. Alexandra Paul, actress, Baywatch
13. Dawn Olivieri, film and TV actress, True Blood
14. Joe Camp, director of Benji films, author of Soul of a Horse
15. Kelly Carlson, actress, Nip/Tuck
16. Mary Ann Kennedy, singer-songwriter
17. Lucy J. Dalton, singer-songwriter

Celebrities signed the following statement:
I support the introduction of this legislation because it will make it harder for people to hurt horses for financial gain. Forty years after the original Horse Protection Act of 1970 was passed to outlaw the practice of soring, horses are still subjected to pain and suffering, merely to produce an exaggerated high-stepping gait for the show ring. It’s time to bring stronger protection to the horses we love and increase the penalties for soring so this abhorrent practice stops once and for all. I urge Congress to pass the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act.
FYI

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitefield [mailto:connie@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 5:41 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Kevin Brady

I will find out.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 15, 2013, at 5:40 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> That was a bill that was introduced last Congress. I don’t know much about it and to my knowledge it hasn’t been re introduced. Should he be prepared to talk about this bill tomorrow night?
> 
> >-----Original Message-----
> >From: Connie Harriman-Whitefield [mailto:connie@humanesociety.org]
> >Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 5:34 PM
> >To: Hicks, Cory
> >Subject: Fwd: Kevin Brady
> >
> >Do you think Ed will be supporting this bill?
> >
> >Sent from my iPhone
> >
> >Begin forwarded message:
> >
> >From: Neil Alpert
> >[mailto:nialpert@laserlocktech.com]
> >Date: April 15, 2013, 5:24:21 PM EDT
> >To: Connie Harriman-Whitefield
> >[mailto:connie@humanesociety.org]
> >Subject: Kevin Brady
> >
> >H.R. 6642 (Customs Trade Facilitation and Enforcement Act) was
> >introduced by Kevin Brady - R, TX - 8
> >
> >-N
> >
Connie, all we are doing today is the payroll bill, so no transportation bill.

From: Cantor, Eric
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 07:21 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: The Leader's Daily Schedule - 2/17/12

---

**FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17TH**

On Friday, the House will meet at 9:00 a.m. for legislative business. First and last votes expected: 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

*One Minute Speeches (5 per side)*

- Conference Report on H.R. 3000 - Temporary Payroll Tax Cut Continuation Act of 2011 (Conference Report Rules, One Hour of Debate) [Sponsored by Rep. Dave Camp / Ways and Means Committee / Energy and Commerce Committee / Financial Services Committee / Foreign Affairs Committee / Transportation and Infrastructure Committee / Agriculture Committee / Oversight and Government Reform Committee / House Administration Committee / Budget Committee / Natural Resources Committee / Rules Committee / Permanent Select Intelligence Committee]

*Special Order Speeches*

**COMMITTEE ACTIVITY OF THE DAY**

Natural Resources Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans, and Insular Affairs Oversight Hearing on "Fish and Wildlife Service's Proposed Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Its Potential Devastating Impact on the Economy of the Town of Chincoteague, Virginia"
(Friday, February 17th, at 9:30 a.m.)

[Printable PDF]

[Click Here to Subscribe to this list.]
[Click Here to view this email in your browser]
[Click Here to be removed from this list]
From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2012 9:46 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: The Leader's Daily Schedule - 8/2/12

Last votes between 5 and 7 tomorrow.

From: Cantor, Eric
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2012 9:16 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: The Leader's Daily Schedule - 8/2/12

THURSDAY, AUGUST 2ND

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9:00 a.m. for legislative business.
First votes expected: 11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. Last votes expected: 5:00 - 7:00 p.m.

One Minute Speeches (5 per side)

H.Rep. _____ In the matter of allegations relating to Representative Laura Richardson (Privileged Resolution. One Hour of Debate. Ethics Committee)

Legislation Considered Under Suspension of the Rules:

1) H.R. 2139 - Lion's Club International Century of Service Commemorative Act, as amended (Sponsor: Rep. Pete Roskam / Financial Services Committee)

2) H.R. 5806 - To amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to extend the third-country fabric program and to add South Sudan to the list of countries eligible for designation under that Act, to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States relating to the textile and apparel rules of origin for the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes (Sponsor: Rep. Dave Camp / Ways and Means Committee)

H.R. 5333 - Agricultural Disaster Assistance Act of 2012 (Closed Rule, One Hour of Debate) (Sponsor: Rep. Frank Lucas / Agriculture Committee)

H.R. 5350 - Pathway to Job Creation through a Steeper, Fairer Tax Code Act of 2012 (Structured Rule) (Sponsor: Rep. David Dreier / Rules Committee)

The rule provides for one hour of general debate, two hours of debate on the subject of reforming the tax code, and makes in order the following amendment:

1

App. 6_000004
Substitute (25 minutes of debate)

Postponed Vote on H.Con.Res. 127 - Expressing the sense of Congress regarding actions to preserve and advance the multi-stakeholder governance model under which the Internet has thrived (Suspension) (Sponsored by Rep. Mary Bono Mack / Energy and Commerce Committee)

Special Order Speeches

COMMITTEE ACTIVITY OF THE DAY

Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power Hearing on "The American Energy Initiative: A Focus on Growing Differences for Energy Development on Federal vs. Non-Federal Lands" (Thursday, August 18th, at 9:00 a.m.)

Printable PDF

Click Here to Subscribe to this list.

Click Here to view this email in your browser
Click Here to be removed from this list
Hicks, Cory

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Thursday, April 04, 2013 3:27 PM
To: Pack, Chris
Subject: FW: Ed & Facebook

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:connie.harriman-whitfield@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 04, 2013 2:51 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Fwd: Ed & Facebook

Please show to press secretary too!

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: John Koenig <jkoenig@crosfitcriticalmass.com>
Date: April 4, 2013, 2:43:47 PM EDT
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:connie.harriman-whitfield@humanesociety.org]
Subject: Printer

Connie,


Here is another Congressman's Facebook page that is set up a little better I think. I don't think he is doing paid marketing but it is a little more along the lines of what I would expect a Congressman to be doing on Facebook.

But the main reason I'm emailing you is that I wanted to know if you would like me to pick up a printer for you to replace the old one. I figure it would be easier for me to pic it out than for you to have to go get one.

Just let me know,
---
John Koenig
Owner, Head Coach
CrossFit Critical Mass
Hicks, Cory

From: Connie Harman-Whitfield @humanesociety.org
Sent: Monday, December 30, 2013 2:02 PM
To: Pack, Chris
Cc: Connie Harman-Whitfield; Blackberry; Ed; Ed: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: John Koenig’s Plan

Chris,

Thank you for airing your concerns. I know you have Ed’s best interests at heart.

Ed not I is the person handling this.

I will say that the goal is to substantially increase followers on both Facebook and Twitter. That said, it must be done in a tasteful, politically savvy way.

Happy New Year!

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

> On Dec 30, 2013, at 1:09 PM, "Pack, Chris" <Chris.Pack@mail.house.gov> wrote:
> > Connie,
> >
> > I hope you had a good Christmas.
> >
> > Respectfully, I am going to be honest here and provide my assessment of the situation with John Koenig and this whole social media issue.
> >
> > John obviously has ambition and wants to start a business, which is commendable. However, I do not agree with his strategy on doing so. First off, I am disappointed that John has chosen to bypass Cory and I and go directly to you and the Congressman without Cory or I being allowed to provide our rationale behind decisions. Our decisions have always been with the Congressman’s best interests in mind (neither of us profit off Mr. Whitfield’s campaign).
> >
> > For example, some of the content John has suggested to post on Facebook includes, but is not limited to a new story featuring a surveillance video of a store clerk putting a gun in someone’s mouth; a story about controversy surrounding a transgendered student attending a school dance; and a story that had racial undertones. It is my belief that stories like these are in poor taste, which is why we chose not to post many of the stories that John has suggested.
> >
> > Secondly, John told Cory and I in our final meeting that he would get our Facebook and Twitter followers to 10,000 each on a $10,000 budget. He has fallen far short of those goals. So far, with $5,000 spent, John has gathered roughly 3,200 Facebook followers, and 562 Twitter followers.
> >
> > John is also not distinguishing between campaign social media with the official social media to for the sake of his argument. For example, he said that Mr. Whitfield has the lowest numbers of followers in Kentucky. This is not true, as Rep. Guthrie has far less followers than us.
> >
> It is also worth noting that the official side was lacking before Cory took over as Chief of Staff and I took over as Press Secretary (I will forward you the e-mail I sent to the Congressman explaining this.) I would love to sit down with you and show you the difference since I've started.
>
> Regarding John's e-mail that states, "...in the event that you all decide you want to contract the operations of the Facebook/Twitter to me," I would welcome an opportunity to sit down to explain our strategy. However, if you choose to give full control to John, I would just caution you to be mindful of the controversial topics that he suggested we post in the past. Social media is a great tool when used properly, but it can be extremely damaging when not used properly. I think it belongs with people with experience in politics and campaigns.
>
> I hope my honest assessment here is not taken the wrong way, and I mean no disrespect whatsoever. I have the utmost respect for Mr. Whitfield, and as his press secretary and employee, it is always my main goal to protect him and his public image the best I can.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Chris
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitefield [mailto:connie @humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Sunday, December 29, 2013 9:29 PM
> To: Blackberry, Ed; Ed
> Cc: Pack, Chris
> Subject: John Koenig's Plan
>
> Please see below.
>
> Connie
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> From: John Koenig [mailto:crossfirecriticalnass.com]
> Date: December 28, 2013 at 9:31:05 PM EST
>
> I'm just going to keep running the ads for now. However my priorities moving forward will be:
>
> * Re-evaluating the strategy for building up Ed's social media - Kentucky vs US
> * Designing new ads to meet the new strategy
> * Working up ideas for in the event that you all decide you want to contract the operations of the Facebook/Twitter to me. Please just keep me in the loop for my own planning purposes.
>
> I sent that picture of Nigel off to Chris along with a draft message for it. I will let you know when I see it posted.
>
> I did some research on Mike Simpson per your suggestion. I would LOVE to work for this guy. It looks like he is about to get into a war over there and social media is going to be a major tool in winning that race. His campaign social media is rather dismal (much like Ed's was) and the challenger, Bryan Smith, is gaining on him on Facebook 700 vs 1300 and Twitter 100 vs 400. This is exactly the situation I was always worried about with Ed.
>
> Congressman Smith is going to need some help to stay out in front of his opponent, especially with Club for Growth backing him with who knows how much money.
Do you know him well? Do you think I could meet with him or his people?

This is what I found on Congressman Simpson and Bryan Smith:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mike_Simpson


http://simpson.house.gov/

http://www.facebook.com/pages/Mike-Simpson/96007744406

https://twitter.com/ConspMikeSimpson

Campaign

http://www.simpsonforcongress.com/

https://www.facebook.com/pages/Mike-Simpson-For-US-Congress/114477275237474

https://twitter.com/mikesimpson4id

Bryan Smith (Opponent)

https://bryansmithforcongress.com/

https://www.facebook.com/bryansmithforcongress

https://twitter.com/BryanSmithId2

Well, thanks again. Please let me know if you find out anything or have any ideas to help.

--
John Koenig
Owner, Head Coach
CrossFit Critical Mass
Will do.

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto: [redacted]@humansociety.org]
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2013 1:11 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: From POLITICO - RNC: Voters see GOP as 'scary' and 'out of touch'

Yes!

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 18, 2013, at 12:45 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> > A copy of this article?
> >
> > --- Original Message ----- 
> > From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:[redacted]@humansociety.org]
> > Sent: Monday, March 18, 2013 12:10 PM
> > To: Hicks, Cory
> > Subject: From POLITICO - RNC: Voters see GOP as 'scary' and 'out of touch'
> >
> > I would like Ed to give a copy of this to Fred Upton. I was talking to Fred about this last night.
> >
> > Thanks,
> > Connie
> >
> > Someone using POLITICO for iPhone wants to share this article with you:
> >
> >
> >
> > By MAGGIE HABERMANN | 03/18/2013 07:00 AM EDT
> >
> > The Republican National Committee concedes in a sprawling report
> > Monday that the GOP is seen as the party of "stuffy old men" and needs
> > to change its ways. Among the RNC's proposed fixes: enacting
> > comprehensive immigration reform, addressing middle-class e...
> >
> > READ ON POLITICO.COM<http://politico.co/YBQaA7>
Download the POLITICO app for your iPhone, iPad, or Android device: http://www.politico.com/mobile-products/

Follow POLITICO on Twitter: @POLITICO https://twitter.com/@politico

Disclaimer: Please note that POLITICO is not responsible for the content within this email. POLITICO cannot verify the sender of this email.

Sent from my iPhone
Hicks, Cory

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Monday, September 17, 2012 10:19 AM
To: ed@humanesociety.org
Subject: Re: EC

Absolutely, he’s been an very good intern. I’ll prepare a letter. We’ll also get Ed to take a picture and get it signed.

----- Original Message -----
From: Connie Hartman-Whefield [mailto:conni@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Monday, September 17, 2012 10:17 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: EC

EC’s last day in the office is the 19th. He has had a fabulous time. His aunt wonders if we can prepare a short letter under Ed’s signature verifying he interned in Ed’s office. This is for EC’s future employment.

Thanks,
Connie

Sent from my iPhone
From: Hicks, Cory  
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2013 1:43 PM  
To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield'  
Subject: RE: Vitter staff updates

Thanks

----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:...@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2013 12:59 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Fwd: Vitter staff updates

Sent from my iPhone

From: Ruckert, Kyle (Vitter) [mailto:Kyle_Ruckert@vitter.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2013 10:52 AM
To: Ruckert, Kyle (Vitter)
Subject: Vitter staff updates

As the new Congress gets underway, I wanted to make sure you had a few staff updates from Senator Vitter's office.

As you know, Senator Vitter is now the ranking member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. As such, Zak Baig, Senator Vitter's Legislative Director, will be the EPW Staff Director. Travis Johnson, Vitter’s Banking Committee Legislative Assistant has taken over as Legislative Director and will continue to handle Senator Vitter’s work on the Senate Banking Committee. Bryan Zumwalt, who many of you worked with on Energy and Environmental Issues will be the Chief Counsel on the EPW Committee. Charles Brittingham has moved over to EPW to handle Corps of Engineers, and Kathryn Fulton, the Senator’s scheduler, has joined EPW as the Director of Operations. Senator Vitter’s new Washington Scheduler is Stephanie Bell, and any Louisiana related scheduling requests are handled by Admin Director Julie Dyer. All of their contact info is listed below.

Zak Baig@epw.senate.gov | 202-224-6176
Travis_Johnson@vitter.senate.gov | 202-224-4623
Bryan_Zumwalt@epw.senate.gov | 202-224-6176
Charles_Brittingham@epw.senate.gov | 202-224-6176
Stephanie_Bell@vitter.senate.gov | 202-224-4623
Kathryn_Fulton@epw.senate.gov | 202-224-6176
Julie_Dyer@vitter.senate.gov | 202-224-4623

Please let us know if Senator Vitter can be of assistance or if you have any questions. Look forward to continuing to work with you in 2013. Thanks, Kyle

App. 6_000013
From: Rell, Brian
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 7:05 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Quick Heads Up...

Brian Rell
Chief of Staff
Congressman Robert Aderholt (AL-4)
202-225-...
e-mail: BR@mail.house.gov

From: Higdon, Michael
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 05:13 PM
Subject: Quick Heads Up...

Kentucky delegation, Appropriations family, and assorted friends,

I wanted to inform you before it’s posted on my Facebook fan page that my service to Chairman Hal Rogers will conclude in mid-December. Can’t say enough good things about my 11-year work experience with the senior statesman from Kentucky, adequately applaud his fantastic DC and District teams, or fully express admiration and appreciation to the Appropriations Committee staff, Kentucky delegation, and many others including you. I hope to get to many of you individually over the next few weeks to express my supreme gratitude.

With a baby girl very much on the way, this winter is simply the right time for me to take on new challenges and start saving for that wedding.

Much more on me later, in the interim, I’m committed to continuing the good fight for southern and eastern Kentuckians and helping the Chairman find a quality Chief replacement in the next few months. Should you have any high quality and caliber candidates, please quietly and discretely direct them my way.

Sincerely,

Michael R Higdon
202-225-...
Hicks, Cory

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2012 6:33 PM
To: [redacted]@humanesociety.org
Subject: Re: Xmas Party Options

Emma and I like the idea of lunch, but we're going to check with people tomorrow. We're expecting votes that day, but hopefully they won't go beyond lunch. Hopefully we won't have votes at all, but who knows!

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Connie Hartman-Whitfield [mailto: [redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2012 06:09 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Xmas Party Options

1. Lunch on Fri Dec 14 in room we usually use.

2. Dinner on Mon Dec 10 in private room off main dining room on ground floor.

Please advise!

Connie

Sent from my iPhone
Hicks, Cory

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Saturday, December 08, 2012 4:39 PM
To: @humanesociety.org
Subject: Re: Christmas dinner

We told everyone to dress nice, but should I make sure guys have ties and coats if that's required?

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:H@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Saturday, December 08, 2012 03:19 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Christmas dinner

Yes!

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 8, 2012, at 2:15 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Connie, Ed called me about Allison (the new energy staffer) joining us for dinner on Monday. Based on my count that will put us at 13 people. Since the room holds 14, that should be okay, right? Thanks and I hope you are enjoying NYC.
> 
> Cory
Subject: Re: Ed forgot his packet

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:humanesociety.org]
To: Hicks, Cory

Hi, thanks.

---- Original Message ----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:humanesociety.org]
To: Hicks, Cory

Ed has his talking points and also has his i-Pad.

Thanks,
Cory

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 22, 2013, at 3:04 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Emma is sending. I'll try to get the talking points for tomorrow to him. Did he bring his ipad so that I can send the talkers there?
> >
> > Sent from my iPad
> >
> >> On Sep 22, 2013, at 2:42 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" humanesociety.org> wrote:
> >>
> >> So he has none of the info he needs including the name if the restaurant for tonight. Can you please email.
> >>
> >> Thanks,
> >> Connie
> >>
> >> Sent from my iPhone
Heydlauff, Emma

From: Corrine Harriman-Whitfield [redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2014 10:43 AM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: Calendar for Next Week

In the future, would you please enter
"No votes" so that it is clear.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jan 13, 2014, at 10:14 AM, "Heydlauff, Emma" <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov> wrote:
> 
> There are no votes Friday this week.
> 
> ------Original Message------
> From: Corrine Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:Corrine.Harriman@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Monday, January 13, 2014 10:12 AM
> To: Heydlauff, Emma
> Subject: Re: Calendar for Next Week
> 
> His calendar does not indicate whether there are votes on Friday.
> 
> Sent from my iPhone
> 
> On Jan 13, 2014, at 4:16 PM, "Heydlauff, Emma"
> <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov> wrote:
> 
> Mrs. Whitfield,
> 
> Attached is the Congressman’s calendar for next week. The Southern Members dinner is Wednesday evening at
> 630pm at RT’s Restaurant. As soon as I receive the guest list I will send it over to you. Thursday evening you have
> dinner plans with the Kesler’s. Votes are from Monday-Thursday next week. Please let me know if you have
> questions.
> 
> Thanks,
> Emma
> 
> Emma Heydlauff
> Scheduler
> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
> 2194 Rayburn House Office Building
> Washington, DC 20515
> Phone: (202) 225-3115
> Fax: (202) 225-3547
> Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
> <image001.png><http://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield>
> <image002.png><http://twitter.com/repedwhitfield>
> <image003.png><http://www.flickr.com/photos/whitfield KY01><image004.png><http://www.youtube.com/Whitfi}


>
Hicks, Cory

From: Heydlauff, Emma
Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2014 12:59 PM
To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield'
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Flight Info

I apologize for the incorrect time in the travel packet. The plane leaves at 1:59pm as it says in the calendar entry. US Airways changed the time of the flight after I had already booked it but I have checked the reservation online and confirmed it leaves at 1:59pm tomorrow.

Thanks,
Emma

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto: connie@huminasociety.org]
Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2014 12:55 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Flight Info

Emma,

It is unclear when we are supposed to be at the airport tomorrow. Our packet reads 2:26 pm but our calendar reads a different time. We don't want to miss our plane so we need to know which is the correct time.

Thank you,
Connie

Sent from my iPhone
Hicks, Cory

From: Heydlauff, Emma
Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2014 2:13 PM
To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield'
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Driver Pick-Up

The driver will be picking you up at 3:49pm when your flight arrives. I will be sending you the driver information shortly.

Thanks,
Emma

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield (mailto:connie@humanesociety.org)
Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2014 2:11 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Driver Pick-Up

Do you need to tell the driver in Louisville the revised time of our arrival at the airport?

Sent from my iPhone
Hicks, Cory

From: Heydlauff, Emma
Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2014 2:52 PM
To: ‘Connie Harriman-Whitfield’
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Driver for Tomorrow

I’m happy to start putting together a check list. I will work on it this week.

Thanks,
Emma

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto: connie.whitfield@humane.org]
Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2014 2:29 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Driver for Tomorrow

Emma,

Let’s you and I work on a “checklist” for organizing future travel arrangements. Would you like to take a stab at a first draft?

Look forward to working with you on this.

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 4, 2014, at 2:21 PM, “Heydlauff, Emma” <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Congressman and Mrs. Whitfield,

I just received the driver information for tomorrow. They do not assign the driver until 24 hours before so I did not have it before I sent the travel packet. Below is the name and number for the driver that will be picking you up from the airport tomorrow. He will be waiting in baggage claim after your flight arrives at 3:45pm with your name on a sign.

Driver: Larry Dell
Cell: 502-551-[redacted]

Thanks,
Emma

Emma Heydlauff
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Can you incorporate in the original list and then let's discuss again?

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:...@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2014 3:59 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Travel Packet

Emma--

Below are some random initial thoughts. Please incorporate in your Travel Checklist. I may send a few more.

~On the 1st of every month, send us an update of our outstanding flight credits

~Avoid connecting flights w/ long lay-overs

~Check flight times in packet w/ flight times listed in Ed’s calendar

~Confirm all flight times 24 hrs before scheduled departure and send us revised info if necessary

~ASAP Info- 1Agendas, 2Attendees, 3Attire, 4Weather. Don’t hold distributing this info until travel packet is complete. Request it early and send it to me as soon as you receive it.

~OK to email details on driver after sending us travel packet

~If we need to use a cab, get name & tell # of cab co

~Include Tel # of all restaurants and hotels

~Include cell phone # of all hosts and special guests.

~If you learn that a guest or special guest cancels, please inform us as soon as possible.

Thanks SO much,

Connie

Sent from my iPhone
Hicks, Cory

From: Pope, Michael
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 2:43 PM
To: Everett, Janece; Blackberry, Ed; Heydlauff, Emma; Pack, Chris; Hicks, Cory
Cc: Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield P. 270-765-6247; michael.pape@mail.house.gov

Subject: Re: Weekend Schedule

Note to all: dates should be Friday, Oct. 25th and Saturday, Oct. 26th. Time for new glasses.

Michael Pope, District Director
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield
P: 270-765-6247
E: michael.pape@mail.house.gov

---

From: Everett, Janece
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 2:36 PM
To: Pope, Michael; Heydlauff, Emma; Pack, Chris; Hicks, Cory
Cc: Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield P. 270-765-6247; michael.pape@mail.house.gov

Subject: Re: Weekend Schedule

Friday is the 25th.

Sent using Blackberry

---

From: Pope, Michael
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 2:24 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma; Pack, Chris; Hicks, Cory; Everett, Janece
Cc: Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield P. 270-765-6247; michael.pape@mail.house.gov

Subject: Weekend Schedule

Ed, here is what we have so far for this weekend. I will see you early tomorrow morning at the hotel. Janece is out of town today but will be back tomorrow. Our friend and Sheriff’s Dept. Detective J.T. Coleman will be at the airport tonight when you arrive. You will be picking up a rental car at the Paducah Airport, but J.T. will escort you from there to the hotel. He will also be with us on and off over the weekend for security. Have a good trip and I will see you at 8:00am in the hotel lobby tomorrow morning.

Friday, October 24, 2013

10:00am-10:45am: MARION: Visit the Crittenden County Emergency Operations Center. Director is David Travis. Your efforts helped to fund this building and County Judge Perry Newcomb has been wanting you to stop by and see it and meet with the Emergency Responders. We will tour the building and the County is calling WPIS TV and other news outlets to cover. Location: 275 Industrial Drive. 270-965-6107.

11:00am-11:30am: Visit the Crittenden County Food Bank and help distribute food. Location: 402 North Walker Street, Marion. Fred and Minnie Lou Brown are in charge of the Food Bank. 270-965-6107.

Noon-1:00pm: MARION: Lunch with supporters at: the Italia Grill, Main Street across from courthouse.

---
2:00pm-4:00pm: PADUCAH: Attend Pep Rally and tour new McCracken County High School. McCracken County will play Henderson County on Friday evening and you will do the coin toss for the game. Michael Ceginski is the Principal and Jeff Parker is the School Board President. Supt. Dr. Nancy Walker will also be there to speak with you about the Coast Guard program they want to establish on campus. Supposedly, they have now found a private way to fund the training program but still need Coast Guard approval. Location: Hwy 60 West, 270-535

4:30pm-6:00pm: PADUCAH: Dinner with supporters in private room at Olive Garden. Barbara Randall, Misty Drew, Charlie Martin, Ken Wheeler, Tony and Faridah Reck, Wally and Gerry Montgomery and others to attend. Others invited like Steve Little, Ripp and Beverly Pugh, Rick and Cheryl Grana etc. are either out of town or already committed.

6:30pm-8:30pm: PADUCAH: Be introduced and do the coin toss for the McCracken County v. Henderson County football game at McCracken County stadium, Hwy. 60 West.

9:00pm: OVERNIGHT PADUCAH at Hampton Inn and Suites

Saturday, October 25, 2013

8:00am: Depart hotel for Fulton

9:00am-10:00am: FULTON: Breakfast with supporters and friends at local McDonald’s, 104 Nolan Avenue. Guest to include: Beth and Ed McWhirt, Karl Ivey, County Judge David Gallagher, Eddie Crittenden, Curtis Hancock, Seth Hancock and others.

11:00am-Noon: WICKLIFFE: Participate in Turkey Shoot at the Veterans and Patriots Museum (This is a paper turkey target shoot...not live birds!) Proceeds to help fund the museum. Sandy Wright is the contact. Location: 35 Phillips Drive, 270-335

Noon-1:00pm: WICKLIFFE: Lunch with Wickliffe Mayor Lyn Hopkins, Judge Exec. Vicki Vinesed, and others. Mayor Hopkins will decide on a local restaurant and let the others know including the local media.

1:00pm-2:30pm: WICKLIFFE: Visit projects of importance to the City and County. Boat Ramp, Asian Carp processing facility, etc.

OPTIONAL EVENING EVENTS: Please let me know if you are interested in adding either.

6:00pm-8:00pm: HARTFORD: GOP Chili Supper

6:00pm-8:00pm: HOPKINSVILLE: Ducks Unlimited Banquet
Heydlauff, Emma

From: Corrie Harman-Whitfield
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 1:53 AM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Rec. Invitations
Attachments: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png; image005.png

Great idea, Emma. Send them over whenever you want.

Best,
Corrie

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 4, 2012, at 2:27 PM, "Heydlauff, Emma"
<Emma_Heydlauff@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Congressman and Mrs. Whitfield,

I have an assortment of invitations for the fall, starting with some next week, that I wanted to courier over to your house today for your review. They consist of galas, charity events and some Embassy events. Please let me know if that would work for you and I will have someone pick them up shortly.

Thanks,
Emma

Emma Heydlauff
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2368 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png>http://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield>
<image002.png>http://twitter.com/repewhitfield>
<image003.png>http://www.flickr.com/photos/edwhitfield/>
<image004.png>http://www.youtube.com/WhitfieldKY01>
<image005.png>http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml>
Heydlauff, Emma

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield (humanesociety.org)
Sent: Friday, September 07, 2012 9:17 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: LUNGevity Foundation Event
Attachments: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png; image005.png

We cannot attend.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 7, 2012, at 1:58 PM, "Heydlauff, Emma"
<Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Mrs. Whitfield,

I wanted to touch base in reference to the LUNGevity Foundation event on September 14. You marked on the fax yes to names and I wanted to clarify whether or not you and Congressman Whitfield plan to attend.

Let me know.

Thanks,
Emma

Emma Heydlauff
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2368 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png> http://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield>
<image002.png> http://twitter.com/repebwhitfield>
<image003.png> http://www.flickr.com/photos/edwhitfield>
<image004.png> http://www.youtube.com/WhitfieldKENT
<image005.png> http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml>
Heydlauff, Emma

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:charriman-whitfield@humanesociety.org]
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: Invitation from the Turkish Embassy on the occasion of the 91st Anniversary of the Victory Day

We have a private dinner at 6:30. Can you remind Ed?

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 26, 2013, at 4:01 PM, "Heydlauff, Emma" <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> It is this Friday August 30.
> > ----- Original Message ----- 
> > From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:charriman-whitfield@humanesociety.org]
> > Sent: Monday, August 26, 2013 3:59 PM
> > To: Heydlauff, Emma
> > Subject: Re: Invitation from the Turkish Embassy on the occasion of the 91st Anniversary of the Victory Day
> > > Emma,
> > > You don't give the day of the month!
> > > Sent from my iPhone
> > > On Aug 26, 2013, at 11:47 AM, "Heydlauff, Emma" <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov> wrote:
> > > Sir,
> > > I wanted to share this invitation with you. It is a reception on the occasion of the 91st Anniversary of Turkey’s Victory Day. It is held at the Turkish Embassy Residence on Friday evening from 5:30-7:30pm. Please let me know if you would like to attend and I will add the reception to your calendar.
> > > Thanks,
> > > Emma
> > > From: RSVP [mailto:res@turkishembassy.org]
> > > Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 12:57 PM
> > > To: Heydlauff, Emma
> > > Subject: Invitation from the Turkish Embassy on the occasion of the 91st Anniversary of the Victory Day
> > > > Please find attached an invitation for The Honorable Ed Whitfield.
> > > > With kind regards,
> > > > Turkish Embassy
> > > > <August 30, 2013.pdf>
Heydlauff, Emma

From: Conrie Harriman-Whitehead [humanesociety.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2014 1:31 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Cc: Holo, Cory; Ed Weissberger; Blackberry, Ed

Subject: Events to Schedule on Ed’s Calendar

5/31—Prime Rib—7pm
6/1—Stratford Hall Reception 3pm
6/3—Physical Therapy 4:30pm
6/5—Physical Therapy 11am
6/9—Phys Therapy 1pm
6/12—Phys Therapy 3:30pm
6/16—New York—Restaurant 21
6/17—Phys Therapy 11am
6/19—Phys Therapy 11am
6/20—Fly to Jacksonville for Roland wedding
6/22—Fly to DC

Sent from my iPhone
Appendix 5 – HPA Violations by Signatories to PSHA Letter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James (Jim) Cortner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Hankins</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael (Mike) Inman</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Dotson</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Holcomb</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce MacDonald</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickey McCormick</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James L. (Linton) Griffith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee W. McGartland (formerly Lee Ann Wall)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddy Stasney</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Buchanan, Melissa</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>From:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sent:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If mine workers gave you any paper, can you forward to me.

Was their ask to support the Rahall bill or that and something else.

Tom Altmeyer
Arch Coal
O: 202-331
C: 202-521

***Email Disclaimer: The information contained in this e-mail, and in any accompanying documents, may constitute confidential and/or legally privileged information. The information is intended only for use by the designated recipient. If you are not the intended recipient (or responsible for delivery of the message to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance on this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message from your system.***
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Altmeyer, Thomas <redacted@archcoal.com>
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 11:53 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: HR 980—CARE Act

Thanks. I am going to request an appointment to see him. It screws Arch Coal.

Who is handling appointments? Thanks

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 11:46 AM
To: Altmeyer, Thomas
Subject: HR 980—CARE Act

Hi Mr. Altmeyer,

I just wanted to give you a heads up that Congressman Whitfield is thinking about cosponsoring HR 980 the CARE Act that was introduced by Congressman Rahall last week.

Thank you,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:


***Email Disclaimer: The information contained in this e-mail, and in any accompanying documents, may constitute confidential and/or legally privileged information. The information is intended only for use by the designated recipient. If you are not the intended recipient (or responsible for delivery of the message to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance on this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message from your system.***
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Paul Green @MooneyGreen.com
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 3:17 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Bill Banig
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Patriot Healthcare Benefits Discussion Draft

Melissa,

I wanted to respond to Leg. Counsel’s questions:

1. Use of “beneficiaries” v. “individuals”. -- “Beneficiaries” is the term that has been used previously in the Coal Act and SMCRA. We just stuck with that.

2. The “under the Plan” should not be included on page 2, l. 24. There, the “Plan” would refer to the 1993 Plan, although the denial of benefits would come directly from the employer’s own individual employer plan.

3. The final phrase “considered eligible to receive benefits under the Plan” should be there for several reasons. First, it eliminates any doubt that the Patriot group is covered by the 1993 Plan. That is particularly important since the Patriot retirees may also continue to be eligible under an inadequately-funded VERA. In that case, although they would be eligible from both the VERA and the 1993 Plan, the VERA would provide what benefits it could, with the rest of the benefits coming from the 1993 Plan. In total, the beneficiaries would receive no more than their promised benefits. Furthermore, it eliminates any ambiguities that the amounts to be transferred to the 1993 Plan would include the cost of benefits for the Patriot group.

Otherwise, I think this draft works (although I am not terribly familiar with the use of “erva”).

Let me know if you want to talk about any of this.

Paul

Paul A. Green
Mooney, Green, Salindon, Murphy & Welch, P.C.
1920 I Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
202-783-0010
(fax) 202-783-6088
Paul@mooneygreen.com
www.mooneygreen.com

This e-mail message is intended only for the personal use of the recipient(s) named above. This message may be an attorney-client communication and as such privileged and confidential. If you are not an intended recipient, you should not review, copy or distribute this message. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message.
Hi Paul and Bill,

Attached is the discussion draft as prepared by leg counsel using the edits and suggestions you provided. The attorney I’ve been working with did have some questions regarding the drafting of the bill, and those are in brackets. Can you please take a look and let me know your thoughts/suggestions.

Thank you,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-8547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Paul Green <MooneyGreen.com>
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2013 6:43 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: Bill Bang
Subject: RE: Patriot Healthcare Benefits Discussion Draft
Attachments: Order with Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law (1114050).pdf

Melissa,

Here they are. Happy reading!

Paul

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Mellisa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2013 4:25 PM
To: Paul Green; Bill Bang
Subject: RE: Patriot Healthcare Benefits Discussion Draft

Hi Paul,

Could you send me a copy of all of the decisions? I need some light reading for the weekend.

Thank you for all of your help.

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3323
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

From: Paul Green <MooneyGreen.com>
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2013 2:30 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Bill Bang
Subject: RE: Patriot Healthcare Benefits Discussion Draft

Melissa,

It isn’t quite that cut and dried. What I understood the bill to do was to place the VBA beneficiaries in the 1993 Plan so that they would be eligible in both the 1993 Plan and the VBA. The VBA would provide what benefits it could as the “primary” plan, while the 1993 Plan would be secondary, topping the benefits to the promised levels. Moreover, the Court was pretty clear that her order would terminate benefits from Patriot, albeit by transferring the beneficiaries to 1

App. 7_000005
the VEBRA in her decision letting Peabody off the hook under its agreement to retain liability for a group of Patriot’s retirees (the Heritage retirees), she said the following:

[As early as June 1, 2013, Article XX of both the Heritage and Eastern Associated Individual Employer Plans will be deleted, and as early as July 1, 2013, a [VEBRA] can be established pursuant to the Section 1114 relief, to which Heritage and Eastern Associated’s obligation to provide pension and health care benefits will be transferred. Therefore, if Heritage no longer has an obligation to pay the healthcare benefits . . . , Peabody Holdings consequently has no obligation to fund a non-existent liability.


Let me know if you need a copy of the decisions.

Paul

Paul A. Green
Mooney, Green, Saïdman, Murphy & Welch, P.C.
1920 L Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
202-783-0010
Fax 202-783-6088
mooney@mooneygreen.com
www.mooneygreen.com

This e-mail message is intended only for the personal use of the recipient(s) named above. This message may be an attorney-client communication and as such privileged and confidential. If you are not an intended recipient, you should not review, copy or distribute this message. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message.

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Mellisa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2013 1:31 PM
To: Paul Green; Bill Bonig
Subject: RE: Patriot Healthcare Benefits Discussion Draft

Good Afternoon,

Upon further review of our discussion draft, it has come to my attention that due to the bankruptcy court’s ruling, this bill will no longer work. It is my understanding that the 1993 Plan was created for orphaned miners, and because Patriot did not have to liquidate the affected retirees are not orphans. What would be your thoughts towards transferring some of the unobligated AML funds into the VEBRA created by the bankruptcy court to ensure that the benefits paid to retirees through that fund continue to be equal to their current benefits?

Thank you for all of your help,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-G)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Paul Green [mailto:stMooneyGreen.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 3:17 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Bill Banip
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Patriot Healthcare Benefits Discussion Draft

Melissa,

I wanted to respond to Leg. Counsel’s questions:

1. Use of “beneficiaries” v. “individuals”. -- “Beneficiaries” is the term that has been used previously in the Coal Act and SMCRA. We just stuck with that.

2. The “under the Plan” should not be included on page 2, l. 24. There, the “Plan” would refer to the 1993 Plan, although the denial of benefits would come directly from the employer’s own individual employer plan.

3. The final phrase “considered eligible to receive benefits under the Plan” should be there for several reasons. First, it eliminates any doubt that the Patriot group is covered by the 1993 Plan. That is particularly important since the Patriot retirees may also continue to be eligible under an inadequately-funded VEBA. In that case, although they would be eligible from both the VEBA and the 1993 Plan, the VEBA would provide what benefits it could, with the rest of the benefits coming from the 1993 Plan. In total, the beneficiaries would receive no more than their promised benefits. Furthermore, it eliminates any ambiguities that the amounts to be transferred to the 1993 Plan would include the cost of benefits for the Patriot group.

Otherwise, I think this draft works (although I am not terribly familiar with the use of “ems”).

Let me know if you want to talk about any of this.

Paul

Paul A. Green
Mooney, Green, Saindon, Murphy & Welch, P.C.
1920 L Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
202-783-0010
(Fax) 202-783-6088
stmooneygreen.com
www.mooneygreen.com
This e-mail message is intended only for the personal use of the recipient(s) named above. This message may be an attorney-client communication and as such privileged and confidential. If you are not an intended recipient, you should not review, copy or distribute this message. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message.

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@jog.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 10:54 AM
To: Paul Green; Bill Bang
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Patriot Healthcare Benefits Discussion Draft

Hi Paul and Bill,

Attached is the discussion draft as prepared by leg counsel using the edits and suggestions you provided. The attorney I’ve been working with did have some questions regarding the drafting of the bill, and these are in brackets. Can you please take a look and let me know your thoughts/suggestions.

Thank you,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

[Links to social media accounts]

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Paul Green <PaulGreen@MooneyGreen.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:15 AM
To: Hicks, Cory; Bill Baring
Cc: Adam Banig; Steve Earle; Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: Legislation

Cory,

Let me take a crack at this. Under the 2011 NRCWA, Patriot and the other contributing employers pay $1.10 per hour worked into the 1993 Plan. This money provides benefits for industry orphans (so-called because their employers are no longer in business) who are not covered by the 2006 legislation. Patriot is one of the three largest contributors to the 1993 Plan.

Under the Court’s rejection order, Patriot has been authorized to permanently terminate its contributions to the 1993 Plan as early as June 1. Without Patriot’s contribution, the 1993 Plan will not have enough money to continue providing benefits to the more than 3,000 orphans and their dependents for the remaining term of the contract. In short, these 3,000 orphans and their dependents will be directly affected by Patriot’s bankruptcy.

The earlier drafts of the legislation fix this problem by moving the eligibility date for federal funding forward. Absent such a fix, even if the Patriot retirees are taken care of, this group of orphans will be directly affected by Patriot’s bankruptcy.

Does that help? Let me know if you need any more explanation.

Paul

Paul A. Green
Mooney, Green, Salidno, Murphy & Welch, P.C.
1920 L Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
202-783-0010
Fax: 202-783-6088
mooneygreen.com
www.mooneygreen.com

This e-mail message is intended only for the personal use of the recipient(s) named above. This message may be an attorney-client communication and as such privileged and confidential. If you are not an intended recipient, you should not review, copy or distribute this message. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message.

-----Original Message-----
From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:05 AM
To: Bill Baring
Cc: Paul Green; Adam Banig; Steve Earle; Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: Legislation

Adding Melissa. Can you explain further?

----Original Message----
From: Bill Banig [mailto:banig@umwa.org]
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:01 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Paul Green; Adam Banig; Steve Earle
Subject: Re: Legislation

The lines deleted are important because we lose Patriot funding for the 93 Fund under the Court's order.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 17, 2013, at 6:43 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Thanks for the email, Bill. We plan to eliminate lines 16-21 because we've been told that would add workers that will not be impacted back the bankruptcy. We've got a few meetings this week, so we'll know more after those. On a side note, we've heard that UMWA does not support our bill and since Murray opposes it, we've lost a considerable amount of support on the Hill. Can UMWA send us a letter of support before we introduce the bill?

> ----Original Message----
> From: Bill Banig [mailto:banig@umwa.org]
> Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 7:35 AM
> To: Hicks, Cory; Buchanan, Melissa
> Subject: Legislation
>
> We are in St. Louis today for another rally and meeting with our Patriot Local Unions. Any idea when Mr. Whitfield may introduce his legislation? Since it was circulated as a discussion draft, has there been any changes.
>
> Bill B
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Adam Bangling <unimw.org>
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2013 3:20 PM
To: Hicks, Cory; Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Fed: Talking points for legislators to use in statements after ratification

Cory and Melissa,

> Below are some points I think are important for legislators to use in statement's they may issue after the ratification, assuming it passes.
>
> > Phil Smith
> > Director of Communications
> > United Mine Workers of America
> > 701-201-4483 (direct)
> > 571-349-3486 (cell)
> >
> > TALKING POINTS REGARDING PATRIOT SETTLEMENT RATIFICATION
> >
> > • The settlement will provide a way forward for the active workers to continue in their jobs, provide for their families and be strong economic drivers of their local communities.
> >
> > • But we are not out of the woods yet, especially with respect to retiree health care.
> >
> > • The funding for the Veba is only enough to provide a couple of years of benefits, at best, even after cost-saving measures are put in place.
>
> > • The need for legislation to address this problem and make the retirees whole has not gone away. Indeed, the need has become even clearer. The clock is now ticking toward the day when the funding will run out.
> >
> > • The clock will tick faster as the coal markets get worse over the next many months, which industry analysts expect will happen.
> >
> > • The UMWA will continue to press its legal and public case to make Peabody and Arch live up to their responsibilities.
>
> • Congress must move bipartisan legislation quickly that will address this problem and ensure the government’s promise of health care for retired miners is kept.
Travis/Melissa,

Below are updated figures on the potential impact to Kentucky. I want to make sure you have the number of Coal Act retirees covered by Patriot. There will be no impact to this population as we are legally obligated to pay these benefits.

RH

For Kentucky a total of 2,477 retired miners and their dependents may be impacted by this decision. The Peabody Assumed population is 1,256 (691 retirees and 565 dependents). The population paid for by Patriot is 1,231 (659 retirees and 562 dependents). These are as of April 30, 2013.

In Kentucky there are also a total of 1,637 Coal Act retirees and dependents that the ruling will have no effect as their healthcare obligations will be honored by Patriot and Peabody. The breakdown of the Coal Act is Patriot 314 (208 retirees and 106 dependents) with Peabody Assumed 1,323 (907 retirees and 416 dependents).

Rashid G. Hallaway  
Vice President  
American Patriot Holdings, LLC  
202.380.8800 (work)  
202.486.3130 (cell)  
202.315.3130 (fax)
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Rashid Hallaway
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 3:31 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Re: <no subject>

Thanks, Melissa. I missed your note for some reason but just discovered it. Yes, this makes perfect sense. Thank you.

RH

Rashid G. Hallaway
Vice President
American Patriot Holdings, LLC
202.486.1400 (work)
202.486.1300 (cell)
202.315.3180 (fax)

From: Buchanan, Melissa <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov>
Date: Thursday, July 11, 2013 9:46 AM
To: Rashid Hallaway <rashid.hallaway@americanpatrioigroup.com>
Subject: RE: <no subject>

Hi Rashid,

I just tried giving you a call. The biggest difference is we added language at the end of bill which would prevent any of the retirees from receiving duplicative benefits from both the Veba and the 1993 Plan. This language will ensure that the benefits these retirees receive will be a supplement to any benefits they receive from the Veba, so they can continue to collect the full benefits they were promised. Does that make sense?

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield [KY-01]
2254 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
From: Rashid Hallaway [mailto:***@americanpatriotgroup.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2013 9:39 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Re: <no subject>

Do you have a summary document? How does this version differ from the discussion draft?

Rashid G. Hallaway
Vice President
American Patriot Holdings, LLC
202.387.*** (work)
202.485.*** (cell)
202.323.3181 (fax)

From: <buchanan>, Melissa <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov>
Date: Thursday, July 11, 2013 9:37 AM
To: Rashid Hallaway [mailto:***@americanpatriotgroup.com]
Subject: RE: <no subject>

Hi Rashid,

Attached is a copy of the bill. Please let me know if you need anything else.

Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3155
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Rashid Hallaway [mailto:***@americanpatriotgroup.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2013 8:01 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Re: <no subject>

Thank you. I didn’t see it on thomas.
Rashid G. Hallaway  
Vice President  
American Patriot Holdings, LLC  
202.380 [work]  
202.486 [cell]  
202.315.3180 [fax]  

From: <Buchanan>, Melissa <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov>  
Date: Thursday, July 11, 2013 7:56 AM  
To: Rashid Hallaway <Americanpatriotgroup.com>  
Subject: Re: <no subject>  

Hi Rashid,  

It is very similar. I will send you a copy as soon as I get in the office.  

Melissa  

____________________________________________  
Sent using BlackBerry  

From: Rashid Hallaway <Americanpatriotgroup.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2013 07:49 AM  
To: Buchanan, Melissa  
Subject: <no subject>  

Hey Melissa,  

Is your health care bill the same as the discussion draft? I haven’t seen anything else on it. Hope you are well.  

RH  

Rashid G. Hallaway  
Vice President  
American Patriot Holdings, LLC  
202.380 [work]  
202.486 [cell]  
202.315.3180 [fax]
Hey Cory and Melissa,

Attached is an advance copy of our press release regarding Patriot's emergence from Chapter 11 which will be issued later today. Please do not share this with anyone outside of the Congressman's office. I will be sure to let you know when our release is formally sent out. Just wanted you guys to have a heads up.

I am presently on a flight but have access to email if you have any questions or concerns. Thanks for your help and support.

Rashid
NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

PATRIOT COAL EMERGES AS WELL-CAPITALIZED PRIVATE COMPANY WITH COMPETITIVE COST STRUCTURE

ST. LOUIS, December 18, 2013 – Patriot Coal Corporation (OTC: PCXCOQ) today announced its emergence from Chapter 11 as a reorganized company. The Company exits the 18-month restructuring process with a strong balance sheet, competitive cost structure, and a streamlined operating profile focused on market opportunities that create value.

“Today marks an exciting new beginning for our company and for our employees,” said Patriot President and Chief Executive Officer Bennett K. Hatfield. “We have accomplished the objectives of our reorganization and emerged in a much stronger position to compete in the global energy and steel markets. Importantly, we have also preserved nearly 4,000 jobs, signed new five-year labor agreements with the UMWA, and secured significant funding for retiree healthcare.”

Patriot emerges from Chapter 11 reorganization with:

- **Strong balance sheet.** The Company has lower debt levels and higher available liquidity, with dramatically reduced legacy liabilities related to retiree healthcare and other post-employment benefits.
- **Competitive cost structure.** Patriot has significantly reduced its operating costs, achieving more than $200 million in estimated annual cash savings.
- **Industry-leading assets and reserves.** The Company has 1.8 billion tons of coal reserves, state-of-the-art mine complexes in three U.S. coal basins, and broad transportation options.
- **Solid customer base.** Patriot has long-standing relationships with prominent U.S. and international utility customers, steel producers, and energy trading companies.
“Having streamlined our operations through the reorganization process, Patriot is poised to respond quickly to changes in the markets. Utilizing our existing mine complexes and the Company’s large coal reserve base, we can add incremental production at competitive costs with modest capital requirements,” continued Hatfield. “In short, with the support of our dedicated employees and new investors, I believe Patriot Coal has a bright future.”

Emergence Details

Patriot completed the final steps in its Chapter 11 restructuring on December 18 by successfully closing $345 million in exit financing and completing its rights offerings, receiving $250 million of junior capital from Knighthead Capital Management, LLC, Davidson Kempner Capital Management LLC, and other participating unsecured creditors.

The Company has filed notice of the effectiveness of the Plan of Reorganization with the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Missouri. Upon the effectiveness of the Plan, all previously issued and outstanding shares of Patriot common stock were cancelled, as were all other previously issued and outstanding equity interests and bonds. Patriot issued shares of a new class of common stock to unsecured creditors as provided in the Plan. Additionally, the Company issued notes and warrants pursuant to the rights offerings. Patriot expects to make initial distributions to unsecured claim holders in the first quarter of 2014.

As a result of the effectiveness of the Plan, Patriot is a private company and is no longer subject to the reporting requirements of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. However, Patriot plans to release financial results and other pertinent information on at least a quarterly basis.

About Patriot Coal

Patriot Coal Corporation is a producer and marketer of coal in the eastern United States, with 10 active mining complexes in Appalachia and the Illinois Basin. Patriot ships to domestic and international electricity generators, industrial users and metallurgical coal customers, and controls approximately 1.0 billion tons of proven and probable coal reserves.

Forward-Looking Statements

Certain statements in this press release are forward-looking. These statements involve certain risks and uncertainties that may be beyond the Company’s control and may cause actual future results to differ materially from current expectations. Factors that could affect the Company’s results include, but are not limited to factors detailed from time to time in the Company’s reports and other information posted on its website or included in a press release. The Company undertakes no obligation to update or revise forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances that arise after the date of this press release or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events.
CONTACT:
Janine Orf
(314) 275-3880
jorf@patriotcoal.com

# # # #
quick response follows- I will look at this more carefully when I have more time tomorrow

The transfer amount would only cover those enrolled as of the date of enactment— I do not think the Patriot retirees would be enrolled in the benefit plan that quickly. If not, you would need to change their section 2(a) to include individuals described as eligible per their changes in subsection (c) of the draft. Eligible is broader than enrolled. For example, you could modify (b)(2)(C) to read: "only those beneficiaries actually enrolled in the Plan as of December 31, 2006, and those who are eligible to enroll in the Plan pursuant to the amendments made by the ______ Act of 2013, who are eligible to ______." The language still has a timing problem since the first transfer would take place in 2014 since the law calculates the year’s transfer based on eligible participants on January 1 of the year the transfer is made.

The adjustment of benefits language seems to suggest an across the board reduction if needed, not reducing benefits to the youngest first as the objective is described. Perhaps you want to say “adjust benefits based on age and in consideration of the hardship that may be imposed on older beneficiaries to ensure the Plan’s solvency” or some other language to suggest adjustments could be greater on younger participants. The UMWA will always have any “adjustment of benefits” mandate; though, realistically you are heading the right way.

And thank you for using AML for retiree health. I am an old pension guy. A dedicated general tax/ revenue stream into any multiemployer plan causes me to feel sick. The precedent is too unsettling. How about a jet fuel tax for airline retirees?

Good Afternoon Mr. Hart,

Cory Hicks passed along your contact information to me. I was hoping you might be able to answer a few questions I have regarding a bill I am working on for Congressman Whitfield. There are about 1,500 miners in our District who could potentially lose their healthcare benefits pending the outcome of the Patriot bankruptcy. I have attached the draft version of the bill.

In the current law, there is some question over the use of “eligible” and “enrolled” and how those terms operate within the law. We want to make sure the correct language is used in the proposed bill, so that those miners will be able to receive healthcare benefits under the 1993 Multiemployer Health Benefit Plan. The proposed bill uses eligible on page 3 line 10. I have also attached a copy of Surface Mining and Reclamation Act that defines the 1993 Plan.
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My other question is with the last sentence of the proposed bill, "The trustees of the Plan may adjust benefits to ensure the Plan’s solvency." The goal is to ensure that current Patriot employees who are at or close to retirement age are covered, but that a 24-year-old who has many more years to work isn’t just automatically able to take advantage of this.

Any insight and advice would be very much appreciated.

Thank you,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3315
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
Buchanan, Melissa

From: J. Steven Hart @wmw-jen.com
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 1:47 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: David A. Starr
Subject: RE: UMWA/Patriot question

It will probably be tomorrow

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 1:17 PM
To: J. Steven Hart
Cc: David A. Starr
Subject: RE: UMWA/Patriot question

Hi Steve,

Cory spoke with Maryam this morning about this idea and she understands the situation that my boss is in. What we now need to do is get something drafted and see if we can get any support from other offices. However, you are the only person who understands how this works, and I would really appreciate your help in drafting.

Thanks,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congresswoman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
1284 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

From: J. Steven Hart [mailto:wmw-jen.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 11:07 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: David A. Starr
Subject: RE: UMWA/Patriot question

As you know, $210 million was transferred in 1992 from the pension fund to the health fund. This could be transferred back justifiably as an "error". The pension fund has also lost the earnings on this $210 million for almost 20 years. That earnings number is big and an unknown, perhaps hard to calculate and defend.

I raised this option with the Boehner staff yesterday, Maryam and Dave Stewart who handles pension issues. I know you know Maryam. Brown well so may I suggest you try to get a reaction from her? This is dangerous ground policy wise.
and I am not comfortable guiding you to this conclusion without some cover from the leadership. I do not think David Stewart is anywhere close to approving this but Maryam could maybe grant you a reprieve to move ahead on your own

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]  
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 10:54 AM  
To: J. Steven Hart  
Cc: David A. Starr  
Subject: RE: UMWA/Patriot question

Hi Steve and David,

Given yesterday’s announcement from UMWA and Patriot we are getting more pressure to do something. I want to propose this idea of transferring the money back from the Combined Benefit Fund back to the pension fund and supplementing the Combined Benefit Fund with AML interest to my boss. Would you all be able to put something together on this?

Thank you for your help,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan  
Legislative Assistant  
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)  
2184 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
Phone: (202) 225-3115  
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:  
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: J. Steven Hart [mailto:jshart@pmsj.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2013 4:26 PM  
To: Buchanan, Melissa  
Cc: David A. Starr  
Subject: RE: UMWA/Patriot question

The transfer was done in 1992 when the pension fund was over funded. So we could just transfer it back.

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2013 3:26 PM  
To: J. Steven Hart  
Subject: UMWA/Patriot question

Hi Steve,

During one of our meetings in discussing the UMWA/Patriot situation, you mentioned that in 2006 [7] Congress redirected some money from the UMWA Pension fund to the 1993 Health Benefits Fund. I think you also mention that transferring this money back to the pension fund could help with the shortfalls there. Am I correct in remembering this? Could you explain how this would work and if it would be a viable option to help the UMWA Pension fund problem?
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Thank you for all your help on this issue.

Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-03)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3135
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
Buchanan, Melissa

From: J. Steven Hart <j@wm.com>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 12:08 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: pension question

The UMWA pension plan must file reports annually with the Dept of Labor. These reports will detail the underfunding problem. It would be reasonable for Rep Whitfield to request this info from the UMWA. It would be nice if they actually give you a summary since you are trying to be helpful.

I suggest this because $70 million a year budget cost is going to raise objections from conservatives even though we can argue we are just giving them their pension dollars back. Still to protect yourself, we need to know that the $70 million stops the bleeding and will allow more time for the parties to work out a permanent funding solution.

Feel free to ignore this suggestion. I am just pondering out loud trying to predict where the opposition will come from.

From: David A. Starr
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 10:02 AM
To: Melissa.Buchanan@email.house.gov
Cc: J. Steven Hart
Subject: pension question

Melissa:

Attached is the draft you requested with an explanation at the bottom. While Steve and I are happy to offer you this technical assistance, our counsel has not taken a position on this particular issue one way or another and I have not shared this with them. I hope this is helpful. There was a hearing before the House Education Committee on multiemployer pension plans this week which I could not attend, but I understand that the UMWA pension plan was raised. I am waiting for a report on the hearing from one of our paralegals to see what was discussed. Let me know if you have any questions.

David Starr
Williams & Jensen PLLC
701 8th Street NW Suite 500
Washington DC 20001
(w) 202-974
(f) 202-974-0
(e) 703-865-0
wm@wm.com
Hicks, Cory

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2013 2:29 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: FW: Patriot Coal Provides Update on Discussions with UMWA

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Rashid Hallway [mailto:americanpatriotgroup.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2013 2:14 PM
Subject: Patriot Coal Provides Update on Discussions with UMWA

ST. LOUIS, July 2, 2013 /PRNewswire/ -- Patriot Coal Corporation (OTC: PCXQ) today issued the following statement regarding its ongoing discussions with the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA): "Patriot Coal Corporation announced that recent talks with the UMWA have resulted in substantial progress toward a consensual resolution. On July 1, 2013, Patriot exercised the authority granted to it by the Bankruptcy Court to implement changes to wages, benefits and active employee healthcare, but chose to implement terms that are significantly improved from those approved by the court. Patriot and the UMWA are continuing to meet in a diligent effort to resolve the outstanding differences and reach a consensual agreement.

"In addition, Patriot and the UMWA have reached an agreement through which retiree healthcare will continue to be provided at current benefit levels through July and August.

"Negotiations are expected to continue over the coming weeks. The parties are targeting completion of a final resolution to be presented to UMWA members by the end of July."

Note: Background of Patriot's restructuring and transformation can be found at the Company's website, www.patriotcoal.com.

About Patriot Coal

Patriot Coal Corporation is a producer and marketer of coal in the eastern United States, with 11 active mining complexes in Appalachia and the Illinois Basin. Patriot ships to domestic and international electricity generators, industrial users and metallurgical coal customers, and controls approximately 1.8 billion tons of proven and probable coal reserves.
Forward-Looking Statements

Certain statements in this press release are forward-looking as defined in the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. These statements involve certain risks and uncertainties that may be beyond our control and may cause our actual future results to differ materially from our current expectations both in connection with the Chapter 11 filings Patriot announced on July 9, 2012 and our business and financial prospects. No assurance can be made that these events will come to fruition. We undertake no obligation (and expressly disclaim any such obligation) to publicly update or revise any forward-looking statement, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise. Factors that could affect our results include, but are not limited to: (i) the ability of Patriot and its subsidiaries to continue as a going concern, (ii) the ability of Patriot and its subsidiaries to operate within the restrictions and liquidity limitations of the post-petition credit facilities authorized by the Bankruptcy Court, (iii) the ability of Patriot and its subsidiaries to obtain Bankruptcy Court approval with respect to motions in the Chapter 11 cases, (iv) the ability of Patriot and its subsidiaries to successfully complete a reorganization under Chapter 11 and emerge from bankruptcy, which is dependent upon, among other things, the ability to implement changes to wage and benefit programs and postretirement benefit obligations consensually or pursuant to Sections 1113 and 1114 of the Bankruptcy Code, to minimize liabilities upon emergence and to obtain post-bankruptcy financing, (v) the effects of the bankruptcy filing on Patriot and its subsidiaries and the interests of various creditors, equity holders and other constituents, (vi) Bankruptcy Court rulings in the Chapter 11 cases and the outcome of the cases in general, (vii) the length of time Patriot and its subsidiaries will operate under the Chapter 11 cases, (viii) risks associated with third-party motions in the Chapter 11 cases, which may interfere with the ability of Patriot and its subsidiaries to develop one or more plans of reorganization and consummate such plans once they are developed, (ix) the potential adverse effects of the Chapter 11 proceedings on Patriot’s liquidity or results of operations, (x) the ability to execute Patriot’s business and restructuring plans, (xi) increased legal costs related to Patriot’s bankruptcy filing and other litigation, and (xii) the ability of Patriot and its subsidiaries to maintain contracts that are critical to their operation, including to obtain and maintain normal terms with their vendors, customers, landlords and service providers and to retain key executives, managers and employees. In the event that the risks disclosed in Patriot’s public filings and those discussed above cause results to differ materially from those expressed in Patriot’s forward-looking statements, Patriot’s business, financial condition, results of operations or liquidity, and the interests of creditors, equity holders and other constituents, could be materially adversely affected. For additional information concerning factors that could cause actual results to materially differ from those projected herein, please refer to Patriot’s Form 10-K and Form 10-Q reports.

MEDIA CONTACT: Michael Freitag/Aaron Palash
Joelle Frank, Wilkinson Brimmer Katcher (212) 355-4449
INVESTOR CONTACT: Jurnie Orf
(314) 275-3680
jorf@patriotcoal.com
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
JUNE 12, 2013

Patriot breaks off negotiations with UMWA; union schedules meetings with local unions in preparation for vote

CONTACT: Phil Smith
703-291-2430

If we.We very disappointed with this action," UMWA President Cecil E. Roberts said. "We had made significant progress toward reaching an agreement that provided a workable alternative to the severe terms Patriot asked for last spring and that were approved by the bankruptcy court in St. Louis. The union had agreed to more than $400 million in savings for the company over the life of the current contract, which gives them the money they say they need to survive. But that still wasn't enough for them.

"When the company walked out, we were only about $10 to 35 million apart, which given the scope of this problem really isn't all that much," Roberts said. "A big chunk of that money is in bonuses the company wants to pay management personnel into the future.

"I can only conclude at this point that there is no end to the depths of sacrifices our members and retirees are expected to make, even while hundreds of managers and executives are thinking about how they will spend the bonus money they'll be getting in their bank accounts," Roberts said, referring to a recent decision by the bankruptcy court to allow the company to pay millions in bonuses to already highly compensated personnel.

"The company now says it will implement the terms and conditions approved by the judge, effective July 1," Roberts said. "I have consistently made it clear to management that I could not recommend to our membership that they work under those terms, because the sacrifices they require from our active and retired members are too great."

Under the ruling made by Judge Kathy Surratt-States, Patriot is allowed to cut off the current system that provides health care for some 33,000 retirees, their dependents and surviving spouses and replace it with a Voluntary Employee Benefit Association (VEBA) that only has guaranteed funding of just $15 million, along with a royalty payment of 20 cents per ton of coal produced. The company would transfer a 35 percent ownership stake to the UMWA, which could be sold to raise money for the VEBA, but only after a value for the company is established. There is no way of knowing what the level of that funding would be.

The ruling also allows Patriot to deny retiree health care benefits entirely to some 40 percent of currently active workers who have already worked enough years to earn those benefits. In addition, Patriot can substantially reduce the pay, benefits, paid time off and other terms and conditions of the active workforce.

At the same time that Patriot is threatening to implement these cuts, the company plans to pay $25 million more in management bonuses in each of the next three years.
“We have repeatedly said that we are willing to make the sacrifices needed to keep this company operating,” Roberts said. “We are working to preserve these jobs and preserve retiree health care. We also believe that those sacrifices should be shared by all, and that once the company gets through the short-term cash problem it has and begins to make money again in a few years, our sacrifices should be recognized.

“If we’re going to share the pain, we should share the gain,” Roberts said. “That’s only reasonable. But Patriot refuses to make that commitment to the people who actually mine the coal.

“We are going to explain all this, including the terms and conditions the judge approved and Patriot plans to implement, directly to our members,” Roberts said. “This is a democratic union, and our members will have their say about whether they want to work under it or not.” Roberts added that the vote would likely be held sometime during the week prior to July 1.

Under the UMWA Constitution, all active members working at Patriot operations, including those who are laid off or on sick or disability leave, have the right to vote on the terms and conditions of employment.

Roberts also pledged to continue the union’s efforts to get Peabody Energy and Arch Coal, the true architects of the Patriot bankruptcy, to live up to their obligations to the retirees to whom Peabody and Arch promised health care benefits.

We find ourselves in this position today because Peabody and Arch made promises that they didn’t keep,” Roberts said. “We are not letting them off the hook. We are airing a new round of television spots that feature the voices of the victims of their scheme. Thousands of us will be back in front of Peabody’s offices next week, and more events are planned in St. Louis and throughout the coalfields in the coming months."

“No matter what the events of the next few weeks may bring, this struggle is a long, long way from being over,” Roberts said.
From:    Hicks, Cory
Sent:    Monday, August 12, 2013 11:54 AM
To:      Pope, Michele
Subject: Fw: Tentative Patriot Coal Settlement

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Bill Benig <mailto:benig@umwa.org>
To: Thoth, Cory; Tomlinson, Adam; Zoie, Jim; Adler, Ann; Buckley, Teresa; Otht, Patrick; corry.marseli@mail.house.gov
     <corry.marseli@mail.house.gov>; Hicks, Cory; MacDonald, Charlene; kellei.ayequina@mail.house.gov
     <kellei.ayequina@mail.house.gov>; betty.hearing@mail.house.gov <betty.hearing@mail.house.gov>; Piggie, Darryl; Daulby, Jen; Lucas, David; Lylek III, Willie; Mcneil, John; Aiken, Tim; Erf, Vince; Walls, Jesse
Subject: Tentative Patriot Coal Settlement

On behalf of the UMWA I want to thank you for your support in sponsoring H.R. 2918 introduced by Representative David McKinley. I want to let you know that the UMWA has reached a tentative settlement agreement with Patriot Coal that will keep Patriot Coal in business and protect our members jobs. The tentative settlement agreement will be explained to our Patriot members this Wednesday and our members working at Patriot operations will vote on the tentative settlement agreement on Friday in accordance to the UMWA Constitution.

Although we have reached a tentative settlement agreement, this does not relieve us of the need to pass H.R. 2918. H.R. 2918 is still needed to protect retiree health care and pensions.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 202-302- Again thanks for your help.

Bill Benig
Director of Gov't Affairs
United Mine Workers of America
Hicks, Cory

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 6:16 PM
To: ivanig@umwa.org; Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Press Release for Rep. McKinley's healthcare/pensions bill

Thanks, Bill. Have a great evening.

-------------------
Sent using BlackBerry

From: Bill Banig [mailto:ivarnig@umwa.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 8:12 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: Phil Smith <phil@umwa.org>
Subject: Re: Press Release for Rep. McKinley's healthcare/pensions bill

I'll let our press person know. Thanks

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Buchanan, Melissa
To: Bill Banig
Cc: Toth, Corn
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 6:06 PM
Subject: Press Release for Rep. McKinley's healthcare/pensions bill

Hi Bill,

I just saw a copy of UMWA's press release regarding Congressman McKinley's Healthcare and Pensions bill. We do appreciate that you mention my boss's efforts regarding his healthcare bill, but the press release fails to recognize him as a cosponsor of the bill. Congressman Whitfield did agree to be an original cosponsor this morning and should be on the bill.

Thanks,

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-02)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3125
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
Hicks, Cory

From: Pape, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:13 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: McKinley UMWA/Patriot Healthcare and Pensions Bill

I appreciate that.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:07 PM
To: Pape, Michael; Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Re: McKinley UMWA/Patriot Healthcare and Pensions Bill

Yes. We're letting them know first thing tomorrow. We just wanted to check all the boxes before we pulled the trigger.

Thanks.

From: Pape, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:03 PM
To: Hicks, Cory; Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Re: McKinley UMWA/Patriot Healthcare and Pensions Bill

Has EW agreed to be an original cosponsor??

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 09:57 PM
To: Pape, Michael; Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Re: McKinley UMWA/Patriot Healthcare and Pensions Bill

Yes and this wouldn't have happened if it wasn't for Melissa's efforts.

From: Pape, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 09:54 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: McKinley UMWA/Patriot Healthcare and Pensions Bill

Our bill stays out there though regardless, correct?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 09:52 PM
To: Pape, Michael; Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: McKinley UMWA/Patriot Healthcare and Pensions Bill

Thanks, Mike!

Sent using BlackBerry

From: Pape, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 09:23 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Re: McKinley UMWA/Patriot Healthcare and Pensions Bill

He should be an original co-sponsor.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 09:10 PM
To: Pape, Michael
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Fw: McKinley UMWA/Patriot Healthcare and Pensions Bill

Mike, did you see this email? Need your response tonight. Thanks.

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 05:59 PM
To: Pape, Michael
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: McKinley UMWA/Patriot Healthcare and Pensions Bill

Hi Mike,

Attached is the bill Rep. McKinley is introducing tomorrow. They have asked us to be an original cosponsor. The healthcare portion is similar to ours. It puts the retirees into the 1993 Plan. It also transfers the assets from the Patriot established Veba into the 1993 plan. The goal is to avoid any duplication of benefits and to lower the cost of the bill.

The $410 Million in unobligated AML interest would be used towards both healthcare and pensions. Any of the money needed to pay healthcare benefits would be used first, then whatever is leftover would go towards the pensions. The idea being that as the Veba assets grow less money would be needed on a yearly basis for healthcare, so more would be available for pensions.

This bill is supported by Bob Murray and UMWA, and we think it actually has a better chance of getting passed. Please let me know what you think and if EW should be an original cosponsor.

Thanks,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
Hicks, Cory

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2013 12:54 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Bill Barig
Subject: RE: Caring for Coal Miners Act

Thanks, Melissa.

Bill, just to reiterate, Congressman Whitfield explicitly asked me to get a letter of support from UMWA. Is that something you can provide?

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2013 12:51 PM
To: Bill Barig
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Caring for Coal Miners Act

Good Afternoon Bill,

Attached is the final draft of Congressman Whitfield’s bill that will protect the healthcare benefits for UMWA retirees who may be in jeopardy of losing those benefits due to the bankruptcy of Patriot Coal. Congressman Whitfield is planning to introduce the bill next week, and we would certainly appreciate UMWA sending us a letter of support.

Thank you,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3153
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
From: Buchanan, Melissa
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: UMWA/Patriot question

thanks

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 12:33 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: UMWA/Patriot question

I called Maryam. Waiting to hear back.

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 11:10 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: FW: UMWA/Patriot question

See below. Now what do we do?

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
From: J. Steven Hart (mailto:jshart@law-jen.com)
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 11:07 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: David A. Starr
Subject: RE: UMWA/Patriot question

As you know, $210 million was transferred in 1992 from the pension fund to the health fund. This could be transferred back justifiably as an "error". The pension fund has also lost the earnings on this $210 million for almost 20 years. That earnings number is big and an unknown, perhaps hard to calculate and defend

I raised this option with the Boehner staff yesterday, Maryam and Dave Stewart who handles pension issues. I know you know Maryam. Brown well so may I suggest you try to get a reaction from her? This is dangerous ground policy wise and I am not comfortable guiding you to this conclusion without some cover from the leadership. I do not think David Stewart is anywhere close to approving this but Maryam could maybe grant you a reprieve to move ahead on your own

From: Buchanan, Melissa (mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov)
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 10:54 AM
To: J. Steven Hart
Cc: David A. Starr
Subject: RE: UMWA/Patriot question

Hi Steve and David,

Given yesterday's announcement from UMWA and Patriot we are getting more pressure to do something. I want to propose this idea of transferring the money back from the Combined Benefit Fund back to the pension fund and supplementing the Combined Benefit Fund with AML interest to my boss. Would you all be able to put something together on this?

Thank you for your help,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: J. Steven Hart (mailto:jshart@law-jen.com)
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2013 1:25 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: David A. Starr
Subject: RE: UMWA/Patriot question

The transfer was done in 1992 when the pension fund was over funded. So we could just transfer it back.
From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Mellisa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2013 3:26 PM
To: J. Steven Hart
Subject: UMWA/Patriot question

Hi Steve,

During one of our meetings in discussing the UMWA/Patriot situation, you mentioned that in 2006 (?) Congress redirected some money from the UMWA Pension fund to the 1993 Health Benefits Fund. I think you also mention that transferring this money back to the pension fund could help with the shortfalls there. Am I correct in remembering this? Could you explain how this would work and if it would be a viable option to help the UMWA Pension fund problem?

Thank you for all your help on this issue.
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2314 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3315
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Bill Banig <babanig@umwa.org>
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 10:51 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Re: [Span] Patriot Coal meeting follow-up

I'll get it set up.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 16, 2012, at 10:00 AM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Good Morning Mr. Banig:

It was very nice to meet you yesterday, and I appreciate the additional information you provided on this issue. I would like to take you up on your offer to meet with someone from your legal team to further discuss the bankruptcy of Patriot Coal.

Thank you, and I look forward to working with you.

Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2968 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-8547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png> <image002.png> <image003.png> <image004.png> <image005.png>
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Adam Banig <adam@umwa.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2012 10:15 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Re: Representative Whitfield-Patriot Mtg

Melissa-

2:30 seems to be the consensus among our group for being the best time.

Does 2:30 work for you?

Adam Banig
Umwa Legislative Representative
(C) 571-294
(W) 703-291
(P) 703-291-2451

On Nov 19, 2012, at 5:24 PM, Adam Banig <adam@umwa.org> wrote:

Yes. Thanks

Adam Banig
Umwa Legislative Representative
(C) 571-294
(W) 703-291
(P) 703-291-2451

On Nov 19, 2012, at 5:13 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Hi Adam:

Yes, a meeting with the lawyers and experts would be very helpful for me to better understand the issues surrounding the Patriot Coal bankruptcy. Would 2pm or 2:30pm on November 28 work for their schedules?

Thank you:
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2388 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png> <image002.png> <image003.png> <image004.png> <image005.png>
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
Melisa and Cory-

We have talked to our lawyers and experts that we will bring in to brief you and the congressman more on the Patriot Coal Bankruptcy.

Are you available me next Wednesday, Nov 28th in the afternoon?

Thanks

Adam Banig
Umwa Legislative Representative
(C) 571-294- [redacted]
(W) 703-291- [redacted]
(F) 703-291-2451

On Nov 19, 2012, at 3:27 PM, Grant Crandall-<mailto: [redacted]@umwa.org> wrote:

Yes, Wed afternoon would be best if that is possible. Tues we can't do it because of the big strategy meeting CER is having here. The other days of the week are also pretty hard to free up. Just let me know. Grant

Would you be available sometime next week for a meeting on Patriot with Rep. Ed Whitfield (R-KY 1st) office. Whitfield represents the Highland operations in western KY and has expressed a desire to help. Adam and I met with him last week. After that meeting his staff has requested a follow up meeting. I will be at the COP 18 climate meetings next week.

Bill Banig
Director of Governmental Affairs
United Mine Workers of America
(W) 703-291- [redacted]
(F) 703-291-2451

The information contained in this e-mail message is confidential and is intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.
United Mine Workers of America
18354 Quantico Gateway Drive, Suite 200
Triangle, VA 22172
Direct: 703-291-2400 / Main: 703-291-2400 / Fax: 703-291-2448
umwa.org / www.umwa.org
Assistant: Becky Gillespie/ 703-291-2400 / bgillespie@umwa.org

DISCLAIMER

This e-mail message is intended only for the personal use of the recipient(s) named above. This e-mail contains confidential information subject to the attorney-client privilege, and/or confidential attorney work product which has been prepared in anticipation of litigation. If you are not an intended recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message.
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Bill Banig <bill.banig@umwa.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2013 9:33 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: Steve Earle; Adam Banig
Subject: UMWA/CARE Act

Melissa,

I am following up on a meeting that a couple of my Local Union Presidents had with Mr. Whitfield last weekend about the CARE Act. Mr. Whitfield requested that we come in to meet again. He indicated that he had additional questions concerning the legislation. Please let me know when I good time would be for us to come in to meet with him.

Bill Banig
Director of Governmental Affairs
United Mine Workers of America
(W) 703-291-...
(C) 302-302-...
(P) 703-291-2451

The information contained in this e-mail message is confidential and is intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.
Will take a look, at least we can talk. I’m going to ask Rachel to forward a very brief bullet paper that outlines Arch’s prior ownership of several of the Patriot mines. Please don’t share beyond The Chairman and Cory.”

It may answer your questions

Tom Altmyer
Arch Coal
Q 202 333
M 202 325

Hi Mr. Altmyer:

I just met with Rashid from Patriot. Although I appreciated him meeting with me, I still have some questions regarding what role Arch and Peabody have in this whole bankruptcy situation. Is there a time later this week, maybe Thursday or Friday, that you would be available to meet with me?

Thank you,

Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2368 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3155
Fax: (202) 225-3947

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

App. 7 000044
Melissa. Congratulations. Sat next to Cory last evening at the Cool dinner where Ed was honored and he relayed to me. I had asked the Club to invite you however they said they were told that you were no longer there. Apologies for their lack of further diligence.

I'm trying to get the latest on where things stand and will get back to you. The last court action was a transfer of the case from NYC to St Louis several weeks ago. As you know, Patriot is trying to reorganize in bankruptcy.

Rashid, copied above, who is with Patriot, may have more information.

---

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 29, 2012 11:52 AM
To: Altmeyer, Thomas
Subject: Patriot Coal questions

Hi Mr. Altmeyer:

I have moved to the legislative staff in Congressman Whitfield's office, and I've taken over the labor issues portfolio. I received a call from a constituent earlier this week asking about the Patriot Coal bankruptcy case and what could potentially happen to her survivors benefits. I'm trying to get more information about the situation before I answer her and was wondering if you have time to either meet or chat over the phone.

Thank you, and I hope you had a nice Thanksgiving.
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2368 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

---

***Email Disclaimer: The information contained in this e-mail, and in any accompanying documents, may constitute confidential and/or legally privileged information. The information is intended only for use by the designated recipient. If you are not the intended recipient (or responsible for delivery of the message to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance on this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message from your system.***
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Altmeyer, Thomas [mailto:Thomas.Altmeyer@archcoal.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2013 1:20 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Hicks, Cory; Rogier, Rachel
Subject: RE: CARE Act

See you then

Tom Altmeyer
Arch Coal
O 202-333-4268
M 202-321-0060

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2013 11:58 AM
To: Altmeyer, Thomas; Hicks, Cory; Rogier, Rachel
Subject: RE: CARE Act

I have another meeting at 4pm, so 2:30pm would work best for me.

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
1104 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 226-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

From: Altmeyer, Thomas [mailto:Thomas.Altmeyer@archcoal.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2013 11:51 AM
To: Hicks, Cory; Buchanan, Melissa; Rogier, Rachel
Subject: RE: CARE Act

Things have gotten a little confused by my email. How about 4:00 PM which would be best for me.

If that doesn’t work, we’ll stick with 2:30 PM.

Please confirm if 4 PM doable or best to do at 2:30 PM

Tom Altmeyer
Arch Coal
O 202-333-4268
M 202-321-0060

From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2013 11:36 AM
To: Altmeyer, Thomas; Buchanan, Melissa; Rogler, Rachel  
Subject: RE: CARE Act

3:30 works for me and I think it works for Melissa as well. Thanks for being flexible-just didn't want you to be waiting on me if I get stuck at this lunch longer than an hour.

From: Altmeyer, Thomas [mailto:thomas.altmeyer@archcoal.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2013 11:09 AM  
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Rogler, Rachel  
Cc: Hicks, Cory  
Subject: RE: CARE Act

Rachel. Please see if Rothfus person can do 2 PM. I need move the Whitfield staff meeting to 2:30 PM.

In the alternative, I could also do 3:30 PM.

Tom Altmeyer
Arch Coal  
O 202 533-  
M 202 931- 

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2013 10:59 AM  
To: Altmeyer, Thomas; Hicks, Cory  
Subject: RE: CARE Act

To ensure that Cory has time to make it back to the office for this meeting, would it be possible to push back until 2:30 pm?

Thanks,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan  
Legislative Assistant  
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)  
2184 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
Phone: (202) 225-3133  
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

From: Altmeyer, Thomas [mailto:thomas.altmeyer@archcoal.com]  
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 12:14 PM  
To: Hicks, Cory  
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa  
Subject: RE: CARE Act

See you then
From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 12:14 PM
To: Altmeyer, Thomas
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: CARE Act/

Yes. I have a lunch starting at 1, but should be back by 2 or a little after. Melissa is available at 2 as well.

From: Altmeyer, Thomas [mailto:altmeyer.Barco@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 12:10 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: CARE Act/

Could I come by at 2 PM tomorrow to explain why?

From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 11:57 AM
To: Altmeyer, Thomas
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: CARE Act/

We're trying to figure out how it screws Arch. Can you help explain? We're caught in a very difficult spot because we have several mines out of a job with benefits in jeopardy resulting from the Patriot bankruptcy. The Chairman feels the need to do something.

From: Altmeyer, Thomas [mailto:altmeyer.Barco@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 11:54 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: CARE Act/

Heard that Hal Hall and UMWA are trying to get members on. It screws Arch coal.

When could I come in and see the Chairman to explain why.

***Email Disclaimer: The information contained in this e-mail, and in any accompanying documents, may constitute confidential and/or legally privileged information. The information is intended only for use by the designated recipient. If you are not the intended recipient (or responsible for delivery of the message to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance on this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message from your system.
How about Noon.

David Starr and I would be there/Steve would be on by phone. Would help if we could do in Cory or Chris's office to facilitate our calling Steve.

Steve. What would be the best # to call you.

-----Original Message-----
From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 4:13 PM
To: Altmeier, Thomas
Cc: Steven Hart (@wms-jen.com); Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Patriot Healthcare Benefits Discussion Draft Bill

Hi Tom,

I would like to go ahead and meet with you tomorrow, if you're still available.

Thanks,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2384 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

-----Original Message-----
From: Altmeier, Thomas [mailto:thomas@archconal.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 4:02 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: Steven Hart (@wms-jen.com); Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Patriot Healthcare Benefits Discussion Draft Bill

We will be suggesting changes to the Leg Counsel draft. Should we wait till Monday or meet with you.
Cory is back in Kentucky until next Monday.

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

Will be back to you later today.

Cory. Are you in tomorrow.

Tom Altmeier
Arch Coal
O: 202-334-6400
C: 202-321-2314

On May 30, 2013, at 12:22 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Hi Tom,
> 
> I have a conference call at 2:30pm, but other than that, I am free anytime after 11am.
> 
> Thanks for the quick response.
> 
> Melissa
> 
> Melissa Buchanan
> Legislative Assistant
> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
> 2184 Rayburn House Office Building
> Washington, DC 20515
> Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

---Original Message---
From: Altmeyer, Thomas [mailto:archcoal.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 12:21 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: Steven Hart (jshart@wms-jen.com); Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Patriot Healthcare Benefits Discussion Draft Bill

Melissa. What is a good time for Steve and I to come by tomorrow after 11 am to give you feedback.

Tom Altmeyer
Arch Coal
Q: 202-331
C: 202-321

On May 30, 2013, at 11:16 AM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Hi Steve and Tom,

Attached is the latest discussion draft as prepared by leg counsel (Patriot_002). The attorney at leg counsel did have some questions regarding drafting of the bill, and those are in brackets.

I have also attached the original draft of the bill (Patriot_001) and the edits to it as suggested by UMWA. In the meeting Cory and I had with UMWA last week, we were told that we would not need to transfer the unobligated AML fund balances to the 1993 as we did in the original draft. According to UMWA, changing the requirement for who can receive benefits from the 1993 will automatically increase the contributions made by the companies who pay into the 1993 plan.

Can you please take a look and let me know your thoughts?

Thanks,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
[http://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield][id:image002.png@01CACA7F.D17F7D80]
[http://twitter.com/RepEdWhitfield][id:image003.png@G1CAC6F7.D17F7D80]
[http://www.flickr.com/photos/edwhitefield][id:image004.png@01CACA7F.D17F7D80]
[http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml]
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Buchanan, Melissa

From: Rashid Hallaway <rashid@americanpatriotgroup.com>
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2013 11:50 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Heads Up

That works for me. Please call 202-380-5138 at your convenience.

Rashid Hallaway
Vice President
514 Magnolia Ave
Charlotte, NC 28203
202.380.3839 (work)
202.486.3395 (cell)
202.315.1380 (fax)

From: <Buchanan>, Melissa <melissa.buchanan@mail.house.gov>
Date: Monday, March 18, 2013 11:27 AM
To: Rashid Hallaway <rashid@americanpatriotgroup.com>
Cc: "Hicks, Cory" <cory.hicks@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: Heads Up

Hi Rashid,

Would you have time to do a call with Cory and me at 3pm this afternoon?

'Thank you,
Mellisa

Sent using BlackBerry

From: Rashid Hallaway <rashid@americanpatriotgroup.com>
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2013 04:20 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Heads Up

Hey Melissa,

Thanks for your note. I will be in town next Tuesday to Thursday but will be tied up with Steve Chancellor most of the time. I'm really sorry but likely won't be able to swing by the office.

App. 7.000053
Could we catch up by phone on Monday? I’m wide open Monday afternoon if you have time.

Thanks for reaching out.

RH

Rashid Hallaway
Vice President
514 Magnolia Ave
Charlotte, NC 28203
202.380 [work]
202.486 [cell]
202.315.3180 [fax]

From: <Buchanan>, Melissa <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov>
Date: Friday, March 15, 2013 9:30 AM
To: Rashid Hallaway <Rashid.Hallaway@edwhitfield.house.gov>
Cc: “Hicks, Cory” <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Heads Up

Hi Rashid,

Would you be available to meet with Cory and me sometime next week regarding Congressman Rahall’s CARE Act (HR 980)?

Thanks,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3315
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2013 9:34 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: FW: Heads Up
From: Rashid Hallaway  
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2013 06:58 PM  
To: Hicks, Cory  
Subject: Heads Up  

Patriot Coal Files Motion With The Bankruptcy Court To Modify Collective Bargaining Agreements And Retiree Healthcare Benefits; Company Also Files Lawsuit Against Peabody Energy  

ST. LOUIS, March 14, 2013 /PRNewswire/ -- Patriot Coal Corporation (OTC: PCKCQ) today filed a motion with the Bankruptcy Court in St. Louis seeking to modify collective bargaining agreements with the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA). Patriot is filing this motion now to obtain critical financial relief in a timeframe that avoids severe business disruption. The proposed modifications include the establishment of a Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Association (VEBA) trust to provide healthcare for UMWA-represented retirees, as well as changes to wages, benefits and work rules for UMWA-represented employees. This filing follows more than four months of negotiations between representatives of Patriot subsidiaries and the UMWA. The Company is committed to continuing efforts to reach a consensual agreement while this motion is addressed by the court. Also today, Patriot filed an initial lawsuit against Peabody Energy Corporation (Peabody) to ensure that Peabody does not attempt to use Patriot’s bankruptcy to escape Peabody’s own healthcare obligations to certain retirees.

"The actions we have taken today are necessary for the survival of Patriot and the preservation of more than 4,000 jobs. Without the cost relief we are seeking, all of these jobs will be lost and it will no longer be possible to provide healthcare for more than 23,000 employees, retirees and their dependents. Our labor and retiree benefit costs have risen to levels that simply cannot be sustained given the challenges facing the Company and our industry," stated Patriot President and Chief Executive Officer Bennett K. Hatfield. "All of our employees and retirees are being asked to make sacrifices to help Patriot emerge from bankruptcy. These sacrifices include reductions in compensation and benefits for salaried, union and nonunion employees."

"The approval of this motion will be the single most important action necessary to ensure Patriot’s financial viability and successful reorganization," continued Hatfield. "It is critical that we quickly achieve these savings within the timeframe provided by our debtor-in-possession financing."

Patriot’s UMWA labor costs are not competitive with other coal producers that operate under more flexible work rules and a significantly lower labor cost structure. The Company’s proposal seeks to adjust wages, benefits and work rules for its unionized employees to a level consistent with the regional labor market. The Company can no longer afford to pay above-market wages and benefits to its 1,600 union employees as compared to its 1,300 nonunion miners doing exactly the same jobs. As part of the proposal, Patriot intends to offer its union employees the same healthcare benefits it provides to nonunion employees.

Patriot is also seeking to modify its unsustainable payments for UMWA-related retiree healthcare liabilities, which total approximately $1.6 billion. The Company’s proposal would transition certain of its UMWA-related healthcare obligations to a VEBA trust to provide retirees with meaningful long-term healthcare benefits. Funding for the VEBA would consist of: (i) an allowed unsecured claim that will represent a meaningful ownership stake in the reorganized company and could be monetized for significant value, (ii) profit sharing, up to a maximum of $300 million and (iii) an initial cash contribution of $15 million. Patriot would also honor retiree medical obligations incurred prior to July 1, 2012, to allow sufficient time for the VEBA to be established. The VEBA trust would be designed and administered by the UMWA or the UMWA Health and Retirement Funds.
Patriot would continue to provide healthcare for its entire active workforce and their eligible family members, and for more than 2,300 individuals who receive healthcare pursuant to the Coal Industry Retiree Health Benefit Act of 1992 (Coal Act). Patriot spent approximately $14 million on Coal Act liabilities in 2012.

"We very much regret the necessity of these changes to our employees' and retirees' wages and benefits," concluded Hatfield. "However, these actions are necessary for Patriot to become viable and continue to provide more than 4,000 jobs. We believe the alternative of liquidating Patriot would do far greater damage to the employees and retirees who depend on this company."

Also today, Patriot filed a lawsuit against Peabody seeking a declaration from the Bankruptcy Court that any relief Patriot is able to obtain through its motion would not relieve Peabody of its own obligations to certain retirees. In connection with Patriot's 2007 spinoff, Peabody agreed to pay the healthcare costs for thousands of retirees who were employed by Peabody entities that were transferred to Patriot in the spinoff. Patriot believes that Peabody might argue that Patriot's financial condition and unavoidable actions in the Bankruptcy Court will allow Peabody to stop paying for or cut the healthcare of more than 3,000 individuals.

Together with the official committee of unsecured creditors, Patriot continues to investigate potential claims against Peabody. Patriot has filed this initial lawsuit in conjunction with the timing of the Company's retiree healthcare motion filed today.

Patriot's bankruptcy filing in July 2012 resulted from exceptionally weak coal markets, coupled with increasing costs and unsustainable legacy liabilities. Leading up to the filing, coal markets suffered from declining pricing and demand brought on by slowing global economic growth, inexpensive natural gas and heightened regulation of coal-fueled electricity generation. Since the bankruptcy filing coal markets have deteriorated further.

Note: Background of Patriot's restructuring and transformation can be found at the Company's website, www.patriotcoal.com.

About Patriot Coal
Patriot Coal Corporation is a producer and marketer of coal in the eastern United States, with 11 active mining complexes in Appalachia and the Illinois Basin. Patriot ships to domestic and international electricity generators, industrial users and metallurgical coal customers, and controls approximately 1.8 billion tons of proven and probable coal reserves.

Forward-Looking Statements
Certain statements in this press release are forward-looking as defined in the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. These statements involve certain risks and uncertainties that may be beyond our control and may cause our actual future results to differ materially from our current expectations both in connection with the Chapter 11 filings Patriot announced on July 9, 2012 and our business and financial prospects. No assurance can be made that these events will come to fruition. We undertake no obligation (and expressly disclaim any such obligation) to publicly update or revise any forward-looking statement, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise. Factors that could affect our results include, but are not limited to: (i) the ability of Patriot and its subsidiaries to continue as a going concern, (ii) the ability of Patriot and its subsidiaries to operate within the restrictions and liquidity limitations of the post-petition credit facilities authorized by the Bankruptcy Court, (iii) the ability of Patriot and its subsidiaries to obtain Bankruptcy Court approval with respect to motions in the Chapter 11 cases, (iv) the ability of Patriot and its subsidiaries to successfully complete a reorganization under Chapter 11 and emerge from bankruptcy, which is dependent upon, among other things, the ability to implement changes to wage and benefit programs and postretirement benefit obligations consensually or pursuant to Sections 1113 and 1114 of the Bankruptcy Code, to minimize liabilities upon emergence and to obtain post-bankruptcy financing, (v) the effects of the bankruptcy filing on Patriot and its subsidiaries and the interests of various creditors, equity holders and other constituents, (vi)
Bankruptcy Court rulings in the Chapter 11 cases and the outcome of the cases in general, (vii) the length of time Patriot and its subsidiaries will operate under the Chapter 11 cases, (viii) risks associated with third-party motions in the Chapter 11 cases, which may interfere with the ability of Patriot and its subsidiaries to develop one or more plans of reorganization and consummate such plans once they are developed, (ix) the potential adverse effects of the Chapter 11 proceedings on Patriot's liquidity or results of operations, (x) the ability to execute Patriot's business and restructuring plans, (xi) increased legal costs related to Patriot's bankruptcy filing and other litigation, and (xii) the ability of Patriot and its subsidiaries to maintain contracts that are critical to their operation, including to obtain and maintain normal terms with their vendors, customers, landlords, and service providers and to retain key executives, managers, and employees. In the event that the risks disclosed in Patriot's public filings and those discussed above cause results to differ materially from those expressed in Patriot's forward-looking statements, Patriot's business, financial condition, results of operations, or liquidity, and the interests of creditors, equity holders and other constituents, could be materially adversely affected. For additional information concerning factors that could cause actual results to materially differ from those projected herein, please refer to Patriot's Form 10-K and Form 10-Q reports.

SOURCE Patriot Coal Corporation
Buchanan, Melissa

To meet personally on the CARE Act etc.

Separately, left you a vm. Please call me on NSPS’s for various Industries.

Tom Altmyer
Arch Coal
O: 202-323-——
C: 202-321-——

On Apr 30, 2013, at 12:04 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Thanks, Tom. We heard from Patrick. We'll certainly circle around with all those parties before introducing. We're still waiting on feedback from UMWA.

Cc'ing Emma who can work on a meeting after May the 8th. Can you share a subject?

From: Altmyer, Thomas (mailto:——@archcoal.com)
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2013 11:23 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: Hicks, Cory; Steven Hart (mailto:——@wms-jen.com; ——@wms-jen.com)
Subject: CARE Act variation - medical benefits.

Steve Hart met with Rep. Bill Johnson last Friday and referenced that you are looking at putting something together to address the Patriot miner health benefits for Patriot people covered by the '93 plan.

His Chief, Mike Smullens and LD, Patrick Orth, were also in the meeting.
Steve also met with Tiberi and staff, Brad Bailey, who chairs the Select Revenue Sub on W&M. Since the chairs the sub of Juris, he wouldn't be a likely co-sponsor but Brad should be kept in the loop

Before you introduce anything, I think you should circle back with Adam Tonlinson with Capito with whom we've met and Cory Toth with McKinley. If you agree, please touch base with me before you reach out to them.

Separately, Steve and I would like to come in and personally talk with Chairman Whitfield sometime after the 8th

Tom Altmyer
Arch Coal
M: 202-323-——
O: 202-335-——
***Email Disclaimer: The information contained in this e-mail, and in any accompanying documents, may constitute confidential and/or legally privileged information. The information is intended only for use by the designated recipient. If you are not the intended recipient (or responsible for delivery of the message to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance on this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message from your system.
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Bennett, Tate (McConnell) <Tate.Bennett@mcconnell.senate.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 9:11 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT COAL MINERS' HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Is now a bad time?

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Mellisa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 9:09 AM
To: Bennett, Tate (McConnell)
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT COAL MINERS' HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Hi Tate,

Sure, give me a call anytime. My direct is ______.

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
228 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3315
Fax: (202) 225-9547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Bennett, Tate (McConnell) [mailto:Tate.Bennett@mcconnell.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 8:41 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT COAL MINERS' HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Hey Melissa,

Your favorite topic—Caring for Coal Miners. Do you have a quick second for us to revisit this via phone?

Tate

Elizabeth Tate Bennett
The Office of U.S. Senator Mitch McConnell
Legislative Assistant
Agriculture, Energy & Environment
(202) 224-2541
From: Buchanan, Melissa  [mailto:Mellisa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2013 9:33 AM
To: Bennett, Tate (McConnell)
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Yes, the CARE Act (Rockefeller/Rehail bill) puts the retirees into the 1992 Plan. Only the coal companies who were signatories of that plan pay into it. By putting the retirees into the 1992 Plan, they are making Peabody and Arch directly liable for the retiree benefits. We felt their liability in Patriot’s collapse should be settled in the courts (there are several pending lawsuits on the issue) not by changing the law retroactively. The CARE Act also transfers all of the unobligated interest from AML Funds to the UMWA pension plan (which along with the teamsters is on the verge of going under). The UMWA pension plan has been in bad shape for awhile. The original version of the CARE Act only dealt with the pension issue. However, my boss sees the pension issues as separate from the healthcare benefits and unrelated to the Patriot Bankruptcy. Although, if Patriot stops paying into the pension fund it could collapse. It’s a bad situation all the way around. Because of so many interested parties (mainly Bob Murray), our bill probably won’t go anywhere without pension fix language. I’ve been working on this issue since last year. The most difficult challenge I’ve had is there isn’t anyone around (except Jim Zola, Rehail’s CoS) who worked on this issue the last time around. Everyone who did now works for one of the coal companies or UMWA, and their information is always biased. CRS and Leg Counsel aren’t familiar with the issue either. Please let me know if I can help you, and I will try to answer any questions you have.

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2344 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3135
Fax: (202) 225-3347

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Bennett, Tate (McConnell)  [mailto:Tate.Bennett@senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2013 9:22 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Gotcha. The Rockefeller bill does touch the pension issue (makes them tax exempt right?) and is not the Senate counterpart, correct? It (Rockefeller bill) incorporates the 1992 Benefit Plan as well.

From: Buchanan, Melissa  [mailto:Mellisa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2013 9:18 AM
To: Bennett, Tate (McConnell)
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Hi Tate,
I don’t have a dear colleague on the bill. A copy of the bill is attached. I will begin by saying that this is the most complicated issue. Basically, it would make those retirees who may lose their health benefits due to Patriot’s bankruptcy eligible for UMWA’s 1993 Benefit Plan. Per the bankruptcy court’s ruling, Patriot is able to transition retirees into a VERA to pay benefits at a reduced rate. In our bill, benefits paid by the 1993 Plan would only be a supplement to those from the VERA, so that retirees receive benefits at the rate promised but also prevent retirees from receiving double benefits. Also, we did not touch the UMWA pension issues in our bill. My boss doesn’t really want to get into that fight just yet. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Libell, Mark (Rockefeller) <Mark_Libell@rockefeller.senate.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 2:02 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: coal industry retiree issues

Works well, what's your office #?

---

From: Hicks, Cory <mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 1:24 PM
To: Libell, Mark (Rockefeller)
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: coal industry retiree issues

Monday afternoon works. Should we say 3?

---

From: Libell, Mark (Rockefeller) <mailto:Mark.Libell@rockefeller.senate.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 12:28 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: coal industry retiree issues

Thanks Cory, and completely understand the need for you guys to keep your focus to health only. We think positive action on the health side will only help us with our other effort on the pension issues down the road.

I'm out of the country tomorrow and Friday, so how's your Monday afternoon?

---

From: Hicks, Cory <mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 9:27 AM
To: Libell, Mark (Rockefeller)
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: coal Industry retiree issues

Mark, thanks again for reaching out. I've cc'ing Melissa who has been working on this issue in more detail. We're interested in your views on the topic and seeing what we can work out. Just so you know before making the trip over, we're only interested in working on the health challenges, since that is the most pressing issue that our constituents have as a result of the Patriot bankruptcy. We understand that there are long-term challenges with the pension plan, but my boss is not interested in addressing that issue in conjunction with the Patriot bankruptcy at this time.

Melissa and I are available later this week or early next. Let me know what works for you.

Cory Hicks
Chief of Staff
Chairman Ed Whitfield
202-225-3135

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
http://whitfield.house.gov

From: Libell, Mark (Rockefeller) [mailto:Mark.Libell@rockefeller.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 10, 2013 10:09 AM
To: Nicks, Cory
Subject: coal industry retiree issues

Cory, we worked together several years ago back in my Bart Gordon days on energy issues. Hope all’s well for you.

I’m wondering if you’d have a few minutes in the next couple of weeks for me to bring a couple of my leg folks over to talk to you and your relevant folks about the coal retiree health and pension challenges. We’ve been told you’ll are taking a look at this given your constituency, and wanted to offer to help you in whatever way possible and talk strategy going forward.

Thanks for any time you guys can spare.

Mark

Mark Libell
Legislative Director
United States Senator John D. Rockefeller IV (WV)
202-224-6472
All,

With respect to whether Congress can insure that the Patriot retirees are eligible for benefits from the 1993 Plan, the answer appears to be yes, as shown by what happened in 2006 (leaving aside the Constitutionality of such action).

In 2006, as part of the efforts to shore up the 1993 Plan with transfers of federal money, Congress also required all employers who were contributing to the 1993 Plan as of December 20, 2006, to continuing contributing, at the same rate, through December 31, 2010. See 30 USC 1232(h)(5)(B)(ii). Congress also added enforcement provisions for that obligation to Sections 9707(a)(2) and 9721 of the Coal Act.

Accordingly, while it certainly would be unusual, there is precedent by which Congress could require BCWA and the UMWA to treat the Patriot retirees as eligible for the 1993 Plan.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney, P.C.
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street, 20th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Phone: (412) 562- 
Fax: (412) 562-1041
Mobile: (412) 855- 
@bjinc.com

From: Altmeier, Thomas [mailto:altmeier@archcoal.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 3:32 PM
To: Jones, Bob; Stone, Deck; David A; Starr; Lauren; David
Cc: Kofmamy, Mike
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Bob. The Congress can still legislate changes by modifying '06 Act. See second bullet on third page of attached.

Davids. Would you agree?

From: Jones, Bob
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 2:52 PM
To: Altmyer, Thomas; Stone, Deck
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Since the 1993 Plan is under the NBCWA (not the Coal Act) and the terms and conditions are determined by collective bargaining, how can congress change the eligibility criteria for the 93 Plan?

Robert G. Jones
Senior Vice President – General Counsel, Secretary & Chief Compliance Officer
Arch Coal, Inc.
314-994
archoal.com

From: Altmyer, Thomas
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 1:37 PM
To: Steven Hart; David A. Starr
Cc: Stone, Deck; Jones, Rob; Kafoury, Mike; (redacted)
Subject: FW: WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

We are in regular contact with Cory and Melissa. I will be with Whitfield tonight as well as McKinley, who at present, hasn’t settled on what he will do. Capito is looking to do something on the health benefits and hasn’t ruled out also addressing pensions. I am talking with them regularly.

Capito staff asked me whether Arch would oppose the CARE Act if the transfer of Patriot retirees to the ’92 plan was eliminated from the legislation. How should we answer that or should we not answer the question which, at this point, I would recommend. I’ve have told them that the transfer to the ’92 plan is by far and away our biggest concern, however I did not say we would not be opposed. Capito and Whitfield staff are talking and as well as McKinley’s staff. Recommend giving it a few days to see what evolves.

Advice please

From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 2:05 PM
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: FW: WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

I realize this is a challenging and complicated issue. You’re feedback is appreciated. Please feel free to contact Melissa Buchanan (cc’d to this email) who is running point on this issue.

From: Pack, Chris
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 1:53 PM
To: Pack, Chris
Subject: WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Tuesday, June 04, 2013

CONTACT: Chris Pack
(202) 225-3315

WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS' HEALTH CARE BENEFITS


"It is critical that we protect the health care benefits of the thousands of Kentucky miners who have worked hard their entire careers to earn those benefits," stated Whitfield. "That is why I am considering legislative options to ensure that the hardworking miners who took to the mines day in and day out don’t lose the health care that they have rightfully earned."

The Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection that Patriot filed in July 2012 may impact the health care benefits of roughly 1,500 people and their families in Whitfield’s district. They claim that they will not be able to emerge from bankruptcy without significant changes to retiree health care obligations. As a result, a bankruptcy court recently ruled that Patriot Coal is authorized to transition retirees into a Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Association (VEBA).

Since it is expected that the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) will appeal the court’s ruling, there is uncertainty regarding the solvency and availability of the VEBA. Whitfield's legislation addresses this issue by making miners in danger of losing their health care benefits due to Patriot Coal’s bankruptcy eligible for UMWA’s 1993 Benefits Plan.

Whitfield acknowledges that there are challenges with retirees’ pensions, but the most immediate concern is the availability of health care benefits, which is why he is taking this immediate step.

"Protecting the health care benefits is just the first step in what may very well amount to a multifaceted process," concluded Whitfield.


Editor’s Note: Whitfield’s discussion draft is attached.

***Email Disclaimer: The information contained in this e-mail, and in any accompanying documents, may constitute confidential and/or legally privileged information. The information is intended only for use by the designated recipient. If you are not the intended recipient (or responsible for delivery of the message to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance on this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message from your system.***
Hicks, Cory

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 2:29 PM
To: Heystauf, Emma
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: FW: McKinley Bill
Importance: High

Can you add a meeting to my calendar and Cory’s calendar with John Wadsworth and Matt Smith for Monday, July 7 at 2:30pm? The meeting is on the UMWA pension and healthcare issue. John’s phone number is 202-320-4888.

Thanks

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3313
Fax: (202) 225-5547

Fellow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Pope, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2014 3:32 PM
To: Hicks, Cory; Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: McKinley Bill
Importance: High

Had a call this afternoon from John Wadsworth. He and his partner Matt Smith own Atlas Advocacy a bipartisan consulting firm. They are working for the United Mine Workers to move the McKinley Bill. John’s partner, Matt Smith was Associate Director for the White House Public Liaison Office during the Bush Admin.

John said they are working with Senator Ron Wyden, Chair of the Senate Finance Committee to attach the McKinley Bill language to the Highway Trust Fund Bill that will move in the Senate. Bob Murray is also actively involved with them on this. John asked if we had any influence with Senator McConnell’s staff to encourage them to ask Senator McConnell to weigh in or reach out to Senator Orin Hatch who is the ranking member of the Committee to let him know that this language is vitally important to many retired coal miners. I told John that I would contact McConnell’s State Director Terry Carmack and that I would ask for your guidance with McConnell’s DC staff. He said they are getting somewhat mixed signals from McConnell’s DC staff and that they are not trying to push Senator McConnell to do something that he is uncomfortable with but rather see what it is that he might be willing to do to help behind the scenes to move this along.

John Wadsworth’s phone number is: 202-320

Michael Pope, District Director
4.) UMWA has NEVER helped us when we needed it. We asked them to testify on several occasions last Congress and every time they said no despite having the same position as us.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Hicks, Cory 
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 10:15 AM 
To: Buchanan, Melissa 
Subject: Re: UMWA 

I think there are three things EW needs to understand. There maybe others.

1.) Pension isn't our immediate problem. 
2.) Attacking Peabody and Arch isn't our battle and won't help a bill pass 
3.) Rahall bill will never pass the House, which is why our bill is narrowed to the specific problem. We're confident we can get several republicans on our bill.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Buchanan, Melissa 
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 10:08 AM 
To: Hicks, Cory 
Subject: RE: UMWA 

Okay, I will work on it.

Melissa Buchanan 
Legislative Assistant 
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01) 
2184 Rayburn House Office Building 
Washington, DC 20515 
Phone: (202) 225-3125 
Fax: (202) 225-3547 
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web: 

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

-----Original Message----- 
From: Hicks, Cory 
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 10:08 AM 
To: Buchanan, Melissa 
Subject: Re: UMWA
Yes. You should prepare a one pager on why the Rahall bill won’t move and why the Peabody/Arch battle isn’t our fight and won’t move either.

----- Original Message -----  
From: Buchanan, Melissa  
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 09:59 AM  
To: Hicks, Cory  
Subject: RE: UMWA

Are they coming to talk about our bill?

Melissa Buchanan  
Legislative Assistant  
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)  
2384 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
Phone: (202) 225-3155  
Fax: (202) 225-3547  
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

----- Original Message -----  
From: Hicks, Cory  
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 9:58 AM  
To: Heydlauff, Emma  
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa; Pape, Michael  
Subject: UMWA

Please set up a meeting with Bill at UMWA to discuss pension bill next week. Melissa has contact info. Let us know when the date is set. Thanks
Hicks, Cory

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2013 11:02 AM
To: Pape, Michael
Subject: RE: UMWA/CARE Act

How should we respond to Bill’s email? I don’t think we need another meeting with them because they are just going to try to persuade us to cosponsor the Rahall bill.

From: Pape, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2013 11:01 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: UMWA/CARE Act

Wayne Thompson just went to the International Union meeting in St. Louis yesterday. I sure something will be forthcoming.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2013 09:47 AM
To: Pape, Michael
Subject: Fw: UMWA/CARE Act

?? I thought there was a memo coming?

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2013 09:32 AM
To: Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: FW: UMWA/CARE Act

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Bill Benig [mailto:benig@umwa.org]
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2013 9:33 AM

1

App. 7.000073
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: Steve Earle; Adam Banig
Subject: UMWA/CARE Act

Melissa,

I am following up on a meeting that a couple of my Local Union Presidents had with Mr. Whitfield last weekend about the CARE Act. Mr. Whitfield requested that we come in to meet again. He indicated that he had additional questions concerning the legislation. Please let me know when a good time would be for us to come in to meet with him.

Bill Banig
Director of Governmental Affairs
United Mine Workers of America
(W) 703-246-2846
(C) 202-302-2451
(P) 703-291-2451

The information contained in this e-mail message is confidential and is intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.
---Original Message-----
From: Bill Banig [mailto:banig@umwa.org]
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 5:45 PM
To: Toth, Cory; Tomlinson, Adam
Cc: Hicks, Cory; Adam Banig; Ron Airhart
Subject: Whitfield bill

Guys,

I heard your bosses are going to co-sponsor the Whitfield Caring for Coal Miner Act. Could you confirm this?

Also do you have time Wednesday or Thursday for us to come in to go over the number of people and the available funds.

Sent from my iPhone
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Pape, Michael
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 11:08 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal

Thanks!

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----  
From: Buchanan, Melissa  
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:41 PM  
To: Pape, Michael; Hicks, Cory  
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal

I will let you all know as soon as I hear.

Sent using BlackBerry

----- Original Message -----  
From: Pape, Michael  
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:38 PM  
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Hicks, Cory  
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal

It will be interesting to see what they have arrived at tomorrow.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----  
From: Buchanan, Melissa  
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:35 PM  
To: Pape, Michael; Hicks, Cory  
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal

Peabody is unhappy, but they are a different company. Patriot is suing Peabody, for spinning off all the retiree obligations when Peabody created Patroit, claiming they set up the company to fail. Its a bad situation overall and much better for everyone if Patriot and UMWA can work out a deal.

Sent using BlackBerry

----- Original Message -----  
From: Pape, Michael  
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:26 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal

I thought Peabody was unhappy with the legislation. Well in any case perhaps it is a temp resolution.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Buchanan, Melissa 
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:24 PM 
To: Pape, Michael; Hicks, Cory 
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal 

None of the introduced bills really had much effect on Patriot. This probably had more to do with UMWA's bankruptcy decision appeal and the other pending lawsuits. 

Sent using BlackBerry 

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Pape, Michael 
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:15 PM 
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Hicks, Cory 
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal 

I doubt they have worked out a permanent solution. Probably both sides agreeing to short term solution to meet immediate needs. Patriot is probably hoping it will soften legislators stance for a legislative fix and buy them time. Cecil is probably concerned that our fix won't come soon enough to meet current healthcare needs of miners and families. 

Sent from Michael Pape's Ipad

On Aug 11, 2013, at 9:05 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> I don't know. Hopefully it means they have worked out a solution themselves, and there won't be a need for a legislative fix. I don't have any details and won't know anything until tomorrow.
> 
> Sent using BlackBerry 
> 
> 
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: Pape, Michael 
> Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 09:59 PM 
> To: Buchanan, Melissa 
> Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal 
>
> Ok, thanks! How does that impact what we are doing?
> 
> Sent from Michael Pape's Ipad
>
> On Aug 11, 2013, at 8:56 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:
> Sorry, he is the government affairs person with Patriot. He works for Ben Hatfield, the CEO at Patriot. He has met with EW several times.
> ________________________________
> >> Sent using BlackBerry
> >>
> >> --- Original Message ---
> >> From: Pape, Michael
> >> Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 09:53 PM
> >> To: Buchanan, Melissa
> >> Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal
> >>
> >> Who is Rashid?
> >>
> >> Sent from Michael Pape's iPad
> >>
> >> On Aug 13, 2013, at 8:52 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:
> >>
> >> Good Evening Sir,
> >>
> >>> I apologize for the Sunday night email.
> >>> I talked to Rashid earlier tonight. He said that Ben Hatfield and Cecil Roberts reached a 5 year deal tonight regarding benefits for the retirees. The announcement will be made tomorrow morning. Also, UMWA is holding rallies in Charleston, WV and in Henderson, KY on Wednesday to explain the deal to their membership. I will have more details in the morning and will pass them along.
> >>>
> >>> Thank you,
> >>> Melissa
> >>> ________________________________
> >>> Sent using BlackBerry
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Libell, Mark (Rockefeller) <Mark.Libell@rockefeller.senate.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 3:25 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Patrick Bond
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: UMWA healthcare benefits discussion draft

Thanks Melissa! Pat’s out of the country and Greg and I were out late last week, so didn’t want you to think we were ignoring.

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 11:29 AM
To: Libell, Mark (Rockefeller); Bond, Patrick (Rockefeller)
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: UMWA healthcare benefits discussion draft

Hi Mark and Patrick,

Attached is the latest discussion draft for our bill prepared using UMWA’s edits (Patriot_002). The attorney at leg council did have some questions regarding the drafting of the bill. Could you both please take a look and let me know your thoughts? I have also attached the original draft (Patriot_001) of our bill and UMWA’s suggested edits. In the meeting Cory and I had with them on Friday, UMWA said that we did not need to transfer the unobligated AM1 Funds into the 1993 plan. That by simply changing the eligibility requirements for the plan, the contributors would automatically have to pay more money into the plan. Can you please let me know your thoughts?

Thanks,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

App. 7_000079
Melissa— is this possibly a timing rather than drafting issue—i.e., withhold introduction while those negotiations take place? We can give this some thought, but at first blush, it’s difficult to accomplish the safety net you outlined below and not have it become an “out” to UMWA as you outlined unless the benefits provided in the bill are less than what would be provided under the Veba (which is counterproductive to your overarching goal of protecting the miners).
From: Rick Astheim (mailto:rick.astheim@alphar.com)
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 1:08 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Glad to help Melissa – please keep up posted as the draft develops.

Alpha Natural Resources

Rick Astheim
Vice President, Federal Government & External Affairs | Alpha Natural Resources
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 404; Washington, DC 20004
rastheim@alphar.com | www.alphar.com

This transmission is intended by the sender and proper recipient(s) to be confidential and is intended only for the proper recipient(s). It may contain information that is privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you are not an intended recipient, further distribution by you of this message may be prohibited. Please notify the sender of this error and delete the message from your computer. Thank you.

From: Buchanan, Melissa (mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov)
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 3:39 PM
To: Rick Astheim; Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Hi Rick,

This is all really helpful and actually makes sense to me. We certainly appreciate it, and will work on making those changes.

Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3597

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
From: Rick Athhelm [mailto:rick@alpharr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 3:20 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Cory – please see some feedback to each of your points below.

Rick, point #1, that was not our intent, so we will try to fix. I think the best way to fix it is to strike lines 16-21. Do you have a suggestion? We only want to cover employees who may lose benefits as a result of the Patriot bankruptcy- aka our constituents. Agreed that striking lines 16 through 21 of the proposed amendment should suffice, but you might want to double check with Leg. Counsel.

Point #2, this is completely new information, so we’ll have to look into it further. Is this a problem? No, just a fact we thought was worth sharing.

Point #3, if the VEOA stays (which as you know is being challenged), the 1993 plan will supplement the VEOA to fulfill the employees benefits. If you can help us clarify this intent, that would be helpful. To avoid individuals receiving “extra” benefits as a result of the VEOA, Leg. Counsel should be able to draft language that would clarify that if an individual receives benefits from another (federal) source, like a VEOA, such payments would be a 100% offset to any payments under these provisions.

Make sense?

---

Rick Athhelm
Vice President, Federal Government & External Affairs | Alpha Natural Resources
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 404; Washington, DC 20004
rick@alpharr.com | www.alpharr.com

This transmission is intended by the sender and proper recipient(s) to be confidential and is intended only for the proper recipient(s). It may contain information that is privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you are not an intended recipient, further distribution by you of this message may be prohibited. Please notify the sender of this error and delete the message from your computer. Thank you.

---

From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 2:52 PM
To: Rick Athhelm
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Rick, point #3, that was not our intent, so we will try to fix. I think the best way to fix it is to strike lines 16-21. Do you have a suggestion? We only want to cover employees who may lose benefits as a result of the Patriot bankruptcy- aka our constituents.

Point #2, this is completely new information, so we’ll have to look into it further. Is this a problem?

Point #3, if the VEOA stays (which as you know is being challenged), the 1993 plan will supplement the VEOA to fulfill the employees benefits. If you can help us clarify this intent, that would be helpful.

App. 7_000082
Thanks,

Cory and Melissa

From: Rick Astheim  [mailto: Rick.Astheim@alpha.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 2:22 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: WHITTEFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS' HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Cory—

Here’s some more detailed analysis from our counsel:

Currently, only participants who were enrolled in the 1993 Plan before 1/1/07 are eligible for AML transfer money. 3,000 have been enrolled since that date and not eligible for AML Transfer money. The draft appears to make everyone who is enrolled prior to the date of enactment eligible for AML transfer money. This picks up the 3,000, who, by the way, are presently funded by signatory operator's $2.10 per hour worked contribution.

It should also be noted that the 2007 Coal Act amendments said no AML money would be transferred to the 1993 Plan unless all operators signatory to that time agreed in their successor labor agreements to contribute at least $0.50 to the 1993 Plan. Thus, even though under the Whitfield draft the Plan likely would not need the 50 cents per hour going forward, companies would still have to pay it to ensure the flow of AML money. The proposed draft does not purport to address this twist.

Finally, there is some uncertainty in how the proposal would be implemented in view of the fact the same Patriot retirees who would go into the 1993 Plan to be paid from AML transfer money would also be eligible to get benefits from Patriot's VEBAs. The proposed draft does not limit payment from the 1993 Plan to amounts not covered from other sources (such as the VEBAs), so it is unclear how benefits payable from the VEBAs would be coordinated with benefits payable from the 1993 Plan.

Rick Astheim
Vice President, Federal Government & External Affairs | Alpha Natural Resources
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 404 | Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-363-5499 | 800-481-1400 | Fax: 202-285-3478
 RickAstheim@alpha.com | www.alphatub.com

---

From: Hicks, Cory  [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:16 PM
To: Astheim, Rick
CC: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Rec: WHITTEFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

App. 7_000083
Rick, the draft (or at least the intent) is to only pick up the Patriot retirees that would be affected, which is why there is a provision that says "denied benefits because of a 2012 bankruptcy." We think the added employees to the 1993 plan from Patriot could be higher than 3,000. I would be interested in knowing how they calculated that number.

From: Rick Axthelm [mailto: raxthelm@alphar.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 3:56 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS' HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Thanks for sharing the draft Cory.

Melissa – from a quick initial read by our counsel, it appears the bill picks up an additional 3,000 or so folks who become covered by the plan between 2007 and today – in addition to the Patriot retirees. Is that accurate and, if so, intended?

---

Alpha Natural Resources

Rick Axthelm
Vice President, Federal Government & External Affairs | Alpha Natural Resources
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20004

This transmission is intended for the sender and proper recipient(s) to be confidential and is intended only for the proper recipient(s). It may contain information that is privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you are not an intended recipient, further distribution by you of this message may be prohibited. Please notify the sender of this error and delete the message from your computer. Thank you.

From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 2:05 PM
Cc: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

I realize this is a challenging and complicated issue. Your feedback is appreciated. Please feel free to contact Melissa Buchanan (cc'd to this email) who is running point on this issue.

From: Peck, Chris
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 1:53 PM
To: Pack, Chris
Subject: WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Ed Whitfield
WHITFIELD RELEASES DRAFT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT COAL MINERS’ HEALTH CARE BENEFITS


“It is critical that we protect the health care benefits of the thousands of Kentucky miners who have worked hard their entire careers to earn these benefits,” stated Whitfield. “That is why I am considering legislative options to ensure that the hardworking miners who toil to the mines day in and day out don’t lose the health care that they have rightfully earned.”

The Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection that Patriot filed in July 2012 may impact the health care benefits of roughly 1,500 people and their families in Whitfield’s district. They claim that they will not be able to emerge from bankruptcy without significant changes to retiree health care obligations. As a result, a bankruptcy court recently ruled that Patriot Coal is authorized to transition retirees into a Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Association (VEBA).

Since it is expected that the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) will appeal the court’s ruling, there is uncertainty regarding the solvency and availability of the VEBA. Whitfield’s legislation addresses this issue by making miners in danger of losing their health care benefits due to Patriot Coal’s bankruptcy eligible for UMWA’s 1993 Benefit Plan.

Whitfield acknowledges that there are challenges with retirees’ pensions, but the most immediate concern is the availability of health care benefits, which is why he is taking this immediate step.

“Protecting the health care benefits is just the first step in what may very well amount to a multifaceted process,” concluded Whitfield.

###

Editor’s Note: Whitfield’s discussion draft is attached.
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Wheeler, Andrew R. <faegrebd.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 12:35 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Hicks, Cory
Cc: Tomanelli, Luke S. <coolsource.com>
Subject: RE: Pensions

Sounds good.

Original Message---
From: Buchanan, Melissa <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 12:01 PM
To: Wheeler, Andrew R.; Hicks, Cory
Cc: Tomanelli, Luke S.; <coolsource.com>
Subject: RE: Pensions

How about we do the same time, 2:30pm tomorrow afternoon?

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Fellow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

Original Message---
From: Wheeler, Andrew R. <faegrebd.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 11:57 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Tomanelli, Luke S.; <coolsource.com>; Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: Pensions

Tomorrow is better. All I have scheduled is a lunch. What works best for you?

Original Message---
From: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 11:38 AM
To: Wheeler, Andrew R.
Cc: Tomanelli, Luke S.; <coolsource.com>; Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: Pensions

Sorry to do this, but Melissa and I need to be in a meeting at 2:30 with the Congressman. Can we do 1:30 or sometime tomorrow?
---Original Message---
From: Wheeler, Andrew R. (mailto:
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 7:50 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Tomamelli, Luke S.; dac@coalsource.com
Subject: Re: Pensions

Let's say 2:30.

Andrew Wheeler
Principal
FasigReid Consulting
202-317

On Jun 14, 2013, at 6:07 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov><mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>> wrote:

Does 2 or 2:30 work?

From: Wheeler, Andrew R. (mailto:
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 05:22 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: dac@coalsource.com<mailto:dac@coalsource.com>
<mailto:dac@coalsource.com>>
Subject: Re: Pensions

I have a weekly meeting at NIAA at 3:30, I can come be either before or after.

From: Hicks, Cory <mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 4:53 PM
To: Wheeler, Andrew R.
Cc: dac@coalsource.com<mailto:dac@coalsource.com>
Subject: Re: Pensions

Thanks for the feedback. We have a very rough draft of this idea that I proposed to you, which my boss has not agreed to nor does he know anything about. It would transfer by our estimates about 210 million (maybe more with interest) to the pension fund by transferring back funds that were taken away to begin with. However, we're not sure it is drafted properly. This could serve as a bridge until the issue can be dealt with in a larger bill. Can you come meet on Monday?

From: Wheeler, Andrew R. (mailto:
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 04:34 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Mike Carey<mailto:Mike Carey@coalsource.com>
Subject: Pensions

Cory, Mike and I discussed your idea internally with one of the lawyers. The following is our quick reaction. We did not take this to Mr. Murray because we weren't sure if you were still considering it. Therefore it's not an official position. Let us know if you would like us to run this up to him. Thanks and I'm happy to stop by anytime.
"My initial thought is that this is not even a band aid for the 1974 Pension Plan and may deflect attention from the needed long term fix. With that being said, something is better than nothing. As I understand the workings of how AML transfers money to the UMWA Benefit Plans, allocating money to the Pension Plan would not undercut funding of the 1993 Benefit Plan.

If the intention is to allocate what remains of the $490 million annual cap on transfers of AML and General Treasury money after the needs of the Combined Benefit Fund, the 1992 Plan, and the 1993 Plan are satisfied, to prop up the Pension Plan, I can see us supporting it.

Insofar as the remainder of the unused portion of the $490 million is currently used to fund some other need in the federal budget, there is no downside to the coal industry laying first claim to this surplus for the Pension Plan.

The principal risk would be that in the event the entire $490 million is spent each year, there would be no way to "reach back" and claim any of it should there be a shortfall in the amount needed by the UMWA Benefit Plans in some future year."

ANDREW R. WHEELER
PRINCIPAL
faegrebd.com | email: awheeler@faegrebd.com

FAEGRE BD CONSULTING
WWW.FAEGREBD.COM | http://www.faegrebd.com
1050 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 400 | WASHINGTON, DC 20001
You're welcome Melissa.

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 11:54 AM
To: Savage, Hank
Subject: RE: Patriot_002_xml.pdf - Adobe Acrobat Standard

Thank you so much for all of your help on this issue. I know it has been time consuming, and I certainly appreciate your working with me.

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-2547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

From: Savage, Hank
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 11:45 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: Patriot_002_xml.pdf - Adobe Acrobat Standard

Hi Melissa,

Final text is attached. Please let me know the Committees to which the bill is referred.

Hank Savage
Senior Counsel
Office of the Legislative Counsel

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 11:18 AM
To: Savage, Hank
Subject: FW: Patriot_002_xml.pdf - Adobe Acrobat Standard
Hi Hank,

This looks great. I just showed the bill to my boss, and he is happy with the changes. He would like to keep the language in brackets, but have it say "for health benefits" to be consistent with the rest of the bill. Also, we are going to introduce the bill this afternoon, so please remove the "discussion draft" header.

Thank you,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2384 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

From: Savage, Hank
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 10:56 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: Patriot_002_xml.pdf - Adobe Acrobat Standard

Melissa,

Revised text is attached. In it I clarified the new language by creation and use of 2 definitions. However, there is one further clarification that I think is needed, in brackets:

Hank Savage
Senior Counsel
Office of the Legislative Counsel

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2013 1:58 PM
To: Savage, Hank
Subject: RE: Patriot_002_xml.pdf - Adobe Acrobat Standard

Hi Hank,

Just when I thought this bill was ready, I’ve received some feedback from UMWA. They have concerns that the "duplication of benefits" language at the end of the bill could be misinterpreted as to deny supplementary benefits from the 1993 Plan. They have suggested instead using something like the language below. Would this work? I also attached a copy of the last version you prepared.

App. 7.0000090
Thank you,
Melissa

(b) LIMITATION ON DUPLICATION OF BENEFITS.—
For any person eligible in both the plan referred to in Section 402(h)(C) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1252(h)(C)) and a Voluntary Employees’ Beneficiary Association (VEBA) established pursuant to the Order entered May 29, 2013, by the Court in the case In re: Patriot Coal Corporation (Case No. 12-51502, Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Missouri), the amount made available as a result of the enactment of this Act shall be reduced by the amount of any benefits actually paid by such VEBA to or on behalf of such person so that no such person will receive a greater benefit than would have been payable prior to the establishment of the VEBA.

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Savage, Hank
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2013 12:25 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: Patriot_002_xml.pdf - Adobe Acrobat Standard

Melissa,

Final text is attached.

Hank Savage
Senior Counsel
Office of the Legislative Counsel
tel: 542-3523
fax 542-3537

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2013 5:23 PM
To: Savage, Hank
Subject: RE: Patriot_002_xml.pdf - Adobe Acrobat Standard

Hi Hank,
This looks great! I think this is the case number that you need to use:
Patterson Coal bankruptcy case [In re: Patterson Coal Corporation; Case No. 12-51502]
http://pattersoncaseinformation.com/index.php

Also, we came up with a short title. “Caring for Coal Miners Act.”

Could you please prepare this so that my boss can introduce?

Thank you so much,
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Birch, Debra On Behalf Of Savage, Hank
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2013 4:27 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Cc: Savage, Hank
Subject: Pattern_002_xml.pdf - Adobe Acrobat Standard
Buchanan, Melissa

From: Tomlinson, Adam
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 4:46 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: RE: UMWA/Patriot Health Benefits Bill

Melissa,

Please add Mrs. Capito,

Thanks

Adam Tomlinson
Legislative Director
Rep. Shelley Moore Capito
202-225-2711

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 12:02 PM
To: Sarley, Chris; Frederick, Robert; Cunningham, Ryan; Orth, Patrick; Isakovic, Jason
Cc: Toth, Cary; Tomlinson, Adam
Subject: UMWA/Patriot Health Benefits Bill

Hi All,

Attached is the final language for Congressman Whitfield’s UMWA healthcare benefits bill. This bill will put the retirees affected by the Patriot Bankruptcy into the 1993 Plan, but clarifies that if a Veba is established, retirees cannot receive duplicative benefits from both. The 1993 plan will only be a supplement to Veba benefits to ensure the retirees receive the benefits they were promised. Congressman Whitfield is going to introduce this bill today, and I know it is short notice, but we would love to have your boss’ support. Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3315
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.
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Buchanan, Melissa

From: Bennett, Tate (McConeilli) <Tate_Bennett@mcconell.senate.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 2:31 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa 
Subject: RE: jobs/Patriot

Thanks. And thanks for your patience with all my questions!

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]  
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 2:25 PM 
To: Bennett, Tate (McConeilli)  
Subject: RE: jobs/Patriot

Yes, and while they haven't come out really in support, they are much happier with this bill than with the 
(Rockefeller/Rahall) CARE Act. I did work a lot with Tom Altmeier from Arch, but we didn't hear much from Peabody 
when we were working on the bill.

Melissa Buchanan 
Legislative Assistant  
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01) 
2184 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
Phone: (202) 225-3315  
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web: 
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Bennett, Tate (McConeilli) <mailto:Tate_Bennett@mcconell.senate.gov> 
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 1:53 PM 
To: Buchanan, Melissa  
Subject: RE: jobs/Patriot

Got it. Thanks. And Peabody/Arch — have you talked to them since introducing the bill? I'd imagine they were fine 
because they aren't on the hook...

From: Buchanan, Melissa [mailto:Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov]  
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 1:51 PM 
To: Bennett, Tate (McConeilli)  
Subject: RE: jobs/Patriot

A lot of most of them never worked for Patriot. They retired from Peabody, Arch, or one of the other legacies that 
Peabody spun off when they created Patriot.

Melissa Buchanan  
Legislative Assistant  
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01) 
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
From: Bennett, Tate (McConnell) [mailto:Tate.Bennett@mcsen.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 1:47 AM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: jobs/Patriot

Last question- promise.

Do you know where this info came from? Looking for Patriot’s footprint as far as employment in the state/ stats on who is affected by the bankruptcy.

Thanks!

Tate

The Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection that Patriot filed in July 2012 may impact the health care benefits of roughly 1,500 people and their families in Whiffield’s district. They claim that they will not be able to emerge from bankruptcy without significant changes to retiree health care obligations. As a result, a bankruptcy court recently ruled that Patriot Coal is authorized to transition retirees into a Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Association (VEBA).

Elizabeth Tate Bennett
The Office of U.S. Senator Mitch McConnell
Legislative Assistant
Agriculture, Energy & Environment
(202) 224-2541
Hicks, Cory

From: Pape, Michael
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 11:08 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal

Thanks!

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Buchanan, Melissa 
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:41 PM 
To: Pape, Michael; Hicks, Cory 
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal 

I will let you all know as soon as I hear. 

Sent using BlackBerry

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Pape, Michael 
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:38 PM 
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Hicks, Cory 
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal 

It will be interesting to see what they have arrived at tomorrow. 

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld 

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Buchanan, Melissa 
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:35 PM 
To: Pape, Michael; Hicks, Cory 
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal 

Peabody is unhappy, but they are a different company. Patriot is suing Peabody, for spinning off all the retiree obligations when Peabody created Patriot, claiming they set up the company to fail. It's a bad situation overall and much better for everyone if Patriot and UMWA can work out a deal.

Sent using BlackBerry

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Pape, Michael 
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:26 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal

I thought Peabody was unhappy with the legislation. Well in any case perhaps is it a temp resolution.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----  
From: Buchanan, Melissa  
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:24 PM  
To: Pape, Michael; Hicks, Cory  
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal

None of the introduced bills really had much effect on Patriot. This probably had more to do with UMWA's bankruptcy decision appeal and the other pending lawsuits.

Sent using BlackBerry

----- Original Message -----  
From: Pape, Michael  
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 10:15 PM  
To: Buchanan, Melissa; Hicks, Cory  
Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal

I doubt they have worked out a permanent solution. Probably both sides agreeing to short term solution to meet immediate needs. Patriot is probably hoping it will soften legislators stance for a legislative fix and buy them time. Cecil is probably concerned that our leg fix won't come soon enough to meet current health care needs of miners and families.

Sent from Michael Pape's iPad

On Aug 11, 2013, at 9:05 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> I don't know. Hopefully it means they have worked out a solution themselves, and there won't be a need for a legislative fix. I don't have any details and won't know anything until tomorrow.
> 
> Sent using BlackBerry
> 
> "----- Original Message -----  
> From: Pape, Michael  
> Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 09:59 PM  
> To: Buchanan, Melissa  
> Subject: Re: Patriot/UMWA deal
> "
> Ok, thanks! How does that impact what we are doing?
> "
> Sent from Michael Pape's iPad
> "
> On Aug 11, 2013, at 8:56 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:
Sorry, he is the government affairs person with Patriot. He works for Ben Hatfield, the CEO at Patriot. He has met with EW several times.

--- Original Message ----- 
From: Pape, Michael
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 09:53 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: re: Patriot/UMWA deal

Who is Rashid?

Sent from Michael Pape’s iPad

On Aug 11, 2013, at 8:52 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Good Evening Sir,

I apologize for the Sunday night email.

I talked to Rashid earlier tonight. He said that Ben Hatfield and Cecil Roberts reached a 5 year deal tonight regarding benefits for the retirees. The announcement will be made tomorrow morning. Also, UMWA is holding rallies in Charleston, WV and in Henderson, KY on Wednesday to explain the deal to their membership. I will have more details in the morning and will pass them along.

Thank you,
Melissa

Sent using BlackBerry
Hicks, Cory

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2013 1:48 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Re: UMWA bill

Yes. I think removing the AML piece will work.

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2013 1:46 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: UMWA bill

Do you still want me to meet with Leg Counsel this afternoon? I was going to meet with them to discuss the changes UMWA proposed.

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3115
Fax: (202) 225-5947

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield’s e-newsletter.

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2013 1:46 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa
Subject: Re: UMWA bill

That sounds accurate, but we’ll need to run some traps before we introduce. Can you go ahead and send UMWA’s edits and the first draft to Steve Hart and Tom Altmeier and cc me? You might point out this question and see what they say.

From: Buchanan, Melissa
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2013 1:43 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: UMWA bill

I wanted to just double check with you before my meeting with Leg Counsel this afternoon on the Coal Miners bill. Per our meeting with UMWA, it was my understanding that we don’t need to include language regarding the transfer of excess of AML funds because, if we change the eligibility date to include new miners in the 1993, the amount of money available will automatically increase.

Melissa Buchanan
Legislative Assistant
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
February 24, 2016

VIA COURIER

The Honorable Kenny Marchant
The Honorable Ted Deutsch
The Honorable Barbara Comstock
The Honorable John Carney
Committee on Ethics, U.S. House of Representatives
1015 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6328

Re: Representative Whitfield’s Supplemental Submission to the Investigative Subcommittee

Dear Members of the Investigative Subcommittee:

On March 25, 2015, the Committee on Ethics (“Committee”) voted to establish an Investigative Subcommittee (“Subcommittee”) to investigate allegations that Representative Whitfield “failed to prohibit lobbying contacts between his staff and his wife, improperly used his official position for the beneficial interest of himself or his wife, and dispensed special favors or privileges to either his wife, the Humane Society Legislative Fund, or the Humane Society of the United States.”\(^1\)

The Subcommittee’s review of these allegations is the latest phase of an investigation that has spanned more than two years, including a review and referral by the Office of Congressional Ethics (“OCE”) and a discretionary review by the Committees.\(^2\) While the

---


\(^2\) During the course of this investigation, Representative Whitfield’s counsel at McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP and Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP submitted Representative Whitfield’s responses to the OCE and the Committee, respectively. See Letter from Stefan C. Passantino & J. Randolph Evans, McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP, to Omar S. Azzamawy, Chief Counsel, OCE (Feb. 21, 2014); Letter from Beth A. Wilkinson, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton &
protracted investigation has been trying for both Representative Whitfield and his wife, Mrs. Constance Harriman, our clients are both genuinely appreciative of the significant time and attention that the Members and staff of the Subcommittee have committed to investigating these allegations and working to bring this matter to a fair conclusion. Our clients especially would like to thank the Members of the Subcommittee for their attentiveness and participation in our clients’ lengthy interviews with the Subcommittee in early January.

Although the investigations by the OCE and the Committee covered a lot of ground and involved examination of numerous witnesses and thousands of documents, the Subcommittee’s assessment of this case ultimately distills down to the examination of several primary themes that run through the relevant facts and circumstances. These themes all revolve around our clients’ understanding of permissible conduct under the ethics rules and the question of whether Representative Whitfield considered his wife to be lobbying him or his staff when she was acting in support of the Prevent All Soring Tactics (“FAST”) Act and other animal welfare legislation. While these themes all came through very clearly in our clients’ interviews, we think it is important to your deliberations that we highlight them for you in this submission and demonstrate how they are fully supported by the factual and testimonial record.

In order to adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation, the Subcommittee first must find that there is “substantial reason to believe” that Representative Whitfield committed a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or other relevant ethical provision. There is no evidence in the record before the Subcommittee that Representative Whitfield intentionally violated the Code of Official Conduct or any other relevant ethical provision by failing to prohibit lobbying contacts between his staff and his wife, by improperly using his official position for the beneficial interest of himself or his wife, or by dispensing special favors or privileges to either his wife or her employers, the Humane Society of the United States (“Humane Society”) and the Humane Society Legislative Fund (“HSLF”). We submit that an objective assessment of the following themes and their supporting record will clearly demonstrate that a Statement of Alleged Violation is not warranted in this case.

Garrison LLP, to Thomas A. Rust, Chief Counsel & Staff Dir., Comm. on Ethics (Jul. 31, 2014). This letter supplements Representative Whitfield’s responses to the OCE and the Committee.


2 Mrs. Harriman began working for the Humane Society in 2007. She became a registered lobbyist in 2011 and transferred to the payroll of HSLF in October 2011. (Tr. of Interview of Constance Harriman 7:17-21, 11:2-3, Jan. 6, 2016.)
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1. Representative Whitfield did not consider Mrs. Harriman’s engagement with him and his staff to be lobbying because his interests in animal welfare were completely aligned with hers and, therefore, she never needed—and never attempted—to influence him or his staff.

Representative Whitfield and Mrs. Harriman understood that, as a registered lobbyist, Mrs. Harriman could not lobby Representative Whitfield and his staff. (Tr. of Interview of Representative Whitfield 111:14-18, Jan. 7, 2016 [hereinafter Tr. EW]; Tr. of Interview of Constance Harriman 50:4-8, Jan. 6, 2016 [hereinafter Tr. CH].) Although they did not have an in-depth understanding of the Committee’s interpretation of the term “lobbying contact” as defined in the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, both Representative Whitfield and Mrs. Harriman had the common-sense working understanding that “lobbying” was activity that involved some attempt to influence a Member or staff. (Tr. EW 110:17-24, 115:4-7; Tr. CH 15:4-8, 19:10-13.)

Neither Representative Whitfield nor Mrs. Harriman considered her contacts with his office to be an attempt to influence because their interests in animal welfare legislation—and in the PAST Act in particular—were completely aligned. (Tr. EW 12:13-17; Tr. CH 13:4-20.) The Subcommittee has reviewed thousands of e-mails sent from Mrs. Harriman’s Humane Society e-mail address to Representative Whitfield and his staff, and the Subcommittee staff pointed to several of these e-mails during our clients’ interviews as examples of potentially prohibited lobbying contacts. In response, our clients first explained that it was Mrs. Harriman’s practice—both before and after her employment by the Humane Society and HSLF—to assist and remind her husband and his staff about votes and other steps needed to achieve his legislative objectives. (Tr. EW 41:8-15.) They then demonstrated how every one of those e-mails reflected Mrs. Harriman’s effort to assist her husband with his animal-welfare

---

8 Besides being the widely accepted meaning of the term in common parlance, this understanding that lobbying requires an attempt to influence is supported by the Lobbying Disclosure Act Guidance, which explains that certain communications that do not involve an attempt to influence normally would not be considered a “lobbying contact.” See Lobbying Disclosure Act Guidance 7 (last reviewed Dec. 15, 2014), http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov/ldaguidance.pdf (“If a communication is limited to routine information gathering questions and there is not an attempt to influence a covered official, the exception of Section 3(8)(b)(v) for ‘any other similar administrative request’ would normally apply. In determining whether there is an attempt to influence a covered official, the identity of the person asking the questions and her relationship to the covered official obviously will be important factors.”) (emphasis added).

9 See, e.g., HSLF_OCE_020961; EW4 004776; EW3 001189.
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agenda¹ and not an effort to impose her employer’s agenda on him or his staff.⁸ (Tr. EW 41:21-25.)

The absence of any such intent to influence is further highlighted by the various instances described in the interviews and relevant e-mails when Mrs. Harriman urged her husband and his staff to take positions that were directly contrary to the stated interests of the Humane Society and HSLF. (Tr. EW 45:6-20; Tr. CH 13:21-25.) On one occasion, for example, Mrs. Harriman advised against Representative Whitfield signing on to a bill supported by the Humane Society that would regulate the size of chicken cages because she knew it was opposed by her constituents.⁹ (Tr. EW 34:13-35:23; Tr. CH 77:7-9, 78:24-25.) Similarly, during the PAST Act effort Mrs. Harriman acted in direct opposition to the Humane Society’s interests when she pushed to have the Humane Society excluded from the pool of potential witnesses for a hearing on the PAST Act because she knew that featuring the Humane Society in the hearing would be detrimental to her husband’s efforts to garner additional support.

¹ For example, in an e-mail exchange between Mrs. Harriman and two of Representative Whitfield’s staffers on January 7, 2011—before Mrs. Harriman began lobbying for HSLF in October 2011—she commented on differences between Representative Michael Grimm’s Veteran’s Dog Training Therapy Act and a similar measure her husband had passed the previous year. See HSLF_OCE_020961. Similarly, on December 2, 2011, Mrs. Harriman reminded her husband’s staff about signing on to the “Puppy Mill Bill,” which she knew Representative Whitfield had supported every year. See EW4 004417.

² During our clients’ interviews, the Subcommittee staff identified one document showing a case where Representative Whitfield and Mrs. Harriman’s interests were not completely aligned. See HSLF_OCE_013451. Mrs. Harriman had sent Representative Whitfield’s staff an e-mail reminding them that her husband would be voting for the Peters Amendment, which related to banning certain polar bear imports. See EW4 004776. Mrs. Harriman knew that her husband previously had voted in favor of the measure, consistent with his longstanding concern for polar bear protection. (Tr. EW 24:21-25; Tr. CH 57:1-9.) Unbeknownst to her at the time she wrote this e-mail, Representative Whitfield had been subjected to strong pressure from interest groups and constituents opposed to the amendment and ultimately changed his position and voted against the measure without informing Mrs. Harriman. (Tr. EW 30:9-22.) Thus, as both Representative Whitfield and Mrs. Harriman explained in their interviews, this e-mail was not Mrs. Harriman’s attempt to influence her husband’s vote, but was rather her effort to remind the staff about a vote that she reasonably—although mistakenly—believed her husband would want to make. (Tr. EW 26:1-4, 116:11-22, Tr. CH 58:17-18, 63:11-19.) In light of those explanations, it is clear that this e-mail falls squarely in the “reminder e-mail” category described above and evinces no intent on Mrs. Harriman’s part to influence her husband or his staff.

³ See EW3 001189 (On September 12, 2012, Mrs. Harriman wrote to Representative Whitfield’s staffer, “I just decided to sign on to the Egg Bill. I advised against it...”) (emphasis added).
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Republican cosponsors for the bill.10 (Tr. EW 45:6-20; Tr. CH 83:23-85:17.) Had Mrs. Harriman been acting on behalf of the Humane Society, she would have urged her husband to adopt the Humane Society’s position on these issues, and certainly would not have openly supported positions at odds with its agenda.11

2. Representative Whitfield did not consider Mrs. Harriman’s work with him on the PAST Act and other animal issues to be lobbying for HSLF because he and his wife have shared a commitment to animal welfare issues since they were married in 1990.

Representative Whitfield has supported animal protection causes and legislation for decades, since long before Mrs. Harriman began working for the Humane Society. (Tr. EW 10:23-11:10; Tr. CH 9:22-10:5.) His reputation as “the horse guy” and his track record on animal protection issues are well-known to his colleagues on Capitol Hill.12 (Tr. EW 8:23-24; Tr. CH 9:20-22; Transcript of Interview of Marty Irby 115:24-116:19, Sept. 15, 2015 [hereinafter Tr. MI].) Between the time Representative Whitfield joined Congress in 1995 and the start of Mrs. Harriman’s employment at the Humane Society in 2007, Representative Whitfield sponsored four animal welfare bills and cosponsored another 38 bills related to animal welfare issues, and he gave numerous floor speeches on animal protection issues, including two in May 2004 on the horse sparing issue. Representative Whitfield urged the U.S. Department of Agriculture Office of Inspector General to complete a report on horse sparing, and he cosponsored the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act and secured its passage in the House in 2006.13

10 See, e.g., HSLF_OCE_015499 & HSLF_OCE_015485 (In these e-mails, Mrs. Harriman supported Donna Serranioff as a witness at the PAST Act hearing rather than Keith Duvall, a Humane Society employee. Connie told Representative Whitfield’s Chief of Staff, Rory Hieck, to “Stick to your guns” because “Donna could be a great witness.” She also told him that “[Donna] adds a lot. HSSUS is jealous.”). In another e-mail, Mrs. Harriman explained to other Humane Society employees that “HSSUS is anathema to the majority of Republicans.” HSLF_OCE_012822.

11 It is also worth noting that Representative Whitfield’s score in HSLF’s annual Humane Scorecard of Congress actually declined by 44% during the years that his wife worked for the Humane Society and HSLF—from 85 for the 108th Congress (2003-2004) to 41 for the 113th Congress (2013-2014). (Tr. EW 23:3-8.)

12 See e.g., EW-ISO0005419.


14 See, e.g., EW-ISO0005423.
Similarly, Mrs. Harriman has her own accomplished background and passion for animal protection issues. As Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks at the Department of the Interior, Mrs. Harriman oversaw both the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service and was a key figure in establishing the global ban on the trade in elephant ivory. (Tr. CH 10:6-14.) She is the former Vice Chairman of the Kentucky Horse Racing Authority and a former chair of the Kentucky Equine Drug Research Council, in which positions she led a successful effort to limit the use of medication in horse racing. (Tr. CH 10:15-11:1.) Mrs. Harriman’s experience and track record of effectiveness is precisely the reason she was hired by the Humane Society and HSLF—not to lobby her husband, who was already a staunch supporter of much of the Humane Society’s agenda, but rather to lobby other Republicans, who historically have been somewhat skeptical of the Humane Society. (Tr. EW 33:8-12; Tr. CH 11:5-14.)

Beyond Representative Whitfield and Mrs. Harriman’s distinguished professional careers, animal welfare issues have been a common theme in their marriage and personal commitments. (Tr. EW 8:6-11, 9:10-11; Tr. CH 9:10-12.) Over the past two decades, they routinely have rescued horses from slaughterhouses, picked up abandoned dogs on the side of the road, and helped found, and served together on the board of, the Kentucky Equine Humane Center.15 (Tr. EW 8:12-15; Tr. CH 9:12-15.) It is important to recognize this longstanding, shared commitment to animal welfare issues, as it helps to explain why Representative Whitfield would see Mrs. Harriman’s collaboration with his staff on behalf of the PAST Act and the other animal legislation as a natural extension of their relationship, and not as a matter of her “lobbying” him or his staff. (Tr. EW 9:20-23.)

3. Representative Whitfield understandably turned to Mrs. Harriman for assistance with his animal welfare legislation not out of a desire to promote HSLF’s agenda but because she had a demonstrated track record of successfully promoting the passage of animal welfare legislation.

As a natural consequence of their shared passion for animals, Representative Whitfield and Mrs. Harriman have worked hand-in-hand to pass animal welfare legislation throughout their marriage. (Tr. EW 41:10-25, 43:4-9.) Representative of Mrs. Harriman’s close working relationship with her husband’s staff is the successful effort to pass the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act in the House in 2006—months before she joined the Humane Society and five years before she became a registered lobbyist for HSLF. (Tr. EW 13:9-13.) As she explained in her interview, Mrs. Harriman spent countless hours organizing and attending

15 See, e.g., EW-ISC00005417; EW-ISC00005421.
meetings with other advocates of the legislation and Members to educate them about the bill and garner their support. (Tr. CH 11:17-24.) She did this work as a volunteer, not on behalf of any organization, and was so effective that a Congressional Quarterly article cited “the lobbying efforts of Connie Harriman Whitfield” as a reason that the Republican leadership promised a floor vote on the bill. 16 (Tr. EW 18:2-5.)

When efforts to pass the PAST Act ramped up in 2013, Mrs. Harriman assumed the same integral role alongside her husband that she had performed in 2006 in relation to the horse slaughter bill. (Tr. EW 13:9-13.) To observers unfamiliar with the history of their partnership, it could appear that Mrs. Harriman, as an employee of HSLF, had an outsized role and exceptional access to Representative Whitfield and his staff. The reality, however, is that Representative Whitfield simply continued to use his wife the same way he always had—as a tremendously effective organizer and promoter of his animal-welfare legislative agenda. (Tr. EW 41:8-25.) He leveraged her experience and relationships and integrated her into his office’s effort, not as a favor to the Humane Society or as a scheme to improve his wife’s career prospects but because he valued her insights and advice and knew from past experiences how effective the two of them could be when working together. (Tr. EW 41:8-25.)

4. Representative Whitfield understandably never thought he was providing any beneficial position to the Humane Society or HSLF given that they were but two members of a large coalition of PAST Act supporters, which included more than 200 other individuals and organizations.

The PAST Act was Representative Whitfield’s bill, and he built a large coalition to garner support for the legislation. (Tr. EW 14:9, 39:17-22.) Although the Humane Society and HSLF are front and center in the allegations before the Subcommittee, in 2013 and early 2014 they were only two of more than 200 organizations and individuals with whom Representative Whitfield and his staff were coordinating meetings, communication, and strategy in an all-hands-on-deck effort to garner support for the PAST Act. (Tr. EW 12:18-21, 39:17-22; Tr. MI 49:11-22.) In fact, as Representative Whitfield and Marty Irby explained in their interviews, Representative Whitfield and his staff gave as much attention to several other animal welfare groups as it did to the Humane Society, and they considered the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Horse Council, and the American Society for

16 Catharine Richert, Political Horse-Trading Leads to House Vote on Horse Protection Measure, CQ Today, Sept. 18, 2006 (EW-ISCC0005394). Another article acknowledged that “Whitfield’s wife, Connie Harriman Whitfield, has been instrumental in getting her husband’s bill to the floor.” Catharine Richert, Opponents of Horse Slaughter Measure Plan Numerous ‘Poison Pill’ Amendments, CQ Today, Sept. 6, 2006 (EW-ISCC0005403).
the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, along with the Humane Society and HSLF, to be equal among the leading members of the coalition with which they regularly communicated and consulted.  

5. The extraordinary number of meetings that Representative Whitfield directed his staff to set up for members of the PAST Act coalition is not an indication that Representative Whitfield was giving favored treatment to the Humane Society or HSLF, as the OCE Report suggests, but instead was simply a response to Majority Leader Eric Cantor’s extraordinary charge that the coalition enlist a majority of the Republican Members as cosponsors of the bill.

The extraordinary number of meetings that Representative Whitfield’s staff set up to educate Members and promote the PAST Act is not evidence that he or his staff gave the Humane Society or HSLF any sort of favored treatment. Rather, the push to get additional cosponsors was a direct response to Majority Leader Cantor’s requirement that a majority of Republicans sign on as cosponsors before the PAST Act would be brought to the floor for a vote—a higher threshold than traditionally was required to bring legislation to the floor. (Tr. EW 10:3-6, 19:23-20:1.)

The OCE Report and media coverage of the allegations against Representative Whitfield have focused on the allegation that Representative Whitfield’s office provided assistance to HSLF by “scheduling as many as 100 meetings with other congressional offices for Representative Whitfield’s wife and HSLF.”  

As you heard from Representative Whitfield, Mrs. Harriman, and other witnesses, that claim is simply incorrect. (Tr. EW 9:24-10:1; Tr. CH 104:14-19; Tr. MI 54:21-23.) Representative Whitfield’s office did set up meetings with Members and staff to hear from Marty Irlby and Donna Benefield, two citizen advocates from Tennessee who were experts on horse soring, and from a variety of organizations, including the American Horse Council, the American Association of Equine Practitioners, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Animal Welfare Institute, Friends of Sound Horses, and others, as well as the Humane Society and HSLF. (Tr. EW 51:9-14; Tr. MI 69:8-21, 74:12-15.)

---

17 Tr. of Interview of Representative Whitfield’s Congressional Aide, Apr. 24, 2014 (OCE Report Exhibit 22 at 14-2940.029-30, 14-2940.0245).
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All of these meetings were set up at Representative Whitfield’s direction to educate Members about his bill, the PAST Act, and to garner additional cosponsors to meet Majority Leader Cantor’s charge, and not to somehow benefit his wife’s employer. (Tr. EW 103-6, 19:23-20:1.) In arranging these meetings, Representative Whitfield and his staff treated the Humane Society and HSLF no differently than they did other members of the coalition. (Tr. EW 51:9-14; Tr. MI 69:8-21, 74:12-15.) As Representative Whitfield and Marty Iby explained during their interviews, much of their effort on behalf of the PAST Act involved coordination with groups in the coalition other than the Humane Society and HSLF, and they set up a significant number of meetings in which nobody from the Humane Society or HSLF was even in attendance.19 (Tr. EW 60:15-21.)

6. Representative Whitfield’s staff and Mrs. Harriman sought ethics advice on several occasions and made good faith efforts to comply with the guidance they received.

The efforts of Mrs. Harriman and Representative Whitfield’s staff to seek ethics guidance on several occasions, and their actions consistent with their understanding of the advice they received, are further evidence that neither they nor Representative Whitfield intended to violate or circumvent the prohibition against spousal lobbying. To the contrary, their repeated efforts to seek clarification after receiving conflicting advice demonstrate their intent to abide by both the letter and spirit of the House rules.

As you heard from Mrs. Harriman, she had a series of calls seeking ethics advice in late October 2013. (Tr. CH 14:16-15:12.) She recalls Robert Sensenbrenner, General Counsel of the Committee on House Administration, telling her that she could attend meetings set up by her husband’s office, and she understood Dan Schwager, then-Staff Director of the Committee, to tell her that she could attend the meetings but not tell Representative Whitfield’s staff that she attended. (Tr. CH 126:12-16, 150:1-4.) According to the Committee’s summary of Mr. Schwager’s notes of his conversation with Mrs. Harriman, the only prohibition Mr. Schwager articulated was that she could not have “lobbying contacts” with Representative Whitfield and

---

19 Mr. Iby testified that he and Ms. Benefield attended approximately one third of the meetings alone and that third parties affiliated with organizations other than the Humane Society or HSLF, such as the American Veterinary Medical Association and Friends of Sound Horses, accompanied him and Mrs. Benefield to approximately one third of the meetings. (Tr. MI 69:7, 70:4.) Mr. Iby added that Mrs. Harriman attended “a dozen or so” of the meetings, and Mrs. Harriman testified that she attended only about fifteen of the meetings set up by Representative Whitfield’s staff. (Tr. CH 105:18-20; Tr. MI 54:11-12.)
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his staff. As detailed in Part I, supra, Mrs. Harriman had no concern that she was violating that prohibition because she reasonably believed that, due to the absence of any effort on her part to influence them, her interactions with Representative Whitfield’s staff were not lobbying contacts. (Tr. EW 114:14-23; Tr. CH 15:4-12.)

7. **Representative Whitfield has an absolutely unblemished record of serving with the highest ethical standards and is widely regarded as a man of the utmost integrity.**

In considering whether Representative Whitfield had any intention of violating the ethics rules, it is important and only fair to consider the record of his whole career. As he explained in his interview, Representative Whitfield has gone through his whole career, including 25 years in private business and 21 years in Congress, without so much as a suggestion that he ever acted unethically. Aside from those in the horse-selling community who launched the campaign to destroy him and derail the PAST Act, he is universally regarded by constituents and colleagues as a straight shooter who would never even be tempted to bend the rules.

---


21 Representative Whitfield’s then-Chief of Staff Cory Hicks similarly received conflicting advice on the issue of whether Representative Whitfield’s office could set up meetings with other Members and staff for the two horse-selling experts, Marty Irby and Donna Benefield. Mr. Hicks originally was told by Committee staff that Representative Whitfield’s office could set up meetings for Mr. Irby and Ms. Benefield, and then the Committee “changed its mind” and said that Representative Whitfield’s office could not set up meetings for Mr. Irby and Ms. Benefield. HSLP_OCE_015735-56.

22 In the course of its investigation of this matter, the OCE learned that Mrs. Harriman had been on the board of a company that had an interest in legislation before a committee on which Representative Whitfield sat, and the OCE initiated an investigation into the possibility that Representative Whitfield had taken inappropriate actions to benefit that company or his or his wife’s financial interests. There was ultimately no basis for this concern, and on May 29, 2015, the Board of the OCE adopted a report “recommending that the Committee on Ethics dismiss the allegation . . . because there [was] not substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield” violated the House rules or other standards of conduct. Office of Congressional Ethics, REPORT, REVIEW NO. 15-5596 (May 29, 2015). On September 11, 2015, the Committee notified Representative Whitfield that “the Committee unanimously voted to dismiss the matter.” Letter from Rep. Charles W. Dent, Chairman, Comm. on Ethics & Rep. Linda T. Sanchez, Ranking Member, Comm. on Ethics, to Rep. Ed Whitfield (Sept. 11, 2015).
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Representative Whitfield's reputation is the product of a lifelong adherence to the highest standards, and it is also something this Subcommittee should consider very carefully. In order to accept the allegations in this case, one has to find that Representative Whitfield engaged in conduct that is diametrically opposed to the manner in which he has lived his life to date. And to reach that finding, one would expect to see some compelling circumstances that would reasonably explain why he would do something that is so out of character.

It is clear from the results of the investigations conducted by the OCE and the Committee staff, however, that there are no such compelling circumstances. As such, the much more reasonable explanation — and the truth — is that Representative Whitfield conducted himself in regard to his wife’s involvement with his animal welfare legislation in a manner that was both completely consistent with his reputation for integrity and probity and in keeping with the highest tradition of public and congressional service.

CONCLUSION

In light of the themes and analysis presented in this letter, the previous submissions to the OCE and the Committee, and the information and explanations that were imparted during our clients’ interviews, Representative Whitfield respectfully requests that the Subcommittee issue a finding that there is no reason to believe that he violated House rules or standards of conduct and recommend that no further action be taken in this matter.

Sincerely,

Kenneth I. Wainstein
Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP

cc: Christopher Tate
May 31, 2016

VIA COURIER

The Honorable Charles W. Dent
The Honorable Linda T. Sánchez
Committee on Ethics
U.S. House of Representatives
1015 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6328

Re: In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Ed Whitfield

Dear Chairman Dent and Ranking Member Sánchez:

We write to you and the other members of the Committee on Ethics ("Committee") on behalf of our client, Representative Ed Whitfield, to submit his written response to the Report of the Investigative Subcommittee ("ISC") in this matter. Please find enclosed the following:

1. **Written Response:** The enclosed letter responds to the ISC’s analysis and conclusions, and respectfully requests that the Committee resolve this matter by issuing a Committee report that (1) accepts the ISC’s findings that Representative Whitfield’s conduct led to unintentional violations of the lobbying contacts rule and that he took no action to benefit his own financial interest; (2) declines to accept the ISC’s findings that Representative Whitfield provided special privileges to his wife and reflected discredit on the Congress; and (3) declines to accept the ISC’s recommendation that we issue a reprimand.

2. **Draft Committee Report:** The enclosed draft Committee report is intended to demonstrate how a report that makes the above findings would come across in a public document. We hope that you find the draft report helpful as you consider the arguments in our written response.

3. **Prior Written Submissions:** The enclosed binder includes Representative Whitfield’s prior written submissions in this matter to the Committee, Investigative Subcommittee, and the Office of Congressional Ethics. For the convenience of your review, we also include a copy of the ISC Report.
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We appreciate your consideration of this submission and our proposed resolution. Please do not hesitate to reach out to us if you have further questions or need additional information. We look forward to seeing you when Representative Whitfield has his opportunity to meet with the Committee.

Sincerely,

Kenneth L. Wainstein
Counsel, Wickesherman & Taft LLP

Robert L. Walker
Wiley Rein LLP

Enclosures

cc: The Honorable Patrick Meehan
    The Honorable Michael E. Capuano
    The Honorable Trey Gowdy
    The Honorable Yvette D. Clarke
    The Honorable Susan W. Brooks
    The Honorable Ted Deutch
    The Honorable Kenny Marchant
    The Honorable John Larson
    Tom Rust, Chief Counsel & Staff Director
    Patrick McMullen, Director of Investigations
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VIA COURIER

The Honorable Charles W. Dent
The Honorable Linda T. Sánchez
Committee on Ethics
U.S. House of Representatives
1015 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6328

Re: In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Ed Whitfield

Dear Chairman Dent and Ranking Member Sánchez:

We write to you and the other members of the Committee on Ethics ("Committee") on behalf of our client, Representative Ed Whitfield, in response to the Investigative Subcommittee’s ("ISC") report ("ISC Report") in this matter. Representative Whitfield first wishes to acknowledge and thank the ISC and its staff for the diligent and conscientious manner with which they handled the challenging set of factual and legal issues in this case.

We respectfully request that the Committee resolve this matter by issuing its own report accepting the ISC’s finding that Representative Whitfield’s oversights led to unintentional violations of the lobbying contacts rule but declining to accept the ISC’s findings that Representative Whitfield provided special privileges to his wife and reflected discredit on Congress. We also request that the Committee decline to accept the ISC’s recommendation of a reprimand, and instead issue the Committee’s report and the underlying ISC Report to ensure the public record is complete and balanced with respect to the true nature of Representative Whitfield’s conduct.

INTRODUCTION

Representative Ed Whitfield has served in the U.S. House of Representatives for more than 21 years, during which time he has "sponsored or cosponsored over 70 different bills pertaining to animal welfare" and has earned the reputation as "the horse guy" on Capitol

---
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Hill.\(^7\) He and his wife of 25 years, Ms. Constance Harriman, the former Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks at the Department of the Interior,\(^5\) share a passion for animals. That passion is one of the common bonds in their marriage and serves as the motivating force behind their collaboration over the years on legislative efforts to promote the protection of animals.\(^6\)

Throughout Representative Whitfield’s time in Congress, Ms. Harriman has worked closely with him and his staff to promote animal protection legislation and other matters of mutual interest. For example, in 2006, they worked together to build a 100-member national coalition to pass the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act in the House.\(^7\) Ms. Harriman was the coordinator of that effort and spent countless hours working with her husband’s staff to organize and attend meetings with other advocates and Members to educate them and garner their support.\(^8\) Then, again, in 2013, Ms. Harriman joined her husband’s effort to build a national coalition to promote the Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (“PAST Act”), which Representative Whitfield and his staff drafted to address the findings of a 2010 report by the Department of Agriculture Inspector General, which concluded that the inspection program established under the 1970 Horse Protection Act was not adequate to prevent the abuse of Tennessee Walking Horses.\(^1\) There was an outpouring of enthusiasm and support for the coalition, which included more than 200 organizations and individuals. As a result of the coalition’s efforts, 307 out of 435 House Members—more than 70 percent—and 60 Senators became cosponsors of the PAST Act.

In December 2013, activists with the Performance Show Horse Association, an organization that supports horse showing\(^8\) and opposed the PAST Act, filed a complaint against

\(^7\) ISC Interview of Marty Irby.
\(^8\) See ISC Report, supra note 1, at 3.
\(^9\) Id.
\(^10\) Id. at 4.
\(^11\) Id. at 4.
\(^12\) Her efforts were noted in press articles as “‘instrumental’ in steering the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act to the House floor.” Id.
\(^13\) U.S. Dept of Agric., Office of Inspector Gen., Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Administration of the Horse Protection Program and the Slaughter Horse Transport Program (Sept. 2010) (“Concerning the treatment of show horses, we found that APHIS’ program for inspecting horses for sorin is not adequate to ensure that these animals are not being abused.”).

\(^14\) Soring is the cruel and abusive practice of irritating or blistering a horse’s forelegs with chemicals or mechanical devices to accentuate a horse’s gait. See U.S. Dept of Agriculture, Horse Protection Act:
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Representative Whitfield. In that complaint, the 13 signatories – who had been cited by the Department of Agriculture for a total of 57 violations of the horse-soring prohibition and other provisions of the federal Horse Protection Act9 – alleged that Representative Whitfield’s effort “to push a legislative initiative directly connected to his wife’s position as a compensated lobbyist” violated the Code of Conduct of the House of Representatives.10 In 2007, Ms. Harriman had joined the Humane Society of the United States (“HSUS”) in a fundraising role, and in October 2011 she had transitioned to the Humane Society Legislative Fund (“HSLF”) and become a registered lobbyist. Despite Representative Whitfield’s firm belief that his wife’s efforts with the PAST Act coalition were in furtherance of his agenda and not HSLF’s agenda, the Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics (“OCIE”) initiated a preliminary review of the allegations in the horse sowers’ complaint. That development prevented the PAST Act from ever reaching the House floor for a vote – which was clearly the intent of the

9 Horse Protection Act enforcement actions are available on the Department of Agriculture’s website at https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/animalwelfare/sa_hpa_enforcement. See also Appendix 5 to Beth A. Wilkinson’s July 31, 2014 letter to Thomas A. Rust, Esq., Chief Counsel and Staff Director, Committee on Ethics, which lists the violations of the Horse Protection Act by the signatories to the complaint against Representative Whitfield.
10 Letter from Members of the Bd. of the Performance Show Horse Ass’n to The Honorable K. Michael Conaway, Chairman, House Comm. on Ethics & The Honorable Linda T. Sánchez, Ranking Member, House Comm. on Ethics (Dec. 27, 2013). It is important to note that the horse sowers’ complaint and public accusations in the press, see Anna Palmer & John Brenahan, Ped horse trades for Humane Society, Politico (Dec. 17, 2013). http://www.politico.com/story/2013/12/ed-whitfield-humane-society-congress-101231 (quoting Performance Show Horse Association Chairman of the Board Doyle Meadows, “And in a strange coincidence – I think not – the congressman happens to be married to a lobbyist for the Humane Society”), were the first allegations of ethical misconduct made against Representative Whitfield during his more than 21 years of service in the U.S. House of Representatives.
CADWALADER
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complainants all along – and triggered a continuing series of investigations that have lasted nearly two-and-a-half years.11

The first investigation was the OCE’s review, which resulted in a flawed and incomplete assessment of Representative Whitfield’s conduct. Based on OCE’s unnecessarily confrontational interview with Ms. Harriman, whose attorney was forced from the room at the outset,12 and without the benefit of an interview with Representative Whitfield13 – the very subject of the inquiry – the OCE issued a report finding “substantial reason” to believe that Representative Whitfield had lobbying contacts with his wife, permitted his wife to have lobbying contacts with his staff, and permitted his wife to use his congressional office to advance and facilitate her lobbying activities and the lobbying activities of her employer. The OCE did not refer to or in any way acknowledge the voluminous amount of relevant mitigating and exculpatory information. Since their public release in November 2014 and subsequent media accounts, those findings have formed the basis of the public’s understanding of Representative Whitfield’s conduct. Consequently, Representative Whitfield’s reputation for

11 It should be noted that Representative Whitfield and his wife fully and energetically cooperated at every stage of this investigation, submitting to multiple lengthy interviews, combing through personal records and providing thousands of pages of documents to the OCE and ISC. Representative Whitfield was eager to have the opportunity to be interviewed after not being able to be interviewed by the OCE, telling the ISC, “I can’t tell you how appreciative I am of having the opportunity to be here today to give my explanation of exactly what happened and how it happened.” ISC Interview of Representative Ed Whitfield.

12 The OCE interview of Ms. Harriman was quite adversarial. The OCE staff started the interview by denying her attorney the right to be with her out of an alleged concern about the fact that the same attorney was representing her husband (a concern that OCE subsequently agreed was misplaced and did not justify the refusal to permit Ms. Harriman to have her attorney with her at the interview). That set the tone, and the interview became increasingly less productive as the questioning became more aggressive. As Representative Whitfield explained to the ISC, “[Ms. Harriman’s] interview at OCE was really confrontational. She was totally surprised because they would not allow her attorney to stay. . . . [T]he record didn’t even reflect the confrontational nature of that interview.” ISC Interview of Representative Ed Whitfield.

13 Representative Whitfield was unable to be interviewed by the OCE because of a debilitating nerve condition that afflicted him at the time that left him unable to move without exacerbating pain. He offered to be interviewed once he recovered, but the OCE was unable to accommodate because of the strict timeline it was under to complete its review. The OCE report noted that “Representative Whitfield cooperated with the Review, but could not be interviewed for medical reasons.” Office of Congressional Ethics, Report, Review No. 14-2940 S (May 29, 2016) [hereinafter OCE Report].
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absolute integrity, developed over a more than 21-year career in Congress, has been irreparably blackened.14

Fortunately, the ISC’s 13-month investigation was much more thorough, and the ISC’s Report corrected many of the OCE’s erroneous conclusions and included many critical mitigating facts missing from the OCE report. Importantly, the ISC concluded that any violation of the rule prohibiting lobbying contacts between Ms. Harriman and Representative Whitfield’s staff was unintentional. Specifically, the ISC found that Representative Whitfield’s actions were not “knowing, willful, or corrupt,”15 and that any failure to set limits on contacts between his staff and his wife after she became a registered lobbyist was based on a “mistaken” belief16 that there was nothing wrong with “simply continuing [using] to use his wife as part of an effective coalition the same way he always had— as a tremendously effective organizer and promoter of his animal-protection legislative agenda.”17

The ISC Report includes four main findings: (1) Representative Whitfield failed to place limits on the interaction between his staff and his registered lobbyist wife and thereby committed an unintentional violation of the lobbying contacts rule; (2) Representative Whitfield provided special privileges to Ms. Harriman in violation of Section 5 of the Code of Ethics of Government Service; (3) Representative Whitfield took no official action to benefit his own financial interest and therefore did not violate House Rule XXIII, clause 3; and (4) Representative Whitfield reflected discredit on the House by his conduct and violated the letter and spirit of the House rules.

14 During the course of its review, the OCE launched a second investigation of Representative Whitfield when it learned that Ms. Harriman had been on the board of a company that had an interest in legislation before one of Representative Whitfield’s committees. OCE looked into the possibility that Representative Whitfield had taken inappropriate actions to benefit that company or his or his wife’s financial interests. After a thorough and well-run investigation—which stood in stark contrast to the OCE’s flawed investigation of the matter currently before the Committee—the OCE found no basis for this concern. The OCE concluded that “there was no substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield” violated the House rules or other standards of conduct and recommended that the matter be dismissed. Office of Congressional Ethics, Report Review No. 13-5696 (May 29, 2015). The Committee agreed, voting unanimously to dismiss the matter. Letter from Rep. Charles W. Dent, Chairman, Comm. on Ethics & Rep. Linda T. Sánchez, Ranking Member, Comm. on Ethics, to Rep. Ed Whitfield (Sept. 11, 2015).
15 ISC Report, supra note 1, at 32.
16 Id. at 33.
17 Id. at 26-27.
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Representative Whitting acknowledges and accepts the ISC’s first finding, i.e., that his
oversights led to unintentional violations of the rule prohibiting lobbying contacts between a
Member’s lobbyist spouse and the Member’s staff. He also accepts the ISC’s third finding,

i.e., that he took no action to benefit his own financial interest. However, he does not accept
the ISC’s second and fourth findings, i.e., that he provided special privileges to his wife and
her employer and that his unintentional failure to appreciate that his conduct was in technical
violation of the rules was so “severe” as to “reflect discredit on the Congress.” He believes
the ISC’s findings on these two points are based on a misunderstanding of the relevant
circumstances and misapplication of rules everyone concedes are vague.

This letter will address the flaws in the ISC’s analysis and demonstrate how the facts do
not support the ISC’s second and fourth findings. In conclusion, we will request that this
Committee issue its own report accepting the ISC’s finding of violation of the lobbying
contacts rule but declining to accept the ISC’s findings that Representative Whitting provided
special privileges and brought discredit on Congress. We also request that the Committee
decline the ISC’s recommendation of a reproval and instead issue its own and the underlying
ISC Report as the most complete and balanced way of informing the public about the true
nature of Representative Whitting’s conduct. To demonstrate the logic and fairness of this
approach, we have provided as an attachment a draft Committee report that makes the above
points and findings.

ASSESSMENT OF THE ISC REPORT

As stated above, we appreciate the ISC’s effort to make significant improvements to the
analysis and preliminary conclusions in the OCE report. We nonetheless believe that the ISC
Report and its recommendations suffer from several analytical flaws that led the ISC to make
the findings we contest. The following section will address the strengths and the weaknesses
of the ISC Report, and it will conclude that the analysis in the Report fails to support the ISC’s
recommendation that the Committee issue a reproval in this case.

18 Id. at 31.

We recognize that writing a draft report that grants us the result we seek in our submission prior to
the Committee’s consideration of the submission might be perceived as somewhat presumptuous on our part.
That was certainly not our intent. Rather, we simply thought it would be useful for the Members
to see how our proposed findings would come across in a draft public document when you are
considering our arguments in support of those findings.
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I. Areas of Significant Improvement Over the OCE Report.

The ISC Report corrected many of the OCE’s misguided conclusions and addressed critical facts and circumstances that were insufficiently considered in the OCE report. With the benefit of a thorough, full-day interview with Representative Whitfield and a more professional and productive interview with Ms. Harriman, which provided a more complete understanding of their actions and motivations, the ISC reached more balanced and well-supported findings on a number of important points, including the following:

A. The ISC’s finding that Representative Whitfield did not intentionally violate House rules.

The OCE completely failed to address the intentionality of any potential violations by Representative Whitfield, which is a significant oversight given that intentionality is a key element in assessing blameworthiness and in gauging the appropriate sanction for a particular violation. Therefore, Representative Whitfield was extremely gratified to see the ISC’s conclusion that his “oversight[]” in failing to establish clear limits on the interaction of his staff and his wife when she was a registered lobbyist was “unintentional” and not occasioned out of a “knowing, willful, or corrupt” intent to violate the rules.20

B. The ISC’s finding that Representative Whitfield and his staff did not arrange meetings with other congressional offices on behalf or at the behest of the Humane Society or the Humane Society Legislative Fund.

The OCE report drew the unsupported conclusion that Representative Whitfield and his staff scheduled “as many as 100 meetings with other congressional offices” on behalf of the HSUS and HSLF and in furtherance of their legislative agenda.21 That single finding in the OCE report dominated media reports of this matter22 and was used to support the allegation

20 ISC Report, supra note 1, at 32-33.
21 OCE Report, supra note 13, at 3 (“Representative Whitfield’s congressional office provided HSLF with assistance related to its lobbying activities. The assistance included scheduling as many as 100 meetings with other congressional offices for Representative Whitfield’s wife and HSLF . . . .”).
that Representative Whitfield had “permitted his wife to use his congressional office to advance and facilitate her lobbying activities.”

The ISC “did not agree with [the OCE’s] characterization of the meetings in question.” While Representative Whitfield did direct his staff to arrange dozens of meetings with other congressional offices for PAST Act advocates, the meetings were arranged at Representative Whitfield’s direction, pursuant to the legislative strategy ordained by then-Majority Leader Eric Cantor to enlist a majority of Republican Members as cosponsors in order to bring the bill to the floor for a vote, and in furtherance of Representative Whitfield’s animal protection legislative agenda, and not the legislative agenda of HSIUS or HSI.

http://www.rollcall.com/news/home/whitfield-denies-helping-his-wives-financial-interests-in-congress (“According to the OCE report, Whitfield’s staff may have helped arrange up to 100 Capitol Hill meetings for Harriman-Whitfield . . . .”); James R. Carroll, House ethics panel launches formal probe of Rep. Whitfield, USA TODAY (Mar. 27, 2015, 2:59 PM), http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2015/03/27/ed-whitfield-house-ethics-committee/70543022/ (“The November report of the board of the Office of Congressional Ethics, an independent, non-partisan unit made up of private citizens, detailed multiple instances between 2001 and 2014 in which Harriman-Whitfield was involved in as many as 100 meetings with other lawmakers and staffers. The sessions were set up by Whitfield’s office to discuss various bills that the Kentuckian either was sponsoring or co-sponsoring, the report said.”); Anna Palmer & John Bresnahan, Ethics committee launches probe of Rep. Whitfield, POLITICO (Mar. 27, 2015 4:39 PM), http://www.politico.com/story/2015/03/ed-whitfield-ethics-committee-probe-116453 (“The Office of Congressional Ethics found that Whitfield’s office helped set up as many as 100 meetings for his wife’s organization . . . .”).

2 OCE Report, supra note 13, at 1.
2 ISC Report, supra note 1, at 14.
21 Representative Whitfield explained to the ISC that “Eric Cantor had made it very clear to me that, unless we could get more than half of the Republican Conference on the PAST Act, that he was not going to bring it to the floor. . . . Eric Cantor had explicitly told me that he needed cover because standalone animal bills are not that popular in the Republican caucus. And he said, Ed, you have to get over half of the Republican Conference on this bill. And so that is when we—‘we’ being the coalition and myself and everybody else—I said, we want those meetings set up.” ISC Interview of Representative Ed Whitfield.
C. The ISC's finding that Representative Whitfield did not take official actions to benefit his own financial interest.

Representative Whitfield was glad to see that the ISC report concluded in short order that he never acted out of a desire to financially benefit himself or his wife.\(^\text{26}\) It was abundantly clear from the testimony that Representative Whitfield and his wife operated out a love for animals and that neither of them put a second's thought into whether or how that agenda would benefit them financially.\(^\text{27}\)

D. The ISC's finding that Representative Whitfield and Ms. Harriman had collaborated on animal protection legislation for many years before she became a registered lobbyist.

As noted above, the ISC acknowledged that Representative Whitfield and Ms. Harriman's collaboration on the PAST Act was completely consistent with their history of working together on animal protection issues.\(^\text{28}\) This important circumstance – and the fact that it completely supports Representative Whitfield's explanation as to why he never thought there would be a problem when he continued that collaboration after Ms. Harriman became a registered lobbyist – was completely overlooked in the OCE report. Representative Whitfield appreciates the ISC's inclusion of this important context in its own report.

E. The ISC's finding that Representative Whitfield's staff and Ms. Harriman received vague advice on the lobbying contacts issue and its acknowledgment that the legal issue was unclear.

The ISC Report cites the requests by Representative Whitfield's staff and Ms. Harriman for ethics advice from the Committee staff and others\(^\text{29}\) and describes the unclear responses, including statements by the Committee’s then-Chief Counsel and Staff Director that “this is a very complicated issue” and “[i]t’s not clear to me whether or how each of these

\(^{26}\) See ISC Report, supra note 1, at 31.

\(^{27}\) In fact, it was clear to Representative Whitfield that his pursuit of an animal protection agenda was politically costly to him. He explained to the ISC how his support of animal protection legislation often put him at odds with the Republican Conference: “And I will tell you, in the Republican Conference, we represent rural areas. There is not a lot of support for a lot of animal legislation.” ISC Interview of Representative Ed Whitfield.

\(^{28}\) See ISC Report, supra note 1, at 3-4.

\(^{29}\) Id. at 16-18.
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Representative Whitfield appreciates the thorough treatment of these episodes, as they highlight the ambiguity around the relevant lobbying contact rules, which ambiguity helps to explain why it did not occur to Representative Whitfield that his wife’s collaboration with his staff and legislative coalition may have been in violation of the rules.

II. Remaining Areas of Flawed Analysis in the ISC Report.

Notwithstanding the many things it got right, the ISC Report still reflects several critical gaps and flaws in factual and legal analysis that affect the soundness of its findings. The following section will identify these flaws and explain how each one affects the validity of the findings as to each of the alleged violations.

A. Lobbying Contacts.

Although he accepts the ISC’s finding that his inadvertent failure to establish limits on his wife’s interaction with his staff led to violations of the lobbying contacts rule – and he sincerely regrets that failure — Representative Whitfield takes issue with several aspects of the ISC report that resulted in these lobbying contact violations being depicted as more clear-cut and substantial than they truly were. Specifically, he challenges – and asks the Committee to carefully scrutinize – (1) the insufficient weight the ISC Report gives to Representative Whitfield’s lack of intent; (2) the ISC Report’s inaccurate characterization of several specific alleged lobbying contacts; and (3) the ISC’s use of two unsupported legal theories to bolster the finding of a lobbying contacts violation.

1. The ISC Report does not afford sufficient weight to the mitigating circumstances that show Representative Whitfield’s technical violations were unintentional.

As stated above, intentionality is the key element for determining blameworthiness and the appropriate sanction or discipline in a given case. Yet there is no mention that Representative Whitfield’s violations were unintentional until the second-to-last page of the ISC Report. Even if mens rea is not required for the finding of a violation, the absence of

30 ISC Report, supra note 1, at Exhibit 32.

31 Representative Whitfield told the ISC, “Now knowing what I know and the consequences of all this, I think I probably would have been more careful. I would have done something to have a more clear line . . . . I have learned a lesson.” ISC Interview of Representative Ed Whitfield.

32 See ISC Report, supra note 1, at 32.
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“any degree of knowing, willful, or corrupt violation of the rules" is a critical factor that should strongly argue against the ISC’s recommendation of reproof.

Moreover, the ISC failed to fully evaluate several notable circumstances bearing directly on the question of Representative Whitfield’s intent. First, the ISC Report overlooks the salient fact that Representative Whitfield did not even know that his wife had become a registered lobbyist until the ethical allegations were first raised in October 2013. Although it quotes an exchange from Representative Whitfield’s interview in which he explains his ignorance of his wife’s registered lobbyist status, the ISC Report fails to acknowledge that his ignorance is one reason he failed to question whether her continuing interaction with his staff on animal protection issues would implicate the lobbying contacts rule.

Second, the ISC report puts little weight on the fact that Representative Whitfield was unaware of the lobbying contacts rule until concerns were raised in October 2013 by a staffer in another Member’s office. His ignorance of the rule was understandable, given that it was a new rule created 12 years after he joined Congress and had never before been the subject of a

[33] See id. at 33.
[34] ISC STAFF: When Ms. Harriman registered as a lobbyist in January 2011, did you discuss the change in her status with her?

REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD: No, I didn’t really. I honestly didn’t even focus on it. She had been with the Humane Society I guess for 4 or 5 years. And when she changed to becoming quote, a registered lobbyist, I never even – we never discussed it really. . . .

ISC STAFF: Do you remember when you first learned that she had been registered as a lobbyist?

REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD: I don’t know that I ever focused on it whatsoever until one day, [my Chief of Staff], because of these meetings being set up, made some comment that, because of these meetings being set up, made some comment that, oh, [another Member’s] staffer raised an issue about why are you setting up these meetings. And he said he called House Ethics or House Admin or somebody, but he forgot to tell them that she was a registered lobbyist. I think that was the very first time that I really focused on it.

ISC STAFF: So that would have been when those meetings were getting set up in 2013.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD: Right.” ISC Report, supra note 1, at 6.

[35] See id. at 7 (“[Representative Whitfield] further explained that, at the time Ms. Harriman registered as a lobbyist in January 2011, ‘I am not sure that I was aware there was a specific rule regarding lobbying contacts between a Member’s spouse and their House staff.’”). Representative Whitfield testified that he first learned about the rule regarding lobbying contacts between a Member’s staff and registered lobbyist spouse “once OCE got involved and a complaint had been filed.” ISC Interview of Representative Ed Whitfield.
public investigation by the Committee. Representaive Whitfield never received training on the rule. While we recognize that ignorance of the rule is not an absolute defense to an ethics allegation, we submit that it is an important consideration weighing against removal in this case.

Third, the ISC Report fails to acknowledge Representative Whitfield’s lack of notice of the Ethics Committee’s particular interpretation of the new lobbying contacts rule, which was publicly articulated for the first time in the ISC Report, well after the time of the alleged violations. Under that interpretation, any contact between Ms. Harriman and her husband or her husband’s staff that “concerned animal protection matters and [was] directly aligned with [the legislative priorities of her employer] HSLEF” was necessarily a prohibited “lobbying contact,” regardless whether Ms. Harriman was making that contact at Representative Whitfield’s behest and/or in furtherance of his legislative agenda.17

Even if Representative Whitfield had known that his wife was a registered lobbyist and that there was a new rule addressing contacts by spouse lobbyists, it never would have been apparent to him that Ms. Harriman’s continuing contacts with his staff violated that rule. The rule itself is silent on the question of whether the circumstances in this case violate the rule, and the Committee never has issued any public guidance on how to apply the Lobbying Disclosure Act’s five-part “lobbying contact” definition and its 18 enumerated exceptions.18 It was therefore perfectly reasonable – even if he had been aware of the rule – for Representative Whitfield to believe that a Congressional spouse/registered lobbyist was free to contact a Member’s staff about legislative matters so long as he or she was not actually lobbying the

---

16 See id. at 22.

17 ISC Report, supra note 1, at 24. The ISC’s conclusion that all such contacts are lobbying contacts relies on the intermediate conclusion that all those contacts were made on behalf of Ms. Harriman’s employer. But taken to its logical conclusion, the ISC’s interpretation means that Ms. Harriman would have been acting on behalf of HSLEF every time she had a conversation with her husband or his staff about animal welfare issues simply because she – and Representative Whitfield – share the Humane Society’s view about many of these issues. The ISC’s definition of lobbying contact stretches beyond the bounds of reasonable interpretation of the rule and sets a dangerous precedent of turning personal conversations between a Member and lobbyist spouse that involve no attempt to influence into violations of the House Rules.

18 The 436-page House Ethics Manual includes only a one-paragraph discussion of lobbying by congressional spouses, and does not provide any information regarding the definition of lobbying contact. See Comm. on Standards of Official Conduct, House Ethics Manual 245-46 (2008).
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staff—i.e., trying to influence them. Given the common-sense reasonableness of that belief, it is understandable that it would not occur to Representative Whitfield that he would have to conform to the Ethics Committee’s more restrictive interpretation of the rule.

In sum, the failure of the ISC Report to fully address the three foregoing circumstances creates the misimpression that Representative Whitfield’s lobbying contacts violations were much more clear-cut—and therefore much more blameworthy—than they actually were. As a matter of fairness, the ISC Report should have fully explored and explained how each circumstance contributed to Representative Whitfield’s understandable lack of awareness that he was operating anywhere near the line in allowing his wife to continue her collaboration with him and his staff on animal protection legislation. The absence of that analysis from the ISC Report should cause the Committee to question its ultimate findings and reproval recommendation.

2. The ISC Report misconstrues several of the alleged lobbying contacts.

In the absence of concrete examples of intentionally violative conduct, the ISC next discusses a number of emails detailing Ms. Harriman’s contact with Representative Whitfield’s staff about six different pieces of animal-protection legislation. The ISC Report argues that these emails reflect “a dynamic where Ms. Harriman had a unique level of access to the office as a spouse.”49

Upon further scrutiny, however, it becomes clear this “dynamic” discussion is a red herring that sheds no light on the question of Representative Whitfield’s blameworthiness. First, Ms. Harriman’s “unique level of access to the office as a spouse” proves nothing. The ISC concedes in its conclusion that congressional spouses “occupy a rarified position” and “will often need to interact with the Member’s staff.”45 We acknowledge that Ms. Harriman regularly contacted her husband’s staff about legislation. The question is whether she was

49 Representative Whitfield explained to the ISC that he believed a lobbying contact must involve an attempt to influence a covered official. ISC Interview of Representative Ed Whitfield (“And the purpose of it is to influence them to do what you would like them to do on a particular piece of legislation or a letter or whatever.”). Representative Whitfield added, “I never considered her lobbying me or my staff because there wasn’t any reason to influence me. I was already where—we were in agreement on these issues. . . . Not for one millisecond did I ever think [Ms. Harriman] was lobbying me for purposes of influencing me about anything.” Id.

45 ISC Report, supra note 1, at 7.

46 Id. at 33.
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doing that “on behalf of” her client, the HSLF, or in support of the longstanding interest in animal protection she and her husband shared.

Second, as the following section will demonstrate, the ISC misconstrues each of these contacts.

The Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2012 and 2013. As evidence of this alleged “dynamic [of] unique . . . access” the ISC Report points to Ms. Harriman’s outreach to her husband’s office regarding the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2012 and 2013. This is mystifying because it is an example of Ms. Harriman’s recommending Representative Whitfield take legislative action directly contrary to the interests of the HSLF. Thus, she was acting against, not “on behalf of,” her client as required for a violation of the rule. To the extent Ms. Harriman’s behavior evinces a “dynamic,” it is a dynamic reinforcing Representative Whitfield’s position that his wife’s contacts with his office were in furtherance of his interests, and not the interests of the HSLF.

The King Amendment: The ISC found it troubling that Ms. Harriman forwarded to Representative Whitfield’s staff an email asking the staff to inquire “whether the Energy & Commerce Committee has exclusive OR concurrent jurisdiction over the proposed King amendment to the proposed Farm Bill.” Given that this was a simple request for information about procedure with no intent to influence, it clearly falls within the exception in the Lobbying Disclosure Act as an “administrative request [that] does not include an attempt to influence.” It therefore raises no lobbying contact concerns at all.

The Peters and Holt Amendments: The ISC found that Ms. Harriman engaged in a lobbying contact when she emailed Representative Whitfield’s staff, “please be sure Ed votes

---

42 Ms. Harriman testified that her priorities are first, her husband, second, animals, and third, the Humane Society. See ISC Interview of Constance Harriman. Representative Whitfield explained, “I know for myself and I know for Connie, we were not trying to be nefarious, we were not trying to advance the agenda of the Humane Society because she was an employee over there. We were doing it out of genuine compassion and commitment to this cause.” ISC Interview of Representative Ed Whitfield.

43 ISC Report, supra note 1, at 11.

44 2 U.S.C. § 1607(b)(3)(v). The Lobbying Disclosure Act Guidance adds, “If a communication is limited to routine information gathering questions and there is not an attempt to influence a covered official, the exception of Section 3(b)(3)(v) for “any other similar administrative request” would normally apply.” Office of the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, Lobbying Disclosure Act Guidance 7 (revised Dec. 15, 2014).
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FOR the Peters amendment today (banning polar bear imports and hunting in Natl. Parks.) Ed voted this way last time. The ISC Report characterizes Ms. Harriman’s email as an attempt to “urge[]” and “encourage” Representative Whitfield to vote a certain way and goes on at length about how this communication could be perceived as a lobbying contact.

Yet, the ISC Report neglects to mention the explanations Representative Whitfield and Ms. Harriman gave for that email. As they testified, Ms. Harriman routinely called her husband’s staff to pass on her husband’s instructions or to remind them to take an action that he would want them to take. In this situation, as Representative Whitfield explained, his wife simply was reminding them how she thought he would want to vote because she “knew how [he] felt about [the Peters Amendment]” based on his work to protect polar bears and his prior vote in favor of the same measure in 2007. Ms. Harriman similarly explained that this was an example of her habit of sending the staff a reminder. She believed that her husband was voting for the amendment, and simply wanted to remind the staff to ensure he got the vote.

---

45 ISC Report, supra note 1, at 11-12.
46 See id. at 12. 25.
47 See, e.g., ISC Interview of Representative Ed Whitfield (“ISC STAFF: Have you ever asked Ms. Harriman to pass a message along to your staff?” REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD: Yes . . . it happens a lot. You know, we will be driving somewhere or doing something and something will come up, and I will say, well, you know, I have to do this or this, would you mind just contacting whoever and see about doing it, yeah.”

---

48 To his wife’s surprise, Representative Whitfield voted against the measure. As he testified, “I am not proud of the vote that I made on the Peters Amendment or the other one either. But if I tell you, I capitulated to the pressure I was receiving from the sportsmen’s groups and the NRA in my district. If I had to do it over again, I would have voted for the Humane Society because that is the way I really feel. But I am not proud of that fact, but the reality is I am from a very rural district—a lot of sportsmen. The NRA is very strong. And they talked to me a lot about this . . . So that is why I voted against it. And I didn’t tell Connie how I voted on it. I don’t remember any discussion. I never discussed it with her.” ISC Interview of Representative Ed Whitfield.
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registered.19 As such, this is an example of Ms. Harriman’s habit of reminding staff about a legislative action and not her “urging” – i.e., influencing – her husband’s staff to take a particular legislative action.

With no evidence to demonstrate that she was actually “urging” the staff to take a particular action, the ISC Report falls back on a secondary argument that this email exchange created the “appearance” of lobbying. That may be true, but that only takes the analysis so far. The fundamental question is whether, as required to be a lobbying contact under the Lobbying Disclosure Act, she was trying to influence her husband’s staff “on behalf of” her client. The evidence clearly indicates that she was not.

The Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act: Another example of Ms. Harriman prompting the staff to take action she believed was in her husband’s interest was her email reminder to the staff that her husband should be a cosponsor of the Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act. Due to an oversight by his then-Legislative Director, Representative Whitfield had not signed on as a co-sponsor, even though he had signed onto the same bill in previous Congresses and clearly wanted to do so again. As the witnesses explained to the OCF and ISC, Ms. Harriman’s email simply was a reminder and not an attempt to influence.20

The Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act: The ISC found that Ms. Harriman engaged in a lobbying contact when she emailed Representative Whitfield’s staff about the Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act.21 In a footnote the ISC asserts without analysis that “[s]t the time Ms. Harriman sent these emails, she was a registered lobbyist for ISLF.”22 The ISC is simply mistaken. As it acknowledges elsewhere in its report, Ms. Harriman was not employed as a registered lobbyist by ISLF until October 2011, and according to Ms. Harriman’s supervisor, “Ms. Harriman did not lobby for that organization until October 2011, which is the first time

19 Ms. Harriman explained in her testimony that she had no idea that her husband had changed his mind, and that when she heard about his vote, Ms. Harriman sent the staff a follow-up email saying “he voted the wrong way,” thinking that he had mistakenly voted against a measure he intended to support.
20 See, e.g., ISC Interview of Ms. Constance Harriman. The language in the Legislative Director’s email, “Connie wants us on the Puppy Mill Bill,” should not be read to suggest that Ms. Harriman’s contact on this bill was anything more than a reminder. If Ms. Harriman had been trying to influence or change the Congressman’s position, the Legislative Director likely would have included that in his message to Representative Whitfield’s then-Chief of Staff. Instead, the message suggests that Representative Whitfield’s support for the Puppy Mill Bill was routine, as he references that “[w]e’ve been on [the bill] every year.”
21 See ISC Report, supra note 1, at 8-9.
22 ISC Report, supra note 1, at 9 n.43.
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she is listed on a report of lobbying activities for HSLF. Because Ms. Harriman was not employed by HSLF as a lobbyist when she emailed Representative Whitfield’s staffer in January 2011, the lobbying contacts rule does not apply.

The PAST Act: The ISC Report next devotes nine pages to detailing the numerous contacts Ms. Harriman had with Representative Whitfield’s staff about the PAST Act. We acknowledge that the contacts were numerous and intense during Representative Whitfield’s efforts to comply with Majority Leader Cantor’s requirement that a majority of Republicans co-sponsor the PAST Act. But, the reality is that she made every one of those contacts as part of her husband’s coalition, pursuant to his direction and in furtherance of his – and not the HSLF’s – legislative agenda. Despite the ISC’s use of two unsupported legal theories to support its finding that these contacts were prohibited lobbying contacts, the bottom line is that Representative Whitfield believed that his wife was working for him and his agenda and not for the Humane Society or the HSLF when he relied on her to coordinate the PAST Act coalition.

3. The ISC Report relies on two unsupported legal theories to bolster its argument that Representative Whitfield should have questioned the appropriateness of his wife’s contact with him and his staff.

In addition to the foregoing questions about the ISC Report’s factual analysis, we also have concerns about the soundness of its legal analysis of the lobbying contacts issue. Representative Whitfield recognizes that this is the Committee’s first public investigation of an alleged violation of the lobbying contacts rule, i.e., a case of first impression. Nonetheless, the ISC is obligated to ensure that its analysis is based on a reasonable interpretation of House rules and relevant guidance. In two instances, the ISC relied on unsupported – and seemingly unsupported – legal theories to suggest that Representative Whitfield should have realized that his conduct violated the lobbying contacts prohibition.

a. The ISC suggests that the lobbying contacts rule prohibits a lobbyist spouse from lobbying Members other than his or her spouse.

Id. at 3-4.

There is no better illustration of this than her advice to her husband’s staff that they exclude the Humane Society from the PAST Act hearing despite the very strong interest of the Humane Society and its president in appearing as a witness. See e.g., HSLF_OCE_015499 & HSLF_OCE_015485 (In these emails, Ms. Harriman supported Donna Benefield as a witness at the PAST Act hearing rather than Keith Dane, a Humane Society employee.)
May 31, 2016

After conceding for the sake of argument that Ms. Harriman’s contacts with her husband and his staff were not intended to influence them in any way, the ISC presents the novel argument that Representative Whittfield still may have violated the rule by allowing his staff to work with Ms. Harriman in setting up meetings between the anti-sorting advocates in their coalition and other Members. According to the ISC’s argument, those meetings “were intended to influence the [other] Members with whom the advocates met,” and therefore “they certainly would violate the spirit of the rule insofar as they inclined an attempt to influence other Members.”

This supposedly “basic principle”—i.e., that a Member is guilty of an ethical violation if his or her lobbyist spouse works with his staff to lobby or influence other Members in favor of his or her own legislation—is found nowhere in the guidance and runs directly contrary to the common-sense understanding that the new lobbying contacts rule prevents lobbyist spouses from influencing their spouses and those spouses’ staff. The ISC’s sudden and unsupported extension of the rule to interaction with other Members is mystifying. This case is the first time such a limitation has been articulated or applied, and it is without precedent.

Given its detachment from any logical or legal support, it is perfectly understandable that this limitation never occurred to Representative Whitfield’s staff. If fact, it was their understanding that efforts to influence other Members were a clear safe harbor under the lobbying contacts rule for their work with Ms. Harriman. As one of Representative Whitfield’s Congressional Aides testified, he was told by the Chief of Staff at the beginning of his employment that “Connie can’t lobby you to get on a bill, introduce a bill, change a bill, cosponsor a bill, but you guys can work together to help get other people to support a bill.”

b. The ISC suggests that it is the perspective of the client, rather than that of the lobbyist or Member, that is the relevant factor to determine whether a particular lobbying contact is made on behalf of the lobbyist’s client.

Under the controlling provisions of the Lobbying Disclosure Act, a lobbyist spouse’s contact with his or her Member spouse or staff violates the lobbying contacts rule only if the contact is on behalf of the lobbyist spouse’s client. In applying the rule in this case, the ISC

56 ISC Report, supra note 1, at 25.
57 Id. at 25 n.177 (“Representative Whitfield’s Chief of Staff appears to have misunderstood this basic principle.”).
58 Id.
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The report asserts that "the relevant factor for whether or not a contact is made on behalf of a client is the perspective of the client, not the lobbyist." It uses that assertion to conclude that Ms. Harriman’s contacts with her husband’s staff qualified as prohibited lobbying contacts simply because of her employer’s expectations that she was pursuing HSLF interests whenever she was engaging with people on the Hill. There are two problems with that assertion. First, it has absolutely no support in the rules or in the guidance pertaining to the rules. A far-reaching and consequential rule such as this should be based on a well-publicized pronouncement that gives lobbyist spouses proper notice. No such pronouncement exists. The ISC Report’s sole citation was an inapposite hypothetical in the December 2014 guidance about the Lobbying Disclosure Act.

Second, it simply makes no sense to base an interpretation of a contact between two parties—i.e., the lobbyist spouse and the Member spouse or staff—solely on the perspective of a third party, i.e., the lobbyist spouse’s client, that is not even involved in the contact. Rather, it makes much more sense to base that interpretation on all the relevant factors, including the intent, statements and actions of the lobbyist spouse and the Member. Under such a multi-factor test, it is abundantly clear that Ms. Harriman’s contacts in furtherance of her husband’s agenda—which, importantly, included numerous situations when she urged actions that were directly contrary to the HSLF’s interests—were not “on behalf of her client.”

28 Id. at 24.
29 See id.
30 Id. at 24 n.166.
31 Such a multi-factor test is clearly suggested by the Lobbying Disclosure Act Guidance when it says: “In determining whether there is an attempt to influence a covered official, the identity of the person asking the questions and relationship to the covered official obviously will be important factors.” Office of the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, Lobbying Disclosure Act Guidance ? (reviewed Dec. 15, 2014).
32 For example, Ms. Harriman advised against Representative Whitfield signing on to a bill supported by the Humane Society that would regulate the size of chicken cages because she knew it was opposed by his constituents. See ISC Report, supra note 1, at 9-10. Similarly, during the PAST Act effort, Ms. Harriman acted in direct opposition to the Humane Society’s interests when she pushed to have the Humane Society excluded from the pool of potential witnesses for a hearing on the PAST Act because she knew that featuring the Humane Society in the hearing would be detrimental to her husband’s efforts to garner additional Republican cosponsors for the bill. See, e.g., HSLF_OCE_01549 & HSLF_OCE_015485 (In these emails, Ms. Harriman supported Donna Benefield as a witness at the PAST Act hearing rather than Keith Dane, a Humane Society employee. Ms. Harriman told
B. **Special Privileges.**

The ISC concluded that Representative Whitfield violated Section 5 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service because he extended special privileges to Ms. Harriman by providing her "an unusual level of access to and influence over his staff, relative to other registered lobbyists." Representative Whitfield strenuously objects to this finding, and asks that the Committee give careful scrutiny to this section of the ISC Report. A careful review will demonstrate that the ISC's special privileges finding is based on an analysis that suffers from several significant failings.

*The ISC's finding does not consider that Ms. Harriman always has enjoyed the same level of access to her husband's staff.* For nearly 22 years, Ms. Harriman has had the exact same level of access to her husband's office and staff — from prior to her employment with the Humane Society, to the time she was working for the Humane Society, before she became a lobbyist, and then after she became a lobbyist for the HSUS. In fact, she still enjoys the same access now, after ceasing her role as a lobbyist for HSUS. As the ISC Report acknowledges, nothing changed because of Ms. Harriman's employment by HSUS and HSFL; Representative Whitfield "simply continued to use his wife the same way he always had" regardless of her status as a registered lobbyist. Given that continuity in access, it is hard to see how she was in any way "singly cut out for special treatment" or given a special privilege once she became a registered lobbyist. Rather, it appears that she enjoyed — and has continued to enjoy — that status simply because she is Representative Whitfield's spouse, confidante and collaborator on animal issues.

*The ISC's finding does not consider that other groups had similar levels of access to Representative Whitfield's staff.* The ISC "found no evidence that any other similarly situated lobbyist received the same level of access to Representative Whitfield's staff." But the ISC appears not to have even looked for that evidence.

It is clear, as Representative Whitfield, Ms. Harriman, and Murty Irby testified, that other groups in the PAST Act coalition had similar levels of access to Representative...
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Whitfield’s staff. For example, Marty Irby, Representative Whitfield’s lead staffer on the PAST Act, explained that Representative Whitfield and his staff gave as much attention to several other animal protection groups as they did to the Humane Society and HSFL. They considered the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Horse Council, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals to be on equal footing with the Humane Society and HSFL, and they regularly communicated and consulted with these and other groups in the more than 200-member strong coalition.87

The ISC’s finding does not consider that other spouses enjoy unusual levels of access to their Member spouses’ offices: The ISC Report acknowledged that congressional spouses have unique access to their spouses’ offices and staff and that there is nothing inherently wrong with that unique access.88 Despite that finding, the ISC Report finds that Ms. Harriman received a special privilege based on no evidence other than her unique access as a spouse.89 It takes little effort to see the flaw in that argument. In the absence of any access beyond that enjoyed by Congressional spouses, there can be no finding of special privilege.

The ISC cites precedent that is inapposite because the Members in those cases had a financial interest in providing the special treatment: The ISC Report cites the matters of Representatives Phil Gingrey and Shelley Berkley as examples of cases where the Committee has found violations of Section 5 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service, thereby suggesting some equivalence between those cases and this one.90 However, the ISC failed to note a critical distinction—the subjects in those cases had a financial interest in assisting the particular individual or organization that allegedly received the special treatment.91 In this

87 See ISC Interview of Marty Irby, Tr. of Interview of Representative Whitfield’s Congressional Aide, Apr. 24, 2014 (OIC Report Exhibit 22 at 14-2940, 0229-30, 14-2940, 0240).

88 Id. at 33 (“Congressional spouses occupy a rarefied position in many personal offices, and with good reason. Members and staff work long and unpredictable hours in small and tight-knit groups, and balancing that workload with family commitments requires a significant amount of coordination and support. . . . House Rule XXV, clause 7, . . . is a narrow caveat to the general understanding that a Member’s spouse will often need to interact with the member’s staff to coordinate the Member’s official and personal obligations.”).

89 Id. at 28 (“Ms. Harriman’s ability to obtain information and action from Representative Whitfield’s staff was superior to what a lobbyist who was not a spouse could achieve.”).

90 See ISC Report, supra note 1, at 28.

91 Representative Gingrey was reproved for taking official actions on behalf of a bank in which he had invested $250,000. See Letter from The Honorable K. Michael Conaway, Chairman, Comm. on Ethics, & The Honorable Linda T. Sanchez, Ranking Member, Comm. on Ethics to The Honorable Phil
1341
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case, the ISC concluded that Representative Whitfield “did not take official actions to benefit
his own financial interest in this matter” and the absence of any financial motive is an
important factor that weighs against finding a violation of Section 5.

The ISC’s finding bootstraps the “appearance” argument to support finding a violation
where there is not sufficient evidence of special privileges. The ISC concedes that
Representative Whitfield’s staff’s efforts to set up meetings for the PAST Act were not done
on behalf of the Humane Society and therefore were not a special favor. Yet, the ISC still
finds a special privilege violation. It does so by repeating the argument it made regarding the
Peters and Holt Amendments — i.e., that even if there was no intent to convey a special
privilege, the appearance of Ms. Harriman’s “level of access and influence more generally”
and the possibility that “the public could reasonably perceive that Ms. Harriman, as a lobbyist
for HSLF, received special privileges with respect to Representative Whitfield’s staff” was
enough to find a violation.

Our response to this argument here is the same as above. While Representative
Whitfield regrets any appearance of potential ethics violations, he adamantly rejects the notion
that a misreading of his actions and intent should result in his being adjudged guilty of
inappropriately using his office to pursue interests other than the public good to which he has
devoted his entire career.

C. Reflecting Discredit on the Congress.

In support of its violation findings and its recommendation that Representative
Whitfield’s conduct warrants a reprimand, the ISC Report concludes with a finding that
Representative Whitfield’s “failure to comprehend the importance of setting boundaries and
limits on the interactions between Ms. Harriman and his staff” constituted a violation that was

Cingrey (Dec. 11, 2014). The Committee found that Representative Berkley violated Section 5 by
taking actions that resulted in her husband receiving funds for his business based on claims filed with
government insurers. See Comm. on Ethics. Report, In the Matter of Allegations Relating to
Representative Shelley Berkley (Dec. 20, 2012).
13 ISC Report, supra note 1, at 31.
14 See ISC Report, supra note 1, at 29.
15 See above pages 16-17.
16 ISC Report, supra note 1, at 30.
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"severe enough to reflect discredit on the Congress." 26 Representative Whitfield feels strongly that this finding is unsupported.

As the foregoing demonstrates, and as the ISC has found, Representative Whitfield's failure to establish boundaries and limits was unintentional. 27 Moreover, it was a completely understandable oversight, given all the circumstances (detailed above and in our attached previous submissions) that reasonably led him to believe he was doing nothing wrong by deploying his wife for his animal protection agenda as he always did in the past. As such, it certainly does not rise to the level of "violations of law and abuses of one's official position" the ISC cites as examples in its Report. 28

Moreover, it is difficult to see how understandable and inadvertent omissions by a long-time Member with an unblemished record of integrity could be construed as sufficiently "severe" to warrant a finding that the Member "reflected discredit on the Congress." If the Committee accepts that finding, then scores if not hundreds of Members can expect to be entangled in the ethics process and charged with the "severe" misconduct of simply making an honest mistake. Certainly, that is not what Congress intended when it adopted this rule, and it is therefore not how it should be applied by this Committee.

CONCLUSION

In light of the facts and analysis presented in this response and our previous submissions in this matter, Representative Whitfield respectfully requests that the Committee reach the following conclusions: (1) accept the ISC's finding that Representative Whitfield's oversights led to unintentional violations of the lobbying contacts rule; (2) decline to accept the ISC's finding that Representative Whitfield provided special privileges to Ms. Harriman in violation of Section 5 of the Code of Ethics of Government Service; (3) find that Representative Whitfield's unintentional violations were not severe enough to reflect discredit on Congress and implicate House Rule XIII, clauses 1 and 2; and (4) decline to accept the ISC's recommendation that Representative Whitfield be reproved for his unintentional violations.

26 Id. 31 & 33.

27 Id. at 32-33 ("The ISC credits Representative Whitfield's testimony that this failure was not occasioned out of a corrupt or willful intent to violate House Rules... The ISC notes that none of its findings should be read to indicate any degree of knowing, willful, or corrupt violation of the rules."

28 Id. at 31. In discussing this rule, the House Ethics Manual says that "the Committee has historically viewed clause 1 as encompassing violations of law and abuses of one's official position."
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In lieu of issuing the ISC report as a reproof, Representative Whitfield requests that the Committee produce its own report making the above findings and issue that report along with the ISC Report. We believe this would be the best means of producing a public record that builds on the ISC’s strong investigative and analytical work, while at the same time correcting their erroneous conclusions about Representative Whitfield’s conduct. A Committee report also would provide a public explanation as to why a reproof is unwarranted in this case in light of the many mitigating factors – in particular, Representative Whitfield’s lack of intent – as well as the reputational damage he has already suffered from the publicity generated by the OCE’s findings of substantial misconduct, which now have been discredited thanks to the good work of the ISC.

We appreciate your consideration of this submission and our proposed resolution. We stand ready to answer any questions you may have, and Representative Whitfield looks forward to his opportunity to meet with the Committee in the near future.

Sincerely,

Kenneth I. Wainstein
Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP

[Signature]

Robert Y. Walker
Wiley Rein LLP

Enclosures
May 31, 2016

cc: The Honorable Patrick Mechal
The Honorable Michael E. Capuano
The Honorable Trey Gowdy
The Honorable Yvette D. Clarke
The Honorable Susan W. Brooks
The Honorable Ted Deutch
The Honorable Kenny Marchant
The Honorable John Larson
Tom Rust, Chief Counsel & Staff Director
Patrick McMullen, Director of Investigations
Draft Report for Committee Consideration

In the Matter of Allegations Related to Representative Ed Whitfield

On [DATE], the Committee received the Report of the Investigative Subcommittee ("ISC") in this matter, which addressed allegations involving Representative Ed Whitfield that had been referred by the Office of Congressional Ethics ("OCE") on June 10, 2014. These allegations involve several potential violations of House rules related to the interaction between Representative Whitfield and his staff and Representative Whitfield’s wife, Ms. Constance Harriman, who was a lobbyist for the Humane Society Legislative Fund.

The ISC found: (1) Representative Whitfield failed to place limits on the interaction between his staff and his wife once she became a registered lobbyist, and thereby committed an unintentional violation of House Rule XXV, clause 7, which requires Members to prohibit lobbying contacts between their staff and their spouse when the spouse is a lobbyist; (2) Representative Whitfield provided special privileges to Ms. Harriman in violation of Section 5 of the Code of Ethics of Government Service; (3) Representative Whitfield took no official action to benefit his own financial interest and therefore did not violate House Rule XXIII, clause 3; and (4) Representative Whitfield reflected discredit on the House with the above violations. Based on these findings, the ISC recommended that the Committee issue its Report as a reproval for Representative Whitfield’s violations.

The Committee has carefully examined the ISC Report and the record from the ISC investigation, including in particular the lengthy interviews of Representative Whitfield and Ms. Harriman. In addition, Representative Whitfield appeared before the Committee to respond to the ISC Report and spoke at length about his perspective of the allegations and the reasons he genuinely believed his conduct was appropriate. Finally, we carefully reviewed Representative Whitfield’s written response to the ISC Report.

Over the course of that review, we identified and focused on a number of factors that are highly relevant to our assessment of both the violation findings and the proposed reproval. Those factors include:

- The clearly established inadvertence of Representative Whitfield’s violations;
- The vagueness of the lobbying contacts rule and the absence of clear guidance from the Ethics Committee that would have put him on notice that his conduct was in violation of the ethics rules;
- The lack of evidence in the record that Representative Whitfield ever took any action to give his wife any special privilege or special access due to her status as a lobbyist, beyond that traditionally enjoyed by Congressional spouses;
- The established fact that Representative Whitfield’s actions were never motivated by a desire to financially benefit himself or his wife;
Representative Whitfield's unblemished record for integrity over more than 21 years of distinguished service in the United States Congress;

Representative Whitfield's completely cooperative approach throughout the nearly two-and-a-half years of this investigation; and

The punishment that Representative Whitfield has already suffered due to the media accounts of the OCE misconduct findings that have since been discredited and rejected by the ISC investigation.

Our evaluation of the complete record and these important factors has led us to agree with certain of the ISC's findings and disagree with others. Specifically, we adopt the ISC's findings that: (1) Representative Whitfield unintentionally violated House rules by not establishing clear boundaries and limits for the interaction of his staff with his wife when she was a registered lobbyist, and (2) Representative Whitfield took no official actions to benefit his own financial interest in this matter.

However, we do not accept the ISC's remaining two findings. First, we do not find that Representative Whitfield provided special privileges to Ms. Harriman or her employer, the Humane Society Legislative Fund, in light of the complete absence of any evidence that he sought to give her any special treatment or access due to her role as a registered lobbyist. Second, we do not find that Representative Whitfield's violations were severe enough to reflect discredit on the Congress. They fall far short of the "violations of law and abuses of one's official position" that have historically been required for a finding of this violation, especially given the clear and unrefuted evidence in the record that he never intended to do anything in violation of the ethics rules.

After careful consideration of the record and the factors listed above, the Committee finds that a reproof is not warranted and that it is sufficient simply to advise the public of its findings. Accordingly, the Committee orders that this report be immediately released, along with appendices containing the ISC and OCE reports and Representative Whitfield's written responses thereto. Upon issuance of this report, the Committee will consider this matter closed.