

THE MARYLAND ANIMAL LAW ADVOCATE

Opinions, News and Commentary from The Animal Law Section

Joan Epstein, *Chair*
Maricruz Bonfante, *Vice-Chair*
Kathy Anne Mancusi, *Editor*



Vol. I, No. 1
January 2009
Maryland State Bar Association, Inc.

Message From The Editor

This is the Animal Law Section's first newsletter! In order for the section to work on behalf of animals and to educate ourselves regarding animal law matters, I believe that it is necessary that we all work together in sharing our particular expertise in animal law, whether it derives from actual experience in working in the animal law field, from volunteer work with animals, or from any other type of involvement, so that the section may educate more and more members who then will be able to advocate on behalf of animals in our community and the world.

This section is different from other bar sections in that many of us do not actually practice animal law. As you know, the section is very new. Animal matters touch on so many different areas of legal specialties. Hopefully this newsletter will provide a forum for us to communicate with and learn from each other.

The newsletter will keep you informed of the section's subcommittees so that you may become involved with the subcommittee of your choice. The editor invites you submit articles, news, summaries of case law involving animals, ground-breaking legislation passed in other states if such is of potential interest to Marylanders, legislation under review for passage in Maryland, and educational articles about any area of animal law that should be of interest to the membership.

I ask that you be open-minded about this newsletter. A particular issue may matter more to one member than another. Perhaps an animal concern discussed here may seem trivial to you or silly. However, as the commentary by Cindy Ross states, the animal issue discussed in her piece may seem like a small matter, but on closer inspection, the issue is saying something big. Please join Kathleen Gough in passing the fur labeling bill in Maryland this year. Help Glenn Meyer in spreading the word about and eliminating the use of electronic devices that cause dogs unbearable pain. And let's commend D.C. councilmember Mary Cheh, and her

George Washington University Law School's Animal Welfare Project students, in the passage of new animal protection laws in Washington, D.C.

In case you missed it, the Animal Law Section held its first annual dinner meeting on November 15. The speaker was John Goodwin from the Humane Society of the United States. Mr. Goodwin's talk is summarized here.

Last but not least, join a subcommittee!

If you would like to make suggestions for a new name for this newsletter, please email me.

Kathy Anne Mancusi
Editor
kmancusi@verizon.net



IN THIS ISSUE	
Devices Used To Harm Pets.....	2
Maryland Fur Labeling Bill.....	3
Section Officers and Subcommittees.....	4
On the Lighter Side (The First Animal Rights Lawyer?).....	6
Pending Case Law.....	6
First Section Dinner.....	7
New D.C. Animal Laws.....	7
Commentary.....	8

Do You Know That Your Neighbors May Be Abusing Your Pets?

By Glenn Meyer, Esq.

Because of advances in technology, new and unforeseen methods of abusing animals have been developed. Currently on the market are ultra-sonic and high frequency bark stoppers, high-pitched sound dog repellers, and other devices that use sound to punish a dog when it barks. Some are hand-held and some are merely placed in the back yard of its owner and set to trigger after a certain number of barks. Animal abusers can also obtain a beef flavored device that may be swallowed by the animal and activated by a cell phone to cause gastric pain. There are no laws on the books, known to this author, specific to these devices that would regulate or stop their use. Most of the sound-punishing devices are inaudible to human ears or barely audible, yet they can create “discomfort” in animals, particularly dogs, even when used at great distances. Many of the devices were designed for keeping vicious dogs from attacking people; unfortunately, they are often being used to silence dogs who are not excessively barking. Manufacturers have discovered a boon market for these devices which may be purchased with anonymity on the internet. Most animal owners don’t even know they exist.

In the July, 2007, issue of *The Whole-Dog-Journal* an article on controlling dog barking recommends that “electronic anti-barking devices” not be installed because “[W]e are hearing reports that these can be quite aversive, perhaps even painful, for the dogs at which they are directed.”¹ Even when such a device is discovered, proving that the device was used and caused harm to any specific animal is difficult. Providing witnesses and photographic documentation is nearly impossible, especially when the offender knows you are trying to document such attacks. If an attack occurs the dog should be immediately taken to an animal neurologist to examine the ears, before such damage has a chance to heal. Affidavits documenting the event should be obtained from witnesses as soon as possible.

One such device, the *Good Neighbor Barker Breaker*, has a built in microphone that listens for barks and emits a sudden, high-pitched sound that “startles the dog to stop nuisance barking”.² It works at a range of up to 50 feet. The company advertises that it can even be used “while you’re away”.³

The most outrageous product manufacturer not only hides from sound and sight but hides across the border in Canada.

An article on the *Doggie Don’t*, manufactured by Q-Smith, Ltd. Of Toronto, states that the *Doggie Don’t* device is a “battery powered mini car alarm joined to a cell-phone receiver” that is disguised as beef flavored gum and fed to the animal.⁴ It is activated by a cell phone. Even the author of the article states that the device is “at the fringe of legality” but extols that “pranksters will have a field day with this product, but that’s the price we pay for having such flexibly useful technology” and that “Rover’s insides will commence wailing and howling something fierce.”⁵

This author contacted the University of Pennsylvania School of Veterinary Medicine Behavior Clinic regarding this new technology and learned that the Clinic has not tested these devices. The University could not find any independent studies involving these sound devices. This author does not believe that there are any independent studies of these sound devices as they relate to canine pain, but did find a study conducted in Japan pertaining to high-frequency sound waves. This study determined that high-frequency sound adversely affects human brain activity.⁶ Nevertheless, there are no independent studies on the effect of these devices on animals and consequently there is no proof of the harm or safety of these instruments.

Without any studies, this again leaves the pet owner in a catch-22 situation of being unable to test and prove that his or her pet is suffering pain due to the use of one of these devices. With so many horrific cruelty cases being paraded before law enforcement personnel this issue may not even appear on the surface as a cruelty case. Those in law enforcement may believe that these devices are safe.

Electronic shock collars have been on the market for a long time and one would assume that they are safe. However, a recent article in the *Whole-Dog-Journal*⁷ indicates that these devices may not be so safe. Why would an electric shock to your pet on a fairly regular basis be harmful? The article notes that some dogs are affected negatively and exhibit “learned helplessness” behavior, and/or the ceasing of normal dog behavior.⁸ The article provides personal accounts that show the types of bad experiences that may occur with these tested systems for behavior modification.⁹

The individuals using electronic shock collars for their pets

(continued on page 5)

LEGISLATION: Maryland Fur Labeling Bill

By Kathleen S. Gough, Esq.

As we are headed back into colder weather, many people are planning to go shopping for new winter coats for their families. But buyers beware: if a coat has unlabeled fur trim which appears “faux,” and is “a relatively small quantity or value,” the consumer may be getting canine fur instead. Jackets have also been found to carry labels which misidentify raccoon dog, rabbit, fox, coyote or other species.

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) is charged with setting the minimum value of fur in a garment which triggers the labeling requirement in the Fur Products Labeling Act of 1951 (FPLA). It was set at \$20.00 until 1998, when it was raised to \$150.00, leaving manufacturers a great deal of room to include a variety of animal furs before a consumer is entitled to know what the garment is made from. And because the \$150.00 threshold applies only to the cost to the manufacturer of just the fur, and not the cost of the whole garment at retail, unlabeled fur garments can be sold at retail for any price—from \$50.00 dollars to \$5,000.00. According to a New York Times article of December 24, 2006, fur sales have increased as manufacturers have found ways to incorporate sheared, dyed, and knit fur into more casual garments. This means that many people will unknowingly purchase animal fur products which are unlabeled or mislabeled, and perhaps dyed unnatural colors like pink or blue.

An FTC Business Alert issued in December of 2000, “In-FUR-mation Alert: How to Comply with the Fur Products Labeling Act,” outlines the requirements of the Act, and touches upon other laws which might apply to labeling and advertising (both in-store and online), but also covers the rules of exemptions. Not only is there a \$150.00 exemption threshold, there is also an exemption to the exemption. If a garment is exempt under the \$150.00 rule, the retailers can choose to—rather than say nothing on the label—voluntarily offer the species name, but still leave off the country of origin. The country of origin is defined as where the ani-

mal was killed—for example, China, where animal welfare problems are great.

Domestic dog and cat fur is already outlawed under the federal Dog and Cat Protection Act of 2000, but this law did not take into account the growing use of raccoon dogs, especially in garments manufactured in China and sold in the United States. Raccoon dogs are a member of the Canidae family, which also includes domestic dogs and wolves. Their name comes from their striking facial and coat resemblance

to a raccoon, and because many people have an aversion to wearing dog fur, their fur is frequently unlabeled or mislabeled as raccoon fur. One particularly odious practice is that raccoon dogs are often skinned alive in fur production in China. There is an effort underway to ban raccoon dog fur in new federal legislation, H.R. 891, The Dog and Cat Fur Prohibition Enforcement Act, which would protect the raccoon dog and consumers.

For the last several years, The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) has been conducting tests of garments purchased from a wide variety of popular retailers ranging from Macy’s to Ross and Saks Fifth Avenue to Neiman Marcus, and has compiled the results in its “Quick Reference Guide: Fur Investigation

Results 2005 Through Fall/Winter 2007 (Updated March 19, 2008).” The vast majority of mislabeled or falsely advertised garments identified by the HSUS were manufactured in China, and most were made from raccoon dog fur, though several were found to contain domestic dog fur, rabbit, or wolf fur. Both raccoon dog and domestic dog fur was found on unlabeled garments.

Last session in Maryland, Delegate Tom Hucker introduced H.B. 834, to “[prohibit] a person from displaying for sale, offering for sale, or selling any article of clothing made wholly or partly of ‘animal fur’ unless a specific la-

(continued on page 4)



New Animal Law Section Officers and Subcommittees

The Animal Law Section Council elected officers at its July 16, 2008, meeting and also organized four subcommittees to work on various animal law issues.

The officers are:

Chair-elect for 2009-2010: **Gary Norman**
Secretary: **Maricruz Bonfante**
Treasurer: **Kathy Mancusi**

Joan Epstein is the current chair for 2008-2009.

The Council formed the following subcommittees and elected the following individuals to head the subcommittees:

Legislative: **Susan Adams**
Equine: **Kathleen Tabor**
Agriculture: **Cheryl Leahy**
Animal Cruelty: **Alex Foster**

Contact Information for Legislative and Equine Subcommittees:

Legislative Subcommittee: The legislative subcommittee hopes to pass legislation on several animal topics during the 2009 Maryland legislative session. If you are interested in joining the subcommittee, please contact Susan Adams at sadams@humanesociety.org.

The Legislative Subcommittee will be holding a legislative training meeting at bar headquarters in January, 2009. Notification of the day and time will be forthcoming to section members.

Equine Subcommittee: The Equine Subcommittee's mission will be to highlight the myriad legal and legislative issues involving horses (and other equines) and the legal, economic, and social impact such issues have on businesses and citizens within the state and beyond the borders of Maryland. The subcommittee will serve as a resource to provide information to those practitioners interested in specific issues relevant to the equine industry. To join, contact Kathleen at KTaborLaw@aol.com.

FUR LABELING BILL. . .

(continued from page 3)

bel or tag is attached to the article of clothing." This bill required labels indicating the type of animal and country of origin for any product containing fur sold in Maryland. The bill included a two year grace period to give retailers a chance to sell any noncompliant merchandise, and allowed them to satisfy the new labeling requirement by simply attaching stickers over noncompliant labels. This would decrease any possibility of creating

a financial hardship for small businesses in Maryland. Delegate Hucker intends to reintroduce this legislation during the 2009 legislative session. Several other States have similar laws, including Massachusetts, Wisconsin and New York, with a Delaware law set to take effect in 2010. A loophole-free fur labeling law gives consumers confidence in the garments which they purchase from Maryland retailers.

YOUR PETS. . .

(continued from page 2)

are for the most part compassionate owners who will seek the bare minimum in volume or shock. On the other hand, the users of the new technology sound devices are more likely to crank up the volume for maximum effect. Dogs affected by these devices hide under furniture, walk low to the ground, and shiver. This author was privy to an incident where his neighbor's tethered dog was attacked by use of a close-range, hand-held noise device, and the neighbor stated that the dog was writhing on the ground and frothing at the mouth before he was able to stop the attack. A second witness to the attack confirmed that the dog was still foaming at the mouth and was so weak it had to be helped into the house. Criminal charges were brought for animal cruelty; however, the attacker was able to avoid criminal prosecution because the state could not prove that the device caused pain to the dog through expert witness testimony. Testing could not be done in the state involved without violating the law being prosecuted.

The manufacturers and vendors of these products claim the products are safe and yet extol the punishing virtues of the devices. It is surprising that these manufacturers would open themselves to civil liability for nuisance, and depending on the circumstances, trespass. It is true that one's companion animal is valued by our society as personal property of limited worth; yet to most pet owners their animal is valued highly and certainly to them worth more than their inanimate property. Therefore pursuing their pet's tormentor in court may be meaningful.

This author recommends that if a pet owner files suit against a company that produces these sound repellants for harm to one's pet, or against the person who used the device against the pet, that damages should include the actual costs incurred to stop the attacker, the cost of a replacement security system because the dog is being trained by the attacker not to bark and warn the owner of criminal activity, and/or the decrease in value of a home because of such ongoing nuisance activity affecting the resale value. Where malicious intent can be proven a complaint should include punitive damages.

In addition to civil liability, if proof of pain can be obtained, the attacker may be guilty of criminal animal cruelty and if repeated offences can be proven may be guilty of criminal harassment.

There certainly is no statute or case law in the state of Maryland regarding the use of these devices. New laws are needed to address this new technology and the abuses they encourage. In Maryland, a person may not intentionally torture an

animal.¹⁰ The definition of animal cruelty includes the infliction of torture.¹¹ To bring a charge for cruelty, one must show that there was unnecessary or unjustifiable physical pain or suffering inflicted on an animal.¹² As stated earlier, the problem in prosecuting these cases is that the burden of proving "pain" from the use of these sound repellants can be as burdensome as proving that such a device was used against an animal in the first place.

What can you do to protect your animal? Be watchful of your neighbors and pets. If your pet shows hearing problems, hides under the bed, avoids an area of the lawn that it used to frequent, or avoids a neighbor, you should be suspicious. If your neighbors spend a lot of time outdoors standing around, particularly when your pet is out, you should be suspicious. Listen for any high-pitched noises, especially when your dog barks. Count the number of barks and determine whether you are hearing an unusually low number of barks for the situation at hand. Many of the devices are set to act upon a certain number of barks. When visiting the veterinarian, address these issues with him or her and x-ray your dog if you see unusual behavior. Lastly, but most importantly, write your congressman and animal rights organizations to address legislation regarding these devices.

Glenn H. Meyer is an attorney located at Meyer Law Firm, LLC, 211 Gwynnbrook Avenue, Owings Mills, Maryland 21117.

Footnotes:

¹ Pat Miller, *Positively Quiet, How to Achieve An ALMOST Bark-free Home*, THE WHOLE-DOG-JOURNAL, Vol. 10, No.7, July 2007. www.whole-dog-journal.com.

² www.barkingdogs.net/soundgdneighbarkbreak.html.

³ Id.

⁴ Marc Abrahams, *A High-Tech Solution for Pet Owners Whose Dogs Won't Shut Up and Won't Obey*, www.byte.com/art/9801/sec15/art1.htm.

⁵ Id.

⁶ Tsutomu Oohashi, et. al., *Inaudible High-Frequency Sounds Affect Brain Activity: Hypersonic Effect*, THE JOURNAL OF NEUROPHYSIOLOGY, Vol. 83, No. 6, June 2000, at 3548-3558.

⁷ Pat Miller, *Shock or Awe? Are Electronic Training Collars A Positive Training Tool or Evil Incarnate?* THE WHOLE-DOG-JOURNAL.com, Vol. 9, No. 2, 2006 at 18.

⁸ Id. at 20.

⁹ Id. at 21.

¹⁰ MD.CODE ANN., CRIM.LAW, Section 10-606 (a) (1).

¹¹ MD. CODE ANN., CRIM. LAW, Section 10-601 (c) (2).

¹² MD. CODE ANN., CRIM. LAW, Section 10-601 (c) (1).

On The Lighter Side:



The First Animal Rights Lawyer?

ALTHOUGH IT IS KNOWN THAT during the Middle Ages animals were treated very cruelly, during that same period animals were given certain legal rights. Specifically, if an animal were charged with wrongdoing, the beast was given the right to stand trial and be represented by an attorney. These crimes are studied and discussed in detail in a book entitled *The Criminal Prosecution and Capital Punishment of Animals*, by E.P. Evans (Faber and Faber, 1907).

The book contains the actual charging documents and sentences issued against the animal defendants (most of the original documents are in French, however). Pigs, goats, insects, mice, and rats were often

charged with causing destruction of property and sometimes the death of persons. Beasts and birds were devils in disguise. Insects and vermin were charged with the crime of destroying crops. After trial these animals were either put to death or excommunicated by the Catholic Church.

Bartholomew Chassenee, Esq., born in 1480 in France, became famous for his defense of animals. He defended rats before the ecclesiastical court of Autun against the crime of wantonly destroying the barley crop of the province. Chassenee was successful in having the charges dismissed by asserting that one summons was insufficient to compel the attendance of all rats charged with this crime.

When a second summons was issued by publication at churches, he was successful again in defeating the summons by claiming that his clients could not appear in court due to the difficulty of the journey and the perils of traveling when their enemies, the cats, would be lying in wait along the route.

In 1993 a British/French film was produced about one of Mr. Chassenee's more famous cases. The film is called *The Advocate, The Hour of the Pig*. In this film, Mr. Chassenee defends a pig who was accused of killing a young Jewish boy.

Both the book and the movie are available through online services.

KEEP AN EYE ON. . .

The Institute for Justice, of Arlington, Virginia, filed suit against the Maryland State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners and the Maryland Board of Chiropractic Examiners on behalf of Mercedes Clemens, a privately certified equine massage therapist and human massage therapist licensed by the Chiropractic Board. The suit was filed in Montgomery County Circuit Court on June 10, 2008, after the Chiropractic Board sent Ms. Clemens a cease and desist order informing her that she was not licensed to massage animals, only humans. In addition, the Veterinary Board asserted that by massaging horses, she was practicing veterinary medicine without a license. Since the suit was filed, the Veterinary Board changed its position and agreed that animal massage may be practiced by professions other than veterinarians; however, until the law is changed to allow persons who are not veterinarians to massage animals, the issue remains unsettled. The suit alleges that the Maryland animal massage regulations violate fundamental constitutional rights, including the right to earn a living in one's chosen profession. *Clemens v. Maryland State Board of Veterinary Medicine, et. al.* The complaint may be viewed on www.aboutmarylandhorses.com.

Section Holds First Annual Dinner Meeting

~Speaker Is Humane Society of the United States Animal Fighting Expert~

On November 15, the Section held its first annual dinner meeting at Paul's on the South River in Annapolis. Those present were fortunate to not only feast on a varied buffet, but also to learn of the Humane Society of the United States' efforts to combat animal fighting. Mr. John Goodwin, the dinner's featured speaker, works full time at HSUS on animal fighting issues.

Mr. Goodwin spoke about the pervasiveness of cock and dog fighting. Perhaps unbeknownst to most, there are large cock and dog fighting rings throughout the U.S. These animal fighting networks involve gambling and other illegal activities, such as the distribution of illegal drugs. The industry is organized --there are, or were, books and magazines devoted solely to this "hobby". One of the features in these magazines was "fighting reports" submitted by the animal fighting organizers.

In January, 2007, Mr. Goodwin was involved in a cock-fighting raid in Mecklenburg County, Virginia where more than 125 birds were seized and 145 people arrested. The raid was a result of an eight-month investigation in which The HSUS assisted state and local law enforcement agencies.

Mr. Goodwin was also involved in the investigation of Michael Vick in Virginia for his involvement in dog fighting.

Mr. Vick was sentenced to 23 months in jail.

As a result of the massive publicity from the Vick case, many of the "industries" concerning animal fighting have folded; the federal laws against animal fighting have been strengthened and almost all 50 states consider dog fighting to be a felony. HSUS is working on passing laws to make it illegal to be a spectator at such events. In addition, HSUS now offers rewards for those providing tips to the police on animal fighting.

Mr. Goodwin closed his talk by reminding everyone that animal fighting can be stopped by enacting laws, enforcing those laws and changing the culture that supports animal fighting.

[Ed. Note: Maryland participates in the HSUS reward program. If you have information about illegal animal fighting in Maryland, call your local law enforcement or animal control agency. If the suspected person is convicted, ask the law enforcement agency to write a letter to The HSUS stating that your tip helped lead to the animal fighter's arrest and prosecution. The letter should be faxed or mailed to: Animal Fighting Reward Program, c/o Ann Chynoweth, HSUS, 2100 L. Street, Washington, D.C. 20037. Fax, 301-721-6414.]

POLITICIAN IS FIRST IN D.C. TO RECEIVE AWARD FOR HELPING ANIMALS

Overhaul of Animal Legislation

Mary Cheh, a D.C. Councilmember, was awarded a Humane Legislator Award from The Humane Society of the United States, the first time that a District of Columbia politician has received the award. Ms. Cheh was awarded for her persistence in passing legislation amending the city's animal welfare laws. Ms. Cheh introduced the legislation. The legislation started as a project conducted with Ms. Cheh's Animal Welfare Project students at George Washington University School of Law.

The law, Act 17-493 of 2008, also known as the Animal Protection Amendment Act of 2008, overhauls the current D.C. animal laws in a wide range of subjects. The new law permits courts, in animal cruelty cases, to order counseling or forfeiture of the right to own animals; it permits courts to order pet protection orders in domestic violence cases; allows veterinarians to issue animal licenses; promotes the reduction of euthanasia of pets by shelters; regulates commercial guard dogs; requires reporting of animal cruelty by law enforcement officers and child or protective services employees; makes it a felony to be a spectator at an animal fight; sets standards for animals kept in classrooms; requires the inclusion of animals in disaster plans; and sets up a spay and neuter fund to help lower-income residents for their pets, among other provisions.

Commentary: Living Together – Maybe It’s a Mother’s Thing?

By Cindy Ross

The man was felling a dead tree years ago when he discovered that it was a den tree. The mother squirrel had died from the impact, and the babies left orphans. He asked his wife’s opinion and offered to take his chain saw to them and quickly end their misery before their children found out. She protested, so she and the kids gathered them up and took them to a wild animal rehab center. There they were bottle fed, and, when they were older, released into the wild.

The other day the woman was weeding the peas in their garden when she noticed that the resident groundhogs had figured out how to climb their garden fence and had eaten a row.

“Do something, “she pleaded with her husband. She was thinking along the lines of raising the fence. Instead, her husband caught the mother in a death trap, her teats swollen and leaking milk. The five babies were left, shivering with fright, seemingly unable to distinguish which greens to eat. Each was caught in the trap, one by one. The man, who only had a pitchfork in his hand, cornered the father inside the garden.

“Doesn’t it bother you?” she questioned him.

“They were eating the peas.”

Perhaps his attitude is leftover from the age of one animal against the other. Maybe it’s about providing for his family, like shooting wolves that eat their sheep.

We, and the animals around our garden, are occupying the same niche and competing for the same food. That is how the natural world works. One gets it and one does not. It is people and groundhogs competing for the peas, in the man’s eyes, and he is determined to win, regardless of how that is accomplished.

There was a story in the newspaper about the Allentown, Pennsylvania firefighters who were called to rescue baby goslings from a storm drain. Dressed in 60 pounds of gear, these manly men answered the call and happily saved their little lives, for they mattered.

Everyone draws their line on how they value life at a different place. For some their lines encompass small, young, fuzzy, and cute creatures. Yet others shoot cats when they’re bored of hunting and see no game. Why do we make exceptions for one species and not another? Does it only have to do with convenience, location, fear or territory? In another

place and time, we might consider those geese a nuisance and the baby groundhogs charming.

On one hand, this issue seems like a small thing. . .controlling unwanted pests. However, when looked at closer, it may say something big.

The gardening couple’s son feels differently than the husband about the animal world. When he was young, he accidentally stepped on a millipede when they were hiking. Filled with remorse, he sat down on a rock sobbing and pleaded, “Do you think the millipede knew how much I loved him, Mama? Do you think the millipede will go to heaven?”

“I bet he’s already there, “ she assured him.

As a teen, he still relocates spiders outside when he finds them in the house.

Maybe it’s a mother’s thing. Maybe it’s her responsibility to care a few levels deeper and try to balance out the insensitivity. Perhaps this killing diminishes our ability to care, to empathize, to learn how to co-exist. Perhaps we need to instill in our children the value of all life, or the next generation may have hearts shrunken to Grinch-size proportions.

The woman wishes she would not have taken the easy way out and left it up to her husband to determine the groundhogs’ fates. She wishes she had insisted on tactics to repel and outwit, not obliterate. She should have demanded symbiosis-the living together or two species in a manner that is advantageous for both.

She recently purchased a copy of Bill Adler’s book, *Outwitting Critters – A Surefire Manual for Confronting Devious Animals and Winning*. She hopes it will help them both make more humane choices. Then when the next family of groundhogs moves in (and she hopes they do), they’ll be better equipped to deal with the challenge of living together.

The world may not have missed those few squirrels, or a handful of goslings, but surprisingly, the woman truly misses her groundhogs. There are no longer any brown balls of fur romping across our pasture when she drives down her lane. And the peas no longer taste so good.

Cindy Ross lives in Pennsylvania and has written 6 books about the outdoors. This commentary is distributed by Bay Journal News Service.