

H B

1 6 3

COMMITTEE REPORT  
SENATE

FURTHER:

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Mr. President:

The Committee on \_\_\_\_\_ has had \_\_\_\_\_

under consideration and (a majority of the committee) (the committee) reports it back with the following recommendations:

- do pass  do not pass
- do pass with attached amendments(s)
- replace with CS for \_\_\_\_\_  same title  
 new title
- and recommends \_\_\_\_\_
- AND attaches a "Letter of Intent"  New Fiscal Note
- reports it back without recommendation
- referred to the \_\_\_\_\_ Committee

MEMBERS SIGNING  
DO PASS

MEMBERS HAVING  
OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

CHAIRMAN



SENATE AMENDMENT

#1

By Halford

To: SCS SENATE BILL No. CSHB 163

To: \_\_\_\_\_ HOUSE BILL No. \_\_\_\_\_

PAGE: 1 LINE: 24 through

Page 2 Line 5 Delete

(Delete all of 16.05.926)

*Money 2 obj. to*

SENATE AMENDMENT

#2

By Halford

To: SCS SENATE BILL No. CSHB 163

To: \_\_\_\_\_ HOUSE BILL No. \_\_\_\_\_

*Amend / withdrawn*

PAGE: 1 LINE: 24 through

Page 2 Line 5 Delete

(Delete all of 16.05.926)

Page 2 Line 7 & Line 10

delete reference to 16.05.926

*Amend / withdrawn*

SENATE AMENDMENT

#3

By Resorbin & Fisher

To: \_\_\_\_\_ SENATE BILL No. SCS CS HB 163

To: \_\_\_\_\_ HOUSE BILL No. \_\_\_\_\_

PAGE:

LINE:

1

27

*not offered*

*after "probable cause" insert*

*"by reason of ~~the~~ overt acts or preparations"*

ATTACH TO  
5/20/83  
minutes

Although the harassment of hunters and other outdoorsmen has not been nearly as prevalent in Alaska as it has been in other states, notably in Arizona, New Jersey and others on the Eastern seaboard, I think we can expect it to increase here.

The fact that we haven't experienced much of the problem is due, I think, more to the remoteness of hunting areas of Alaska, and the high cost of coming to Alaska, than to any lack of desire on the part of anti-hunters to obstruct the taking of Alaskan wildlife.

However, it is that very remoteness and high cost, I believe, which gives additional impetus to this bill. Confrontations between hunters and anti-hunters would likely take place in extremely remote areas, where the potential for violence may be greater. And because the cost of hunting in Alaska generally runs high for many big game hunters, the frustration of having their hunt intentionally disrupted by anti-hunters would most likely be intensified.

As I said before, the incidence of hunter-harassment has been low to date in Alaska. But I don't think it would be realistic for us to think the problem will not increase. I think we can and should derail the problem while it is still small.

As you can see by the background information we have provided, harassment of sportsmen is, indeed, a concerted nationwide effort by anti-hunting organizations. I believe it is in the best interest of the people of Alaska to meet that challenge with the appropriate protections contained in CSHB 163, before a confrontation becomes a tragedy.

*this* Finally, ~~I would like the <sup>4007</sup> to bear in mind that~~ the bill does not address only hunting, but fishing, camping, and trapping as well.

As the fishing pressure increases in some areas of the state, confrontations are likely to take place between the different user groups, and even between different gear groups, and some protections need to be in the law.

I think the Bristol Bay salmon negotiations over the past several years are a good case for application of this law. Some fishermen want to strike, while some would rather fish. This anti-harassment bill would give the <sup>fisherman</sup> ~~guy~~ who wants to fish some recourse if his nets were cut, or he was obstructed in some other way from pursuing his livelihood.

Trappers and their traplines are also coming under increased pressure as the state develops. ~~This specific issue is the subject of another measure on today's calendar, HCR 27.~~ Trappers should have some recourse if their traplines are disturbed.

*In your support on this Bill,*  
I would ask that the members vote yes.

~~I'd like to say~~  
*I personally discussed this Bill with Commissioner Colunward, this morning and the Fish & Game Dept is very supportive of this <sup>needed</sup> piece of legislation.*

STATE OF ALASKA

Bill Sheffield, Governor

**DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME**  
**OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER**

P.O. BOX 3-2000  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99802  
PHONE: 465-4100

May 20, 1983

The Honorable Richard Shultz  
Representative  
Alaska State Legislature  
Pouch V  
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Representative Shultz:

Your office has asked that we provide you with a comment on our position on HB 163.

We favor the protection of the interest and privileges of individuals legally engaged in hunting and fishing activities, believing that they should be allowed to pursue these important activities without being harassed.

Sincerely,



Don W. Collinsworth  
Commissioner

CSHB 163 (Resources)

"An Act relating to harassment of persons engaged in hunting, fishing, or trapping."

#### SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section .925 would make it illegal to interfere with a person who is lawfully engaged in hunting, fishing or trapping; to disturb fish or game with the intent to interfere with their taking; or to enter or remain upon public or private land with intent to do one or the other of the above. A violation would be punishable by a fine of up to \$500 or 30 days in jail, or by both.

Section .926 mandates that a wildlife protection agent shall order a person to desist from a violation of section .925, if he has observed the violation, or has probable cause to believe the person has engaged in or intends to engage in such activities. The officer shall inform the violator of penalties applicable to failure to desist - a fine of up to \$1000 or 90 days in jail, or both.

Section .927 provides civil remedies allowing: a court injunction to stop the harassment; the aggrieved party to recover general damages for expenses rendered futile by the harassment; and the court to award punitive damages.

## Background material for HB 163

### British Columbia case

In response to several cases of harassment of hunters by anti-hunting groups in a Provincial Park in northern BC, the legislature last year passed the following statute:

#### Section 82 of BC Fish and Wildlife Act

"A person who interferes with or obstructs a person licensed or permitted to capture wildlife, or to hunt, fish, guide or trap while that person is lawfully so engaged, commits an offense."

### Vancouver Aquarium case

Newspaper article from September 18, 1982.

Greenpeace harassed Sealand Pacific employees in their attempt to capture two killer whales for their aquarium. The aquarium has an annual attendance of 700,000 people. No action was taken to stop this hinderance of men doing their jobs because there was evidently no law to support their complaint. Killer whales can be better studied scientifically in the controlled environment of an aquarium, and only two were to be taken.

### Virginia Deer Hunt case

Newspaper article from October 17, 1982

Conservationists are harassing Virginia zookeepers from conducting a two week hunt on their own fenced property. This hunt was approved by Virginia fish and game officials. The deer have overforaged the 5000 acre area and would die from starvation if the hunt was not held. While Greenpeace was committed to take every step necessary to stop the hunt, including harassment, biologists from the Humane Society of America claim the Greenpeace logic is reversed and just plain crazy.

TIPS FOR HUNT SABOTEURS

Fourteen million Americans will be shouldering their rifles and shotguns within the next few months, marching off to their annual offensive against our wildlife. These legions, which are more numerous, and generally better equipped than the entire Nazi armies of the Second World War, will take a bloody toll before the season ends. They will kill deer and rabbits, ducks, dogs, cats, a few children, and even a few hunters.

It is time for friends of animals to start organizing a defense that will serve to at least temper the wanton destruction. There are many ways that a friend of animals can become a forest partisan on behalf of our wildlife, and we offer here a few suggestions that range in effort, depending upon a person's abilities and commitment:

1. Deny the hunter the land to hunt on. Much hunting is done on private lands. To protect these animals, encourage your neighbors, especially those who own large tracts such as farms and ranches, to post their land and forbid hunting. Try to convince them that hunters invariably cause more damage to agriculture than the wild animals do.

2. Many areas have hunting restricted to a specified number of hunters who have special permits. Commonly, these permits allow the hunter to use a particular blind or hunt less common species, such as bear. Apply for these permits yourself. The permits are usually awarded by a simple lottery selection. If you're lucky, you'll win a permit and deny a hunter his kill.

3. Get into the woods yourself the day before the hunting season. If you're familiar with the most commonly hunted areas, try to drive wildlife away. A stroll through the forest with a nice loud radio and a dog on a leash, will serve to make wildlife more wary of humans. This is particularly important for younger animals that have not yet had the traumatizing experience of being hunted.

4. Certain substances, such as rotten eggs, when rubbed into hunting blinds, make these enclosures even more uncomfortable for the hunters. Uncomfortable hunters are irritable, and are also poorer shots. Plastering the floor of a hunting blind with cow dung is another good idea.

5. If you're familiar with wildlife habits in your neighborhood, try to encourage them to break these habits shortly before hunting season. For instance, many hunters like to stalk along deer tracks which are pretty well defined to a good woodsman. Placing deer repellent (available at many feed and hardware stores) along these tracks will encourage the deer to move away and leave the hunter with a route devoid of the species. If you want to save money, just scoop up a bag of human hair from a local barber shop and hang handfuls of it in little bags about two or three feet from the ground, along the deer track. The deer will soon get the message that there are humans in the area and will drift away.

6. If there is much hunting with dogs in your area, try to get hold of a female dog in heat and lead her, on a leash, through an area that is heavily hunted. Male dogs in the hunter's pack will "get wind" of the female and lose their enthusiasm for chasing rabbits or deer.

7. Hunters frequently like to ambush their prey by setting out food and then hiding in blinds. Commonly, bushels of apples are set out a few days before hunting season to encourage deer to browse in this area. When hunting season comes, the hunter merely comes to the site, climbs into a blind, and waits for the deer to come to him. To disrupt this, there are two alternatives. First, remove all apple piles immediately on finding them during the days preceding hunting season. Second, if there are just too many apples to carry away, give them a good spraying with deer repellent and spread barber shop hair clippings all over the area.

8. Encourage your municipality to pass an ordinance that bans, in the interest of public safety, the use of all weapons within its limits. Rifles, shotguns, bows and arrows have been known to kill people too.

9. If you have a portable tape recorder, get a cassette recording of wolf howls. Play this in the woods a few times in the days before hunting season. It will make wildlife wary.

10. Try to develop strong anti-hunting sentiment in your community by writing letters to the editor of your local newspapers, meeting with neighbors, getting on talk shows. Creating public awareness of the problem is a vital point. Let your neighbors know that the law recognizes wildlife as belonging to all people, and they are not the exclusive property of hunters until after they have been murdered.

11. Work on a project to get your State to pass a law that would require all hunters to carry written permission from the landowners of the places they hunt. This further curbs the hunter's battlegrounds because many farmers are reluctant to sign permits that would allow people to hunt on their lands. Also, much land is owned by summer residents, corporations, etc. that are nearly impossible to get hold of.

12. Approach your Congressperson and Senators with demands that hunting and trapping be prohibited on national wildlife refuges and all public land.

13. If you have any old, stuffed animal toys, set these around commonly hunted areas. Hunters often don't take the time to check if an animal is real. Better to have a hole in a cotton rabbit than a real one - and the noise of the gun going off might serve to scare away other wildlife.

14. We will be trying to put together a better activist's guide for next hunting season, so if you have any ideas or procedures you've found effective, please let us know. Mail them in to Bill Clark, Friends of Animals, 11 West 60th Street, New York, NY 10023.

Use your imagination. There are plenty of ways to frustrate the hunt, depending on your own abilities and enthusiasm. The main point here is to do something. By your work, you will be helping animals in two ways. First, you will be protecting them from the hunters and second, you will be letting the hunters know that friends of animals are in the woods. This serves to anger them, and angry hunters do not stalk so quietly, their aim is not so precise. Emotions can play heavily in the success of a hunt, and the most effective killers are cool and methodical. Disrupt!

Friends  
of Animals

David  
H.

To → Jim Glass

# 1979 Won't Be Your Typical H

News Item... The Connecticut chapter of Friends of Animals is urging its supporters to "sabotage" gunners when the state's hunting season opens next month. Methods would include strolling through the woods with a loud radio, leaving deer repellent at likely places and spreading human hair to drive animals away.

At first glance, it sounded like inviting disaster. More than a few hunters accidentally get shot by other hunters every year, not to mention cows and horses. Some Connecticut Friends of Animals was a clinch to stop a bullet, and maybe not by accident.

**NOPE, SAID** Bill Clark, national vice-president of Friends of Animals from his New York City office. "We are discouraging any direct confrontation with hunters."

Instead, Clark said, the Friends will be in the woods *before* hunting season but not during it.

"Most killing of animals takes place on the first day of the season," Clark said. "It's the most successful



JIM  
MONTGOMERY

day for hunters, by far, especially deer hunters. So we're telling our people to do what they're going to do the week before that first day.

"Primarily, we're hoping to disrupt ambushes. Many hunters will place a stack of apples along deer trails, for instance. Our people will split these up. Where blinds in trees are illegal, we are encouraging our people to tear down any they see in place.

"But basically, what we hope to do is make the animals wary by letting them know humans are in the area."

**CLARK SAID** he realized hunting is allowed by law, nor did he dis-

pute biologists' claims that up to 80% of game animals die each year, whether hunted or not.

"First of all," he said, "we do not believe animals should be shot and killed by anyone at any time, and we do not believe hunters are really concerned about wildlife, although they claim to be.

"Hunters claim they pay for preservation of animals through their license fees and the taxes on sporting goods. This isn't true. Taxes from the general public pay most of these costs, and hunters' money doesn't entirely go for preservation of animals.

"The 80% figure is a trap. We don't doubt the actual figures, but the 20% which would survive would be the best animals, the strongest animals, the ones best suited to reproduce. These animals are the No. 1 goal of hunters. If any percentage of the best animals are killed by hunters, it damages the species."

The vice-president even had an

# Hunting Season In Connecticut

... for a personal point of puzzle: do the Friends intend to let fishing season, since it also is the pursuit and possible loss of small animals in their natural habitat?

...," Clark said. Why? "It isn't equal. We're not big enough. If you get into the morality involved, as we should if we had sufficient numbers. But from a biological standpoint, fishing causes less harm than hunting."

... CONNECTICUT effort isn't consistent along its lines.

... did the same thing last year in New York," Clark said. "We got a mixed response, hundreds of letters, was accused of being both a socialist and a Fascist. But perhaps some animals were saved."

... I have to respect Clark and the Friends for one thing. They believe in what they're doing. On the other hand, so (presumably) does the good friend, Valdim Hayden, albeit not me. And so do hunters.

... In many ways, it is difficult to compare hunting.

There is the meat-on-the-table rationale. It has some validity, what with the market prices of beef, pork and chicken. It had more validity in pioneer days, though, and on a cost-per-pound basis (including license, travel, ammunition, etc.) a quail or venison or rabbit dinner is more expensive than store-bought sirloin.

There is the it's-legal-and-nobody's-business approach, which is true. Except, by definition, being friendly to animals must be the Friends of Animals' business.

There's the it-does-no-harm approach, which is also true. Remember the island experiment where rabbit hunting was allowed for several years, barred for several years, then allowed again. Result: virtually no difference in rabbit population.

There's the hunting-is-fun view. Again, true. Hunting is fun . . . to hunters. Personally, I cannot remember killing an animal (snakes, spiders and scorpions excluded) without feeling some regret. I suspect most hunters feel the

same. Death by gun in most cases is more merciful than the alternatives to an animal—starvation or freezing. But there is still the feeling of remorse.

So why do I hunt? For all the above reasons, and for others no one but a hunter understands. The Friends of Animals are trying to make a majority conform to their minority viewpoint. Name notwithstanding, it's none of their business if I or anyone else legally hunts.

*Jim Montgomery is Enquirer Outdoors Editor.*

## This Week's Solunar Table

Date	A.M.		P.M.	
	Minor	Major	Minor	Major
Sept. 30	12:35	7:15	1:10	7:45
Oct. 1	1:25	8:10	2:00	8:40
2	2:20	9:00	2:55	9:30
3	3:10	9:50	3:45	10:20
4	4:05	10:40	4:35	11:10
5	4:50	11:35	5:25	11:55
6	5:45	—	6:15	12:35
7	6:45	1:00	7:15	1:35

# Sabotaging the Shooting Crowd

Friends of Animals took to the field through the autumn and winter, bringing the fight to protect animals into the woodlands, marshes and meadows.

On one expedition to a state forest in Connecticut, an FoA team uncovered a variety of illegal hunting tricks—including a cache of apples used to “bait” deer—and destroyed them. Other tactics used by the FoA hunt saboteurs included:

- Destruction of tree stands and hunting blinds,
- Spreading animal repellent around heavily hunted areas.
- Setting up bogus targets to lure hunters into false shots,
- Playing tape recordings of wolf howls just before the opening of hunting season to instinctively sensitize wildlife to the presence of predators.

Hunters complained to the state fish and game commission that the FoA teams were wrecking their sport, but the bureaucrats had to admit that the FoA efforts were entirely legal and there was nothing that could be done.

On another operation, FoA blocked the last day of goose hunting season on Long Island Sound with a widely publicized sabotage. The publicity was so great that despite the day's warm and clear weather, all the goose blinds were empty for twenty miles around. The hunters apparently decided to give up their last blast of the season to avoid confrontations with the protectionist FoA saboteurs. Score one safe day for the geese. Lesson learned: Even the rumor of confrontation will make hunters balk and stay home.

Hunt sabotage precipitated a paranoia throughout the gunslinging fraternity that resulted in a blizzard of hate mail and nasty editorials in the hunters' favorite periodicals,

including Gun Week and Field & Stream. They ridiculed and mocked FoA and spent much effort in telling the world how ineffective the FoA hunt sabotage program was.

Either the hunters are unusually sensitive to being challenged on their own marshes or they're really sore at having lost the chance to kill a few animals. Either way, they're on the defensive.

Some of the season's sabotages received substantial media coverage. One effort even had two television crews and a squad of newspaper reporters trailing along, all of whom were welcomed because their presence tended to make the hunters in the area a little sheepish.

FoA encourages all its members and sympathizers to sabotage the sport hunter. One need not jump into the woods to shoo deer and rabbits away from the hunter's blinds in order to be a useful saboteur. One can also talk with neighbors and get them to post their land, press for local ordinances that prohibit the discharge of firearms within the borders of your community, write letters to the editor of local newspapers to let people know that wild animals belong to ALL citizens, and as a citizen, you're unwilling to see animals murdered by hunters who find a perverted interpretation of sport in butchering innocent animals.

# Animal-Lover Amory Takes Aim at Hunting

The world is going to be a terrible place when the only thing left in it walks on two feet, said the man who is perhaps the world's most famous friend of living things that move with fins, wings, hoofs and paws.

Cleveland Amory, writer, television critic, activist and gadfly in his advocacy for animals, spoke Friday night at an environmentalists' banquet on the Chico State University campus. The talk marked the mid-point of the third annual Chautauqua.

Amory, president and founder of The Fund for Animals, entertained an audience of approximately 100 in Bell Memorial Union, with sharp wit and provocative anecdotes concerning cruelty to animals.

Never shy of controversy, Amory also illustrated by his comments during the evening why he is the scourge of organized gun groups and hunters, and why, for example, the hunting magazine *Shooting Times* once ran a cover headline saying, "Cleveland Amory, go soak your head!"

Saying he was accustomed to such reactions wherever he goes, Amory several times referred to a recent letter to the editor in *The Enterprise-Record* that called the Fund for Animals a fake charity that spends little of its income on animals.

Amory said the charge was false and that most of the organization's money is spent on lawsuits to protect animals, rather than salaries for its 23 paid employees.

In any case, Amory suggested, charities for animals are different than charities for people.

Quoting the president of the Chico chapter of the Fund for Animals, Laura Morrell, Amory said, "We can't send a \$20 bill to a dolphin."

Most of the letters written in opposition to his cause are sent by hunters and trappers, Amory said.

The letter, which appeared Tuesday in the E-R, was jointly authored by Norman Owens Sr. and Norman Owens Jr., both of Oroville.

Owens Jr. is the owner of Owen's Shooter's Shop, a gun store in Oroville.

Parodying the conservationist-based argument of deer hunters that they only "thin the herd" to prevent starvation of the animals, Amory said he intended to form a group called "Hunt the Hunters Hunt Club."

Hunters are a renewable resource, he said, and the club would shoot them for "their own good" because there "is nothing sadder than the sight of hunters out in the woods starving."

However, club members would be asked not to shoot hunters during mating season or while they were making out in parked cars, he said.

"There's no question of completely exterminating hunters," he said. "When the

numbers get so low, we'll start to breed them."

On a more serious side, Amory catalogued a number of what he called "abominations" against animals in the name of sport or for profit.

Amory said the worst thing he ever witnessed was the annual mass slaughter of baby seals in Canada, "where the mother seal is absolutely helpless as she watches her cubs being clubbed to death."

He also cited an event in Pennsylvania where 148 archers in full field camouflage dress turned out to kill six lame goats and sheep released in a wooded area. The event also called for a live turkey shoot with arrows, he said.

A lawsuit filed by the Fund for Animals interfered with the club's plans, however, and in what Amory called a landmark case established the principle of legal action to prevent probable cruelty to animals.

A Pennsylvania judge ruled two weeks ago that for each animal released during the event, a person must stand by with a gun to put the animal out of its misery after it was hit by an arrow, Amory said.

Amory was scheduled to speak again at 12:30 p.m. today in the City Plaza, preceding another Chautauqua event at Municipal Center, Fourth and Main streets; a 2 p.m. discussion of the proposed coal-fired power plant.

by JIM HAYNES



Cleveland Amory

## Veterinarian Challenges Amory

Chico, Calif.  
10-19-78

Dear Editor—

In order that Mr. Amory has my credentials correct, I do not own a gun store, but am a practicing veterinarian, having spent three years at the University of Idaho, majoring in Wildlife Management. I do not hunt deer or elk, but do hunt pheasant and duck and also love to fish. I am an active member of the California Wildlife Federation, National and World Wildlife Federations, National Rifle Association, Bass Anglers Sportsman Society, Ducks Unlimited, The Wild Turkey Federation, California Waterfowl Association and The Canvasback Society. Locally, a small amount of time is devoted to volunteer work for the Bidwell Nature Center.

My taste buds enjoy wild fowl as well as domestic, my body the warmth of a feather-filled period on a cold day. Mr. Amory implies that because my family prefers to harvest some of their own fowl and fish (the latest comments suggest that fishing also be eliminated) we are perverted. My favorite Indian friend in Minnesota would have a saying for Mr. Amory. It would state, "White man speak with fork's tongue!"

Under the guise of helping wildlife, Mr. Amory, is really trying to relieve his own personal frustrations against those who hunt and fish. He insinuates that those early morning hours spent in a duck blind or in the field with my son or daughter is contributing to the loss of our wildlife. With this same sound thinking, he says in his book that it may be necessary to eliminate firearms from all law abiding citizens (hunters or not), to save our wildlife. Shame on Mr. Amory! The American people will not be deceived in this manner, we already have more than enough government in our daily lives.

Sports Illustrated's latest issue contains an article by Virginia Kraft which tells of three South Dakota hunters who planted the state's first Chinese pheasants way back in 1908. Through proper management these initial birds have grown to a population which may approach 8-9 million birds this fall and have provided this state an economic return said to be in the billions. The National Wildlife Federation in its October issue points out there are now more elk, antelope, deer, fox, racoon, etc. than ever in

the history of our nation and the real threat to our wildlife is loss of habitat, not hunting.

What has Mr. Amory done to help our wildlife? He has, with his lawsuits against hunting, tied up millions of dollars which could have been used to purchase wetlands, woods, streams, and estuaries for our wildlife. It is all right for wildlife to die of disease, malnutrition or parasites but one can't harvest any of these animals! (Ten thousand ducks died of botulism here in California a few weeks ago.) He holds the Audubon Society, National Wildlife Federation, Ducks Unlimited, Sierra Club and virtually every other wildlife group up to ridicule because they fail to condemn hunting. These groups — recognizing the points of agreement that exists between hunters, fishermen, and nature lovers of all kinds — chose not to condemn hunting, but take a stand permitting a strong united front of mutual interest. Amory has placed their honor in question.

Mr. Amory says nothing of the many birds, rodents, pheasants, deer, etc. that are killed by jet engines or car tires as he travels the countryside, supposedly crusading for wildlife. The death toll from the automobile alone is staggering — many of these injured animals crawl into the woods. Is that nature's way? So you see, he is a murderer too, if that's how he wishes to phrase it — and a coward also, for the hunter or fisherman admits that the harvest of wildlife may be a part of the hunt.

In the final analysis it will be the bulldozer and that word "habitat" which determines the fate of our wildlife. The true hunter whose love and concern for wildlife has planted the Chinese ringneck pheasant in South Dakota, purchased habitat in Canada, U.S., Mexico and brought back the woodduck, whooping crane (still critical), bighorn sheep and others from low numbers. These same people along with others truly concerned with wildlife are now purchasing habitat and replanting the wild turkey and studying the king of ducks, the Canvasback, to find a replacement for the grass it needs to survive, but which is succumbing to pollution.

JAMES R. CLAESGENS D.V.M.  
Chico, Calif.

# *WLFA Initiates Program to Combat Hunter Harassment*

**Hunter Harassment: Sabotage.** The anti-hunting, anti-trapping, anti-fishing "animal rights" organizations have been waging a war on sportsmen in the field and on the water. Their aim is to torment sportsmen and drive game away to deny sportsmen the opportunity to hunt and trap.

The Wildlife Legislative Fund of America has initiated a program to fight anti-hunters bent on harassment of sportsmen.

Incidents of harassment have been increasing in recent years. The problem became so intense in Arizona as members of the Tucson-based Animal Defense Council were sabotaging the annual desert big-horn sheep hunt, that a law was passed to make premeditated harassment of hunters illegal.

In British Columbia's Spatsizi Preserve, hunters have been faced with violent harassment by members of the international animal rights organization, Greenpeace. Greenpeace members finally came head to head with hunting guides in British Columbia earlier this year. One of the anti-hunters reportedly fired a flare gun at a guide and violence erupted which sent the Greenpeace members to local hospitals for treatment of cuts and scrapes incurred in the fight.

Over the past few years in New Jersey, anti-hunters have regularly turned out at the Great Swamp wildlife area and other public hunting lands to harass hunters on the opening day of deer season. New Jersey officials are fearful the opening day fracas will one day erupt in violence similar to that which occurred in British Columbia.

In Connecticut, widespread trap and game theft have occurred and anti-hunters have taken to sawing partially through struts supporting deer hunters' tree stands. This tactic is not only bothersome, but endangers unsuspecting hunters who could easily be injured in falls from tree stands.

The WLFA is out to wage a counter-campaign against the anti-hunters. We plan to take our fight to the state legislatures and the courtrooms in our effort to make harassment of hunters, trappers and fishermen illegal.

The WLFA has drafted model legislation, which can be converted to the format used by any state, which makes harassment of hunters, trappers and fishermen illegal. The bill provides stiff penalties for violators and will be extremely beneficial in curtailing incidents of hunter harassment.

The courtroom may also provide the forum for the demise of the anti-hunters' harassment tactics. The WLFA is prepared to advise sportsmen on how to file suit against anyone who torments hunters.

Sportsmen need protection under the law from hunter harassment. Most forms of hunting are quite simple to disrupt. Waterfowl hunters are probably the most vulnerable. The Friends of Animals publishes a pamphlet entitled "Hints for Hunt



Saboteurs" which has been widely circulated. In time, this pamphlet and other instructions by anti-hunting organizations are expected to create even more headaches for hunters of waterfowl, deer, turkey, squirrel and virtually every other game animal.

If you are interested in working for passage of a hunter harassment law in your state, contact WLFA. We can get you started on the right track by giving you valuable tips on how to lobby for the bill's passage and may even be able to identify a legislator in your state who will introduce the bill.

## New battles loom over right to hunt

By WILLIAM E. GEIST  
*The New York Times*

NEPTUNE, N.J.—When Susan Russell strolls through the woods playing classical music on her tape player, the deer, muskrats and other wildlife of the forest run the other way. A muskrat may linger momentarily over a few notes of Chopin, but John Philip Sousa always sends them crashing through the brush.

Russell is one of tens of thousands of animal lovers who patrol the woods during hunting and trapping seasons, blaring everything from Sousa marches to recorded wolf howls in a nationwide campaign to set animals running for their lives before hunters arrive. She has found the hunter has

(See HUNTERS, page 8)

## HUNTERS . . .

(Continued from page 1)

no more appreciation for her music than the muskrat.

A growing number of confrontations between hunters and these protectors of wildlife has led a New Jersey legislator to introduce a bill that would make it illegal to "interfere or attempt to interfere with the lawful hunting, pursuit, killing or taking of an animal, bird or freshwater fish." Violators would be fined.

The legislator, Assemblyman Joseph W. Chinnici, Republican of Bridgeton, himself a hunter, said his legislation was needed to protect both the hunters from harassment and the animal protectors from reprisals. Such legislation recently became law in Arizona and is under consideration in several other states in response to the growing militance of animal protectionists.

"There's a war going on," said Russell, a spokesman for Friends of Animals, a national organization with headquarters here and in New York that distributes "Tips for Hunt Saboteurs" to its 120,000 members. The tips range from lobbying for changes in the law with local, state and national officials to such guerrilla tactics as taking a female dog in heat into the field to turn the heads of male hunting dogs, and scattering rotten eggs and cow dung in duck blinds.

Russell sees nothing extreme in any of this.

"Wildlife belongs to everybody," she said. "We think it is audacious of hunters to say they can shoot animals but we cannot protect them."

But Chinnici has said, "If this isn't stopped immediately," "someone is going to get hurt."

Implicit in his warning, and those voiced by concerned hunters throughout the state, is that the side carrying tape players is at a distinct disadvantage in confrontations with those carrying rifles and shotguns.

Chinnici said he had received reports of "anti sportsmen's groups" blaring car horns and firing weapons to scare off game and in one instance even flying a helicopter over a hunting area.

His bill has been referred to the Assembly's Agriculture and Environment Committee, where four of the five committee members are co-sponsors. Both opponents and proponents believe the bill has substantial support in the Legislature.

Bob Busnardo, host of the weekly radio program "Sportsmen's Hot Line" on a Bridgeton station, said "these antis" (one of the more pleasant terms hunters use to describe those opposed to hunting) had disrupted his hunting excursions by playing radios, honking car horns, letting air out of tires and swerving their automobiles toward him as he stood on country roads.

"The confrontations have been verbal so far," he said, "but when you harass someone long enough and hard enough, eventually there are going to be serious problems."

Opponents charge that Chinnici's bill would infringe on their rights of speech and assembly.

"Whenever there is a protest of anything," said Russell, "whether it be civil rights or women's rights or whatever, there is the chance of confrontation. But someone cannot just do away with our right to speak out on things we disagree with. If they do, I believe that in good conscience we would have to continue to protest as we are now."

BACKGROUND IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE BILL 2291

During the past several years certain groups and individuals have appeared in hunting areas each fall with the expressed objective of disrupting a hunt. While their efforts were not notably successful, they did generate a lot of hostile reaction from hunters. Incidents of this kind have been increasing. They will likely produce a serious confrontation some day, and this situation poses a threat to the safety of all concerned, including state peace officers.

An example of this problem is the sheep hunt conducted annually in Unit 33, a portion of the Catalina Mountains near Tucson. What began a few years ago as a one-man protest against the hunt has recently drawn as many as 8-10 active participants who march through the area firing guns, blowing whistles and following hunters to frustrate their purpose of taking a sheep. Tempers run high; Arizona sheep hunting is often a once-in-a-lifetime experience which is the culmination of years of planning and can involve the expenditure of several thousand dollars. Someone is going to get injured if this interference continues.

The buffalo hunt conducted at Raymond Ranch near Flagstaff also has drawn protesters during past seasons. One year, a group of emotionally charged persons, apparently aroused by a television movie, actually threatened to stand in front of a buffalo herd in range of the gunners. The threat was not carried out but the hunt proceeded with assistance from a large contingent of DPS officers called in to keep the peace.

Now, one clear purpose of these demonstrators is attracting publicity to their cause. And though many of us deplore the irrationality we see in the anti-hunting crusade, we do not dispute the right of all persons to be heard. In fact, public forums abound where anti-hunting views can be expressed. Each year, for example, the buffalo and sheep seasons are discussed and then established in open, well publicized meetings of the Game and Fish Commission. The Commissioners themselves are citizens from all areas of the state who are readily accessible to anyone wanting to influence Game and Fish policy. For that matter, demonstrations could be conducted in the field without harassing others and would be appropriate.

The proposed legislation is designed only to prevent actual interference with hunters or disturbance of game in

public hunting areas. It will apply in certain, defined places where the Game and Fish Commission has found, after public hearing, that a hunt disruption is likely to occur. The law includes specific language excepting ranchers, miners and others on public lands who might inadvertently disturb a hunt. But it will allow the removal or arrest of demonstrators who do interfere, intentionally, with hunters. Moreover, such persons may be liable to the hunter for civil damages.

The law answers the problems experienced repeatedly on sheep and buffalo hunts. Should these incidents continue to happen, and recent history suggest that they will, the law can be used to preserve the peace before a serious incident does occur. But aside from the state's concern for order and safety, the law serves clear notice that the right of protest is not unlimited and that it ceases to exist when protesting citizens purposely interfere with the lawful activities of other citizens in a public place.

*Publication*

Arizona Game & Fish Department  
3-31-81

Offered: 5/27/83  
Referred: Rules

Original sponsor: Shultz

1 IN THE HOUSE BY THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
2 SENATE CS FOR CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 163 (Judiciary)  
3 IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA  
4 THIRTEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION  
5 A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act relating to harassment of persons lawfully  
7 engaged in hunting, fishing, camping, or trapping."  
8 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

9 \* Section 1. AS 16.05 is amended by adding new sections to read:

10 Sec. 16.05.925. HARASSMENT OF PERSON LAWFULLY ENGAGED IN HUNT-  
11 ING, FISHING, CAMPING, OR TRAPPING. ~~\*(a)~~ A person may not knowingly  
12 interfere with a person lawfully engaged in or attempting to lawfully  
13 engage in sport hunting, subsistence hunting, commercial hunting,  
14 sport fishing, subsistence fishing, camping, or trapping with the  
15 intent of hindering or preventing the person's activity.

16 (b) A person may not knowingly disturb fish or game or the  
17 habitat of fish or game with the intent of <sup>HARASSING OR</sup> hindering or preventing a  
18 person lawfully engaged in or attempting to lawfully engage in sport  
19 hunting, subsistence hunting, commercial hunting, sport fishing,  
20 subsistence fishing, camping, or trapping.

21 (c) A person who violates this section is guilty of a mis-  
22 demeanor punishable by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment  
23 for not more than 30 days, or by both.

24 Sec. 16.05.926. ORDER TO DESIST. (a) An enforcement or inves-  
25 tigative officer charged with enforcement of the fish and game laws of  
26 the state shall order a person to desist from violation of AS 16.05.-  
27 925 if the officer observes such conduct or has probable cause to  
28 believe that the person has engaged in or intends to engage in such  
29 conduct on specific premises. The officer shall inform the person of

1 the penalties set out in (b) of this section.

2 (b) A person who violates an order of an officer under (a) of  
3 this section is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not  
4 more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 90 days, or by  
5 both.

6 Sec. 16.05.927. CIVIL REMEDIES. (a) A person aggrieved by  
7 conduct in violation of AS 16.05.925 or [AS 16.05.926 or] threatened  
8 with such conduct may petition a superior court to enjoin the respon-  
9 dent from engaging in such conduct.

10 (b) A person aggrieved by a violation of AS 16.05.925 or [AS 16.-  
11 05.926] is entitled to recover general damages and special damages,  
12 including license and permit fees, travel costs, guide fees, special  
13 equipment and supplies, and other related expenses.

14 (c) A court may award punitive damages in addition to the dam-  
15 ages set out in (b) of this section.