

# **EXHIBIT 39**

---

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield [redacted]@humanesociety.org  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 11, 2013 6:00 PM  
**To:** Irby, Marty; Heydlauff, Emma  
**Cc:** Keith Dane  
**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

EW4 005262

14-2940\_0436

# **EXHIBIT 40**

**From:** Irby, Marty [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:38 PM  
**To:** 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield' <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Subject:** RE: Conf Call Fri w HSUS

---

That is fine with me. Just let me know.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield [REDACTED]@humansociety.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:12 PM  
**To:** Irby, Marty  
**Subject:** Conf Call Fri w HSUS

See below.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>  
**Date:** December 17, 2013, 12:28:24 PM EST  
**To:** Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>  
**Cc:** Sara Amundson <[REDACTED]@hsif.org<[REDACTED]@hsif.org>>, Keith Dane <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>, "Cherie Beatty" ([REDACTED]@aol.com<[REDACTED]@aol.com>)  
**Subject:** Re: email exchange with Wayne on PAST

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 Fri off.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 17, 2013, at 12:18 PM, "Mimi Brody" <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>> wrote:

Works for me.

**From:** Sara Amundson  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 12:18 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody  
**Cc:** Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cherie Beatty ([REDACTED]@aol.com<[REDACTED]@aol.com>)  
**Subject:** Re: email exchange with Wayne on PAST

Maybe Friday from 10:30-11?

Sent from my iPad

On Dec 17, 2013, at 12:02 PM, "Mimi Brody" <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>> wrote:  
I'm available, not sure about others this week.

**From:** Keith Dane  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 11:59 AM  
**To:** Mimi Brody; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cherie Beatty ([REDACTED]@aol.com<[REDACTED]@aol.com>)  
**Subject:** RE: email exchange with Wayne on PAST

Should we have a call this week, before everyone takes off for the holidays, to discuss our current strategy, Senate targets, etc. - as well as our game plan once Congress is back in session in January?

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 12:33 PM  
**To:** Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Coos Kremer; Keith Dane; Cherie Beatty ([REDACTED]@aol.com<[REDACTED]@aol.com>)  
**Subject:** FW: email exchange with Wayne on PAST

FYI, emails with Wayne below re: cosponsor goal and other strategy...

**From:** Wayne Pacelle  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 12:30 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Right. She won't back off. I'd really like to get to 50 in the Senate, and then we have an ironclad public case to make for moving it, with majorities in both chambers.

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 12:29 PM  
**To:** Wayne Pacelle  
**Subject:** RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Then there's Alexander's top fundraiser, Steve Smith, now leading the charge at TWHBEA (Big Lick group). I'm glad that didn't make Ayotte back off the bill!

**From:** Wayne Pacelle  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 12:27 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

We need to overlay HPA violators with McConnell's donor list, and make it too radioactive for him. If Commerce passes it, then Reid, if we give him enough time, can do a cloture vote on it. This would be our one cloture ask of him this Congress. We've got enough ins with him that we just might get it done.

**From:** Mimi Brody

Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:25 PM  
To: Wayne Pacelle  
Subject: RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Indeed, I just brought that up with Sara the other day - we need a scandal to make these key ones afraid or unable to stand in the way.

From: Wayne Pacelle  
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:23 PM  
To: Mimi Brody  
Subject: RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Remember when Allard was carrying animal fighting, and Lott was the problem.

From: Mimi Brody  
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:22 PM  
To: Wayne Pacelle  
Subject: RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

We need it to be a total flood, to overcome McConnell's, Blackburn's and Rogers' machinating behind-the-scenes to keep it from getting done.

From: Wayne Pacelle  
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:20 PM  
To: Mimi Brody  
Subject: RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Great get, too. With Daines in the House and Thune in the Senate, the dam has burst.

From: Mimi Brody  
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:04 AM  
To: Fed Leg List; Keith Dane; Cherie Deatty; [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov; [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov; [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov; [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov; Hicks, Cory  
Subject: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

In case it may help, we need to make sure Sen. Murkowski's staff knows. I can send email to those in her office who got the scorecard letter, or if Marty and any others who met with her staff would prefer to pass along this news to her office, please let me know. Thanks,  
Mimi

From: Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte) [REDACTED]@ayotte.senate.gov  
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 10:52 AM  
To: Mimi Brody; Runyan, Caitlin (Warner)  
Subject: RE: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Senator Begich will cosponsor, as well.

From: Mimi Brody [REDACTED]@humansociety.org  
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 10:37 AM  
To: Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte)  
Subject: RE: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Thanks, Caitlin. I also heard last week from Karla Thieman for Chairwoman Stabenow that she wanted to be added.

From: Runyan, Caitlin (Warner) [REDACTED]@warner.senate.gov  
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 9:57 AM  
To: Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Mimi Brody  
Subject: FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

FYI

From: Stenczuk, Alexis (Agriculture)  
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 9:55 AM  
To: Runyan, Caitlin (Warner)  
Cc: Thieman, Karla (Agriculture)  
Subject: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Hi Caitlin,

Chairwoman Stabenow would like to be added as a cosponsor to the PAST Act.

Thank you,  
Alexis Stenczuk

Legislative Correspondent  
U.S. Senate Agriculture Committee  
(202) 224- [REDACTED]

# **EXHIBIT 41**

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 3, 2012 10:35 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov  
**Subject:** Fwd: Questions for Constance Harriman-Whitfield from Washington Post; Thank you

---

Here are questions Post sent me.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield [REDACTED]@humansociety.org <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Date:** December 2, 2012, 3:47:11 PM EST  
**To:** Heather Sullivan <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org> <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>, HSLF Heather Sullivan <[REDACTED]@hslf.org> <[REDACTED]@hslf.org>, Sara Amundson <[REDACTED]@hslf.org> <[REDACTED]@hslf.org>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield [REDACTED]@humansociety.org <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Questions for Constance Harriman-Whitfield from Washington Post; Thank you

For purposes of tomorrow's discussion, here are the questions the Post sent me four days ago. I will be forwarding my draft answers later today. Talk tomorrow!

Connie

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield [REDACTED]@humansociety.org <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Date:** December 2, 2012, 3:43:18 PM EST  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield [REDACTED]@humansociety.org <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Questions for Constance Harriman-Whitfield from Washington Post; Thank you

Sent from my iPhone

>>  
>>  
>> ----- Forwarded by David S Fallis/news/TWP on 11/28/2012 11:57 AM -----  
>>  
>> **From:** David S Fallis/news/TWP  
>> **To:** [REDACTED]@humansociety.org <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
>> **Date:** 11/21/2012 11:30 AM  
>> **Subject:** Questions for Constance Harriman-Whitfield from Washington  
>> Post; Thank you  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> Dear Constance Harriman-Whitfield,  
>>  
>> This year at The Post we have been reporting on the personal finances of  
>> lawmakers and their families and their official actions in Congress. As  
>> part of that we're working on a story about lawmakers who have family  
>> members that are registered to lobby Congress or work for firms that  
>> lobby.  
>>  
>> Public records show that you are a registered lobbyist for the Humane  
>> Society Legislative Fund. A review of lobbying disclosure forms and the  
>> Congressional Record show that you registered to lobby on bills this  
>> session sponsored by or cosponsored by your husband.  
>>  
>> Those bills and the corresponding lobbying reports include (I have  
>> embedded  
>> links to the bills and the reports for your convenience, please let me  
>> know  
>> if they do not open):  
>>  
>> - HR 6388 (112th), sponsor. Here is a lobbying report.  
>> - HR 1733 (112th), sponsor. Here is a lobbying report.  
>> - HR 2492 (112th), cosponsor. Here is a lobbying report.  
>> - HR 2966 (112th), cosponsor. Here is a lobbying report.  
>> - HR 1513 (112th), cosponsor. Here is a lobbying report.  
>> - HR 835 (112th), cosponsor. Here is a lobbying report.  
>>  
>> I have some questions so that we may include your answers in our  
>> reporting:  
>>  
>> 1) Why did you first register as a federal lobbyist and what are your  
>> qualifications?  
>> 2) Have you ever lobbied your husband on these or other bills and issues?  
>> If so, what bills/issues and what were the circumstances?  
>> 3) If you have not lobbied your husband on these bills or other bills or  
>> issues, why not? And has that hampered your effectiveness as a lobbyist  
>> for  
>> the group?

>> 4) Have any of your fellow lobbyists from the Humane Society Legislative  
>> Fund lobbied your husband regarding these or other bills? If so, please  
>> explain the circumstances.  
>> 5) Who are you lobbying in Congress regarding the bills listed above and  
>> what is it you are advocating? Please describe the circumstances.  
>> 6) Have you ever communicated with your husband in any other manner on  
>> behalf of your clients on these or other issues that involve Congress? If  
>> so, what were the circumstances?  
>> 7) Did you or anyone from the Humane Society Legislative fund or the  
> Humane  
>> Society have input on or help draft language on the bills listed above?  
> If  
>> so, please describe the circumstances and what was done.  
>> 8) Please cite any cases in which your husband has acted in opposition or  
>> contrary to the interests of the Humane Society's lobbying efforts.  
>> 9) Would you like to provide any additional comments in the interest of  
>> fairness or accuracy?  
>>  
>> This is not for a daily story, but we would like to hear back in the  
> coming  
>> two weeks (December 3) so that we can include the information in our  
>> reporting for our story. Thank you very much for your time and  
>> consideration.  
>>  
>> Respectfully,  
>>  
>> David S. Fallis  
>>  
>> Staff Writer  
>> Washington Post  
>> 202-334- desk  
>> mobile  
>  
>



# **EXHIBIT 42**

**From:** Sara Amundson <[REDACTED]@hslf.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 4, 2012 10:52 AM  
**To:** Ed Whitfield <[REDACTED]@verizon.net>  
**Subject:** RE: Answer to Questions 2-7

---

Connie: Thanks so much for this message--I do appreciate it. I only sent the cursory feedback on Sunday night as I understood we three would connect yesterday to walk through the answers.

I understand your assertion about providing enough information to ensure you didn't appear to be hiding or withholding. When there's the possibility of a negative piece, it's helpful to send the reporter to the documentation (the Scorecard links) instead of trying to articulate where a member agreed/disagreed with us. That's one area I would have addressed with you. I thought it was concerning that you should have to address that at all!

I also would have provided background/distinction between HSUS and HSLF. I would have referred to myself as a "registered lobbyist" since you have done some lobbying, just not enough until this year to require registration.

Those are a few areas I would have addressed with you.

Talk soon and thank you,  
Sara

-----Original Message-----  
From: Ed Whitfield [REDACTED]@verizon.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2012 9:21 AM  
To: Sara Amundson  
Subject: RE: Answer to Questions 2-7

Sara,

I am really sorry that I did not get your final sign-off.

I sent you and Heather all my answers on Sunday. The only thing Heather wrote back was 1) talk in the first person and 2) tell your story not Ed's and 3) a few sentences for each question would suffice. The only thing I heard back from you was you thought I was going to answer with one over-arching paragraph.

I changed it to the first person and cut my answers. Since some of the questions are precise, they did not lend themselves to a one paragraph-answers- all format. I wrote a one paragraph answer to questions 2-7. The other questions are entirely different.

Ed was asked 10 other questions and he went into a full-blown discussion of his record because he feels he has a good story to tell. So, that information was out anyway. Furthermore, since this is a continuation of an article about Congressional members and he was already mischaracterized in an earlier article by not answering the questions, he felt that a full response was required.

Please tell me how you would have answered the questions differently. I do know you feel that less is more but the press is often more harsh if they sense you are withholding information or being uncooperative.

Again, I am sorry. I was not attempting to by-pass you. It will never happen again.

Connie

-----Original Message-----  
From: Sara Amundson [REDACTED]@hslf.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2012 7:13 AM  
To: Ed Whitfield  
Subject: Re: Answer to Questions 2-7

We agreed on Friday that Heather and I would vet your answers before submission to the Post to ensure we were all on the same page with the submission. I urged less is more, especially when representing his record and influence (or not) by us. Heather's got a ton of PR experience and would have weighed in to help protect you and the organizations from areas where the reporter may attempt to trip you up. I'll have someone cut and paste these into one document and see if Heather notes areas that may be ripe for follow-up or concern. I have no idea if the Post will contact us.

On Dec 3, 2012, at 11:50 PM, "Ed Whitfield" <[REDACTED]@verizon.net> wrote:

> Sorry, I am not tracking you. What do you mean by "consistent approach?"  
> Are you expecting the Post to submit questions to HSLF and HSUS?

>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Sara Amundson [REDACTED]@hslf.org]  
> Sent: Monday, December 03, 2012 10:03 PM  
> To: Ed Whitfield  
> Subject: Re: Answer to Questions 2-7

> Yea, I want the rest. I understood we were going to vet this so we  
> had a consistent approach. If there are follow-ups, we're responding  
> to answers we didn't settle on.

>  
> On Dec 3, 2012, at 9:54 PM, "Ed Whitfield" <[REDACTED]@verizon.net> wrote:

>> That was the response for questions 2-7.  
>>  
>> Question 1 asked about my qualifications. Question 8 asked for  
>> examples of Ed's going against HSUS interests. Question 9 was  
>> anything I

> wanted to add.  
>> Question 10 was about my compensation.  
>>  
>> Let me know if you want to read any of my answers.  
>>  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: Sara Amundson [redacted]@hslf.org]  
>> Sent: Monday, December 03, 2012 9:13 PM  
>> To: Ed Whitfield  
>> Subject: Re: Answer to Questions 2-7  
>>  
>> Thanks, Connie. That was the whole response?  
>>  
>> On Dec 3, 2012, at 8:48 PM, "Ed Whitfield"  
>> <[redacted]@verizon.net<[redacted]@verizon.net>> wrote:  
>>  
>>  
>> <<...>>  
>>  
>> <Wash Post # 2-#6.doc>  
>>  
>

# **EXHIBIT 43**

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield [REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 21, 2013 11:22 AM  
**To:** Hicks, Cory [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: PRESS RELEASE: PSHA Reacts to Misleading Testimony

---

They are mischaracterizing the provision. Nevertheless, I think I will call Jan Baran.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 21, 2013, at 10:57 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Connie, I researched what they alleged in the House Rules in their press release. I pasted it below.

>  
> 7. 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  
> lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure  
> Act of 1995 or is employed or retained  
> by such a lobbyist for the purpose of  
> influencing legislation.

>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [REDACTED]@humansociety.org  
> Sent: Friday, June 21, 2013 10:51 AM  
> To: Hicks, Cory  
> Subject: Re: PRESS RELEASE: PSHA Reacts to Misleading Testimony

> I was kidding! Just choose a good moment!

> Sent from my iPhone

> On Jun 21, 2013, at 7:40 AM, "Hicks, Cory" [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov> wrote:

>> Connie, I do not feel comfortable not show Ed.

>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [REDACTED]@humansociety.org  
>> Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2013 7:50 PM  
>> To: Hicks, Cory; Fareed, Justin  
>> Subject: Fwd: PRESS RELEASE: PSHA Reacts to Misleading Testimony

>> Don't show this to Ed!

>> Cory, I would like to scan and send to Roy Exum the legislative record and text we sent to the Wash Post about this issue.

>> Sent from my iPhone

>> Begin forwarded message:

>> From: Keith Dane <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>  
>> Date: June 20, 2013, 4:23:51 PM EDT  
>> To: Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
>> <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>, Michael Markarian <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>, Cherie Beatty  
>> <[REDACTED]@aol.com<[REDACTED]@aol.com>>  
>> Subject: Fwd: PRESS RELEASE: PSHA Reacts to Misleading Testimony

>> Sent from my Verizon Wireless Droid

>> -----Original message-----  
>> From: roy exum <[REDACTED]@aol.com<[REDACTED]@aol.com>>  
>> To: [REDACTED]@aol.com<[REDACTED]@aol.com>> <[REDACTED]@aol.com<[REDACTED]@aol.com>>  
>> Sent: Thu, Jun 20, 2013 20:20:03 GMT+00:00  
>> Subject: Fwd: PRESS RELEASE: PSHA Reacts to Misleading Testimony

>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: Walking Horse <[REDACTED]@gmail.com<[REDACTED]@gmail.com>>  
>> To: pshassoc <[REDACTED]@gmail.com<[REDACTED]@gmail.com>>  
>> Sent: Thu, Jun 20, 2013 3:48 pm  
>> Subject: PRESS RELEASE: PSHA Reacts to Misleading Testimony

>> PRESS RELEASE: June 20th, 2013

>> Whitfield (R-KY) Pushes Elimination of Walking Horse Industry and Risks Ethics Violation to Help Wife's Employer Shelbyville, TN - Today, the Performance Show Horse Association (PSHA) reacted to misleading and inaccurate testimony given by U.S. Representative Ed Whitfield yesterday to the Rules Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. Whitfield was pushing to add an amendment to the Farm Bill that would destroy the walking horse industry, an industry that generates hundreds of millions of dollars in economic activity each year and

tens of millions of dollars to charities throughout the country. In addition, the Whitfield Amendment would add millions of dollars to the cost of the Farm Bill to taxpayers by forcing the U.S. Department of Agriculture to hire hundreds of new inspectors and other personnel.

>>

>> Yesterday Whitfield told the Members of the Committee, during a discussion of proposed amendments to the farm bill, that the amendment would only would only change the industry's self-inspection process. What Whitfield failed to tell his fellow Members of Congress is that:

>>

>> \* The amendment eliminates a total division of the equine breed, impacting more than 10,000 horses that would be deemed no longer fit for their intended purpose;

>> \* Take from hard-working taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars of investments and income without cause or any scientific evidence;

>> \* Eliminates the Horse Protection Act's self-regulation, which is far superior to that of the federal government and which does not need the hundreds of new federal employees required by Whitfield's amendment;

>> \* Eliminates self-regulation that is far superior than that of the federal government whose services he wants to expand; and

>> \* Creates a federal bureaucracy that will result in a huge cost to taxpayers by increasing the agency's budget in order to do the same thing that the industry does today at minimal cost to the taxpayers.

>>

>> One other important fact Mr. Whitfield failed to tell his fellow Members is that he is sponsoring this amendment 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.

>>

>> ###

# **EXHIBIT 44**

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 22, 2013 11:35 AM  
**To:** Heydlauff, Emma <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Ellmers' Office

---

You have been doing a GRBAT job.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 22, 2013, at 11:25 AM, "Heydlauff, Emma" <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> I am currently working on the meetings that we have pending and any that may need to be rescheduled. I set up a meeting with Issa's office already this morning.

>  
> Thanks,  
> Emma

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:[REDACTED]@humansociety.org]  
> Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 11:19 AM  
> To: Heydlauff, Emma  
> Subject: Fwd: Ellmers' Office

> Emma,

> Please see second paragraph below.

>  
> Thanks,  
> Connie

> Sent from my iPhone

> Begin forwarded message:

> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
> Date: October 22, 2013, 10:51:18 AM EDT  
> To: "Hicks, Cory" <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>; [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
> Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>; [REDACTED]@humansociety.org>; "Blackberry, Ed" <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>; [REDACTED]@gmail.com>; [REDACTED]@gmail.com>  
> Subject: Re: Ellmers' Office

> Cory,

> John Sabo failed to tell you that he asked me to call the House Administration Committee for a final "ruling." So the issue is NOT yet resolved. I plan to call them later today.

> John also said that ANY meeting already set up --including meetings that need to be rescheduled--can go forward.

> So, don't back down so quickly.

> Connie

> Sent from my iPhone

> On Oct 22, 2013, at 9:25 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov> <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>> wrote:

> Congressman and Connie, I received a phone call from the House Ethics Committee this morning and they changed their mind. They advised us that we cannot set up these meetings all together for Donna and Marty. It may be that Ellmers' office called them. John Sabo said he spoke with Connie and informed her of this change in course as well. For the meetings that we have set up, I've asked Emma to follow through and finish what we started, but going forward I've asked her to stop setting up the meetings. Marty and/or Donna will have to set them up going forward.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Hicks, Cory  
> Sent: Monday, October 21, 2013 3:54 PM  
> To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield'  
> Cc: Blackberry, Ed; [REDACTED]@gmail.com; [REDACTED]@gmail.com  
> Subject: RE: Ellmers' Office

> Connie, Marty is reaching out to Ellmers staff to set up the meeting. I did inform their LD that she was wrong and that there is nothing wrong with our office setting up these meetings. The person I spoke with at Ethics is John Sabo at 225- [REDACTED] I actually just spoke with him again and he advised against your attending because we are setting them up and you are a registered lobbyist.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:[REDACTED]@humansociety.org]  
> Sent: Monday, October 21, 2013 3:39 PM  
> To: Hicks, Cory  
> Cc: Blackberry, Ed; [REDACTED]@gmail.com; [REDACTED]@gmail.com; Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
> Subject: Re: Ellmers' Office

> Cory,

> I am happy to talk to the Ethics Committee myself.

> In the meantime, please tell Elmers' LD that you spoke to the Ethics Committee and they see no problem because Ed sponsored the bill and all three are on the same page.

> What is the name of the ethics person with whom you spoke? I would like to talk to the same person.



> Thanks,  
> Connie  
> Sent from my iPhone

> On Oct 21, 2013, at 3:29 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov><[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov><[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>> wrote:

>  
> Congressman, I just had a very uncomfortable conversation with Renea Ellmers office's legislative director. They were concerned with the optics of our office setting up a meetings for Mary and Donna. I called the ethics committee and they did not have a problem with our office setting up meetings on a bill that you have sponsored. I even asked what if we were requesting offices to take a meeting on behalf of a registered lobbyist. They also did not have a problem with us requesting meetings with registered lobbyists. I did not inform them that Connie was attending these meetings as I suspected they would have expressed concerns since she's married to you and a registered lobbyist. Since people are starting to hear about these meetings on the Hill and their effectiveness, I think we need to be careful about Connie attending these meetings. What do you think?

>  
> Cory Hicks  
> Chief of Staff  
> Chairman Ed Whitfield  
> 202-225-[REDACTED]

> 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/edwhitfield>><image004.png><<http://www.youtube.com/WhitfieldKY01>> <image005.png><<http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml>>  
> Click here<<https://whitfieldforms.house.gov/enews.shtml>> to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.  
> <http://whitfield.house.gov><<http://whitfield.house.gov>>

>

# **EXHIBIT 45**

**From:** Michael Markarian <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 11, 2013 8:46 AM  
**To:** Sara Amundson <[REDACTED]@hslf.org>  
**Subject:** Re: Story, Anna Palmer Politico

---

Pls get response from her ASAP

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 11, 2013, at 8:07 AM, "Sara Amundson" <[REDACTED]@hslf.org<[REDACTED]@hslf.org>> wrote:

I know she was in direct touch with House Ethics about six weeks ago to seek advice on specific activities, which is why she backed off asks/communications with Whitfield's staff and Keith and I took more prominent role. An overarching prohibition? Didn't come up.

On Dec 11, 2013, at 8:00 AM, "Michael Markarian" <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org<[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

What does Connie say about the rule?

From: Heather Sullivan  
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:14 PM  
To: Michael Markarian  
Cc: Alan Heymann; Sara Amundson  
Subject: FW: Story, Anna Palmer Politico

Hi, Mike.

Would you like to talk to her, or would you like me to send her a statement?

From: Anna Palmer <[REDACTED]@politico.com> <[REDACTED]@politico.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:08 PM  
To: HSLF Heather Sullivan  
Subject: Story, Anna Palmer Politico

Heather,

Hi, my name is Anna Palmer. I am working on a story regarding Rep. Whitfield and his wife Connie Harriman-Whitfield. The congressman has co-sponsored and sponsored legislation that Connie has specifically lobbied on for HSLF, according to Senate lobbying disclosure reports. This includes cosponsoring HR. 847, 1094, 366, 183 and sponsoring HR. 1518. This would appear to be a violation of the House 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 HSLF sees this as a conflict of interest. I am on deadline for 5 pm Wednesday. The best number for me is [REDACTED]

Thanks,

Anna

Anna Palmer  
POLITICO

Cell: [REDACTED]  
Twitter: @apalmerdc

# **EXHIBIT 46**

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 1, 2014 6:47 PM  
**To:** Marty Irby <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Vail/Priscilla Presley

---

Sara makes a good point about Landrieu. She is in a tough re-election campaign.

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Sara Amundson <[REDACTED]@hslf.org<[REDACTED]@hslf.org>>  
**Date:** January 1, 2014 at 6:36:52 PM EST  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>  
**Subject:** Re: Vail/Priscilla Presley

Love the Landrieu idea, but she's going to be concentrated on her own fundraising! How about a reception featuring Presley with the other female senators as hosts too? An easier ask of a senator in cycle likely to be forced to a December run-off as she may not get 50% again...

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 1, 2014, at 5:27 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>> wrote:

Ed and I will be in Vail 1/2-1/6 for five Republican fundraisers including Pompeo, Schock, Aderholt, Adrian Smith and Ed. Lots of lobbyists, of course.

Marty and I met all day yesterday re strategy and I arranged for a former McCain staffer to set up meetings with McCain and Graham.

My latest idea is to have Mary Landrieu do a fundraiser for our cause at her double townhouse. All women Senators who support PAST will be the Host Committee and Priscilla Presley will be the draw (if Keith can get her to do it). Crazy but an ideal way to get media attention and to box Republican Senators into a corner.

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 1, 2014, at 4:37 PM, "Sara Amundson" <[REDACTED]@hslf.org<[REDACTED]@hslf.org>> wrote:

Ugh!!! They ordered it in November and it was back ordered. Ridiculous. Will yell.

Happy New Year!

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 1, 2014, at 4:31 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>> wrote:

a new computer!!! Mine will not work!

Happy New Year!!!

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

# **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. XIO1717

\*\*PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of  
the transcript are phonetic

1 QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

2

3 Q. This is Kedric Payne and Nate Wright  
4 with the Office of Congressional Ethics and we are  
5 joined via conference call with [REDACTED] and his  
6 attorney Lawrence Tabus. It is April 25, 2014.

7 [REDACTED], I just want to begin with a  
8 few background questions. Can you let me know when  
9 you were employed with Representative Whitfield's  
10 congressional office?

11 A. Yes, February 2013 through the end of  
12 February 2014.

13 Q. Okay. And during that time, what was  
14 your job title?

15 A. Press Secretary.

16 Q. And as Press Secretary, what were your  
17 duties?

18 A. I handled the communications and  
19 outreach effort for Congressman Whitfield.

20 Q. And did you have any legislative  
21 responsibilities, say a portfolio of certain issues?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And what were those issues?

24 A. They were handling agriculture issues,  
25 basic -- primarily during the government shut down



1 which coincided with a former staffer leaving the  
2 office.

3 Q. And did the AG issues include animal  
4 welfare issues?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Okay. So how long were you  
7 responsible for animal welfare issues?

8 A. Maybe six weeks, if I had to guess. I  
9 don't really -- I'm not sure. I didn't mark it on a  
10 calendar.

11 Q. Are you familiar with the PAST Act,  
12 the Prevent of All Soring Tactics Act of 2013?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And what was your role with this  
15 legislation?

16 A. I would say generally tracking  
17 co-sponsors, because I took over the issue after it  
18 was already introduced and well circulated.

19 Q. Anything else besides tracking  
20 co-sponsors?

21 A. Helping set up meetings, again, during  
22 the shut down, because we were short staffed and  
23 obviously I would say 90 percent of my job still  
24 focused on my press duties, and answering  
25 constituent phone calls due to the short staff. I

1 would try to help set up meetings with interest  
2 groups, supporters of the PAST Act, with other  
3 offices.

4 Q. Okay. And let me make sure I am  
5 clear, you would set up meetings between other  
6 congressional offices and interest groups?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Anything else that you did for the  
9 bill?

10 A. Not that I can recall. I know I --  
11 helped draft a few dear colleague letters, I think  
12 that goes into the whole tracking co-sponsors and  
13 gathering co-sponsors.

14 Q. Okay. Do you know Mrs. Whitfield?

15 A. Professionally, yes.

16 Q. And how long -- well, let me rephrase  
17 that. When did you first meet her?

18 A. The first day I actually started, she  
19 was in with the Congressman's dog.

20 Q. Okay. And are you aware that she  
21 worked with the Humane Society?

22 A. Now or then?

23 Q. Then.

24 A. No.

25 Q. When did you first learn that she was

1 employed with the Humane Society?

2 A. I couldn't point to a specific date.

3 Q. During the time period in October of  
4 2013 when you were working on the PAST Act, did you  
5 know she was employed with the Humane Society?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. At that time, did you know whether she  
8 was a registered lobbyist?

9 A. I don't know.

10 Q. Just so I am clear, you are saying at  
11 that time, you didn't know, are you saying at this  
12 time you don't know what you knew then?

13 A. I can't tell you the specific time I  
14 found out she was a lobbyist.

15 Q. And are you aware she's a registered  
16 lobbyist now, currently, today?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. During your work on the PAST Act that  
19 you described earlier, did you have communication  
20 with Mrs. Whitfield concerning that legislation?

21 A. Can you be more specific on  
22 communications?

23 Q. Absolutely. Communication ranging  
24 from emails, telephone conversations and in person  
25 conversations.

1           A.           My initial answer is primarily email,  
2 but I guess I would want you to be more specific on  
3 emails, you mean direct one on one emails, group  
4 emails, I would say the majority -- I would say over  
5 90 percent of my communication was through group  
6 emails to which I was not the originator of.

7           Q.           Okay. Let's take them one by one  
8 then. With the group emails that you were on during  
9 that time period with Mrs. Whitfield, those were  
10 emails that you received from her and you were on a  
11 group of recipients?

12          A.           Correct, yes.

13          Q.           And then with respect to one on one  
14 emails, where she's communicating with you or you  
15 are communicating with her, what was the percentage  
16 of those?

17          A.           I would say less than one percent.

18          Q.           And in the remaining percentage of  
19 emails that you had, how would you describe those?

20          A.           Just group emails where I would -- I  
21 was cc'd on a bunch of them.

22          Q.           You said bc'd?

23          A.           Cc'd.

24          Q.           And just so I am clear, it seems as  
25 though I don't get the distinction between the 90

1 percent you mentioned that were group emails and  
2 this remaining percentage of approximately nine  
3 percent?

4 A. I'm sorry. Sorry, 99 percent of the  
5 emails were group emails, and one percent -- less  
6 than one percent were direct one on one. In fact,  
7 I'm not sure, aside from the one example in your  
8 email that you sent us, I can't recall if I had any  
9 other direct emails where at least one other person  
10 was not cc'd.

11 Q. Now let's discuss telephone calls with  
12 Mrs. Whitfield. Did you have telephone  
13 communications with her during this time period in  
14 2013 when you were working on the PAST Act?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. What was the nature of those calls in  
17 general, I am not expecting you to remember  
18 specifics on every call, but in general, how would  
19 you describe the nature of those calls?

20 A. I would say a lot of them, the ones  
21 that come to mind would be during the shut down when  
22 I was again, aside from focusing 90 percent of my  
23 time on my official press duties, another part of  
24 the time would be answering the phone because our  
25 legislative assistants were laid off, I would say

1 some of them would be asking for another person or  
2 if the Congressman was in the office, that she  
3 needed to speak to or -- and it was more of well,  
4 while she had me on the phone, do you know the  
5 current co-sponsor number of the PAST Act, and I  
6 feel like a lot of the time, I was just like the  
7 middle man in connecting her to someone else.

8 Q. Would those phone calls also relate to  
9 scheduling meetings with potential co-sponsors?

10 A. I don't remember.

11 Q. Okay. With the emails or -- let me  
12 rephrase that. Your communications in general with  
13 her during that time period, did they include  
14 discussions on scheduling meetings with potential  
15 co-sponsors?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Okay. And can you explain, describe  
18 in general what was going on, what type of  
19 information you were sharing or discussing with her?

20 A. With her or with the scheduling of  
21 meetings?

22 Q. With her concerning the scheduling of  
23 the meetings.

24 A. Just when the two interested parties  
25 were meeting at the offices, her not being the party

1 but typically just two other people, not her.

2 Q. Were those two other people, Marty  
3 Irby and Donna?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And during this time period when you  
6 were working on those meetings, was it your  
7 understanding that Mrs. Whitfield could possibly  
8 attend those meetings?

9 A. No, but again, a majority of my  
10 efforts were focused on dealing with the press  
11 during the shut down. I think it's important to  
12 realize we were under media fire in Congress for  
13 forcing the government shut down and I spent a  
14 majority of my efforts trying to protect the  
15 congressman from bad press and being accused of  
16 starting the government shut down.

17 Q. Who was the staff person who was most  
18 involved in scheduling the meetings?

19 A. I don't know.

20 Q. Are you familiar with Emma Heydlauff?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Is she the Scheduler in the  
23 Congressman's office?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Do you recall whether or not she was

1 working on scheduling these meetings?

2 A. I believe she did have involvement,  
3 yes.

4 Q. Do you recall approximately the number  
5 of meetings that were scheduled related to this PAST  
6 Act at that time in October 2013?

7 A. I don't want to speculate, because I  
8 don't know the number.

9 Q. Do you know whether it was more than  
10 50?

11 A. 50 or 15?

12 Q. 50, five zero.

13 A. That seems high.

14 Q. Okay. Did you have communications  
15 with Mrs. Whitfield related to communications like  
16 dear colleagues letters?

17 A. Yes, to check for accuracy, because  
18 again, I was the Press Secretary, I was primarily  
19 focused on the Congressman's external communications  
20 publically, so obviously I am not familiar with  
21 legislative background or the legal language of a  
22 bill, so I -- I had her verify -- the dear colleague  
23 to make sure I was adequately explaining the bill  
24 that I wanted other members of Congress to  
25 co-sponsor.



1 Q. Who suggested you send out the dear  
2 colleague letter?

3 A. I think it's just a general thing,  
4 everybody does it. Once I took over the agriculture  
5 issue briefly, I would get 20 or 30 dear colleagues  
6 a day, it's a pretty standard known practice.

7 Q. Did Mrs. Whitfield request that you  
8 send out a dear colleague letter?

9 A. Not that I recall.

10 Q. And any other letters that you are  
11 involved in related to the PAST Act, such as the  
12 Royce letter, do you recall discussing such letters  
13 with Mrs. Whitfield?

14 A. Honestly, I don't even recall the  
15 Royce letter.

16 Q. And from the --

17 A. I think it's important to remember  
18 that all -- really all of my focus was on my actual  
19 job of not -- during the shut down, but doing my job  
20 as Press Secretary.

21 Q. From the documents that we sent, did  
22 that refresh your recollection as to whether you had  
23 an email between you and Mrs. Whitfield discussing a  
24 "Royce letter"?

25 MR. TABUS: Kedric, is there a

1 specific Bates number document that you can identify  
2 that he can --

3 MR. PAYNE: Yes, absolutely. It is  
4 EW4001542. EW4001542.

5 A. Okay. And what was your question  
6 again?

7 Q. The question is, after taking a look  
8 at that email, does that refresh your recollection  
9 as to whether you were involved in drafting a letter  
10 that's entitled Royce letter?

11 A. I mean obviously I must have, it's on  
12 there. I don't recall it but again, I am writing  
13 press releases, I am writing talking points on the  
14 shut down, I am writing emails, I write for a  
15 living, so I could not -- I could not recall a  
16 majority of the press releases that I wrote, I don't  
17 think it's --

18 Q. Did Mrs. Whitfield ever request that  
19 you write a press release?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Did she ever request that you write a  
22 letter?

23 A. Not to my recollection.

24 Q. And did she ever request that you  
25 write any public statement or other document on

1 behalf of Representative Whitfield?

2 A. No.

3 Q. I want to also draw your attention to  
4 another document that is in there, it is EW3000753.  
5 EW3000753.

6 A. Okay.

7 Q. And in the email, Mrs. Whitfield sends  
8 it to you and Mr. Hicks and says can you set up a  
9 meeting with Yarmouth and you respond sure thing.  
10 Can you describe what the purpose of this meeting  
11 was?

12 A. I would assume -- actually I don't  
13 want to assume -- I don't know what the purpose -- I  
14 would say it was probably, to set up the meeting for  
15 Marty and Donna.

16 Q. During that time period, October 13  
17 when this is dated and you are setting up those  
18 meetings, why would Mrs. Whitfield contact you about  
19 setting up meetings for Marty and Donna?

20 A. I think you have to ask her that  
21 question.

22 Q. We absolutely will ask her but I want  
23 to get your understanding of this email that was  
24 sent to you where you say sure thing to her request  
25 about setting up the meeting?

1 A. Ask the question again.

2 Q. Why are you receiving an email from  
3 Mrs. Whitfield to set up a meeting for Marty and  
4 Donna?

5 A. So Marty and Donna could advocate on  
6 on behalf of the PAST Act for which they are  
7 supporters.

8 Q. And what was Mrs. Whitfield's role in  
9 getting the supporters for the PAST Act?

10 A. I don't know.

11 Q. Did Marty and Donna have any  
12 connection with the Humane Society?

13 A. I think they all were supporters of  
14 this bill.

15 Q. And did you have any communication  
16 with Mrs. Whitfield about her attending any meetings  
17 with Marty and Donna at this time period?

18 A. Not that I can recall.

19 Q. Did you work on any additional  
20 legislation related to animal welfare issues other  
21 than the PAST Act?

22 A. I -- I think I did something with the  
23 horse racing doping bill but I couldn't tell you --  
24 the name -- I couldn't tell you beyond that, I don't  
25 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

1 could have heard the name but I don't know why I  
2 heard the name.

3 Q. And Animal Fighting Spectator  
4 Prohibition Act, are you familiar with that?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Okay. During your time period working  
7 with Representative Whitfield's office, did Mrs.  
8 Whitfield ever have you working on special projects  
9 or assignments?

10 A. No.

11 Q. Okay. And in the material that we  
12 sent to you, there is a document bates stamped  
13 EW4001549. Let me know when you have it.

14 A. I have it.

15 Q. And at the top it's from you to Cory  
16 Hicks and it says Connie called and asked me on a  
17 side project at the moment.

18 A. Uh-huh.

19 Q. Can you describe what you meant with  
20 that statement?

21 A. I truthfully don't recall the email.  
22 Again, I just want to say it was in the middle of  
23 the shut down, I get hundreds of emails a day and I  
24 am doing double duty with answering phones and  
25 handling this issue and obviously doing my real job.

1 Q. And with those emails and telephone  
2 calls that you are getting and your real job, did  
3 you receive multiple phone calls and emails from  
4 Mrs. Whitfield related to various issues?

5 A. Not other than what I described  
6 earlier, where I was answering the phones during the  
7 shut down and she may have called for her husband,  
8 but nothing out of what I said earlier.

9 Q. And you don't recall her requesting  
10 any activity from you to do anything related to the  
11 PAST Act other than what you have described with the  
12 meetings?

13 A. You are -- just setting up meetings  
14 for Marty and Donna?

15 Q. That's correct. That's correct.

16 A. No, I don't recall anything other than  
17 that.

18 Q. During that time period, October 2013,  
19 did issues arise related to press focusing on the  
20 contacts between Mrs. Whitfield's office and  
21 Representative Whitfield's office?

22 A. Yes, I believe so. I believe some  
23 papers from Tennessee had contacted us about the  
24 bill.

25 Q. Okay. And as you said, that was what

1 you were really focused on was the press, that's the  
2 main thing you handle and is your bread and butter.

3                   During that time period, did Mrs.  
4 Whitfield contact you related to a response that you  
5 were preparing for the media on that issue?

6           A.       I can't recall. I mean I think all of  
7 my -- when dealing with the press, I usually go to  
8 my Chief of Staff to verify accuracy of any  
9 statements I would make publicly, because I really  
10 truly never understood the language of this bill,  
11 because it's not my area, it's not my bread and  
12 butter.

13          Q.       With respect to the contacts between  
14 Mrs. Whitfield and the Congressman's office, were  
15 you ever given any advice from the office on any  
16 restrictions to those contacts?

17          A.       Can you elaborate on what you mean by  
18 restrictions?

19          Q.       Was there any policy in the office on  
20 how to handle requests from Mrs. Whitfield?

21          A.       No, not that I can recall.

22          Q.       Okay.

23          A.       I am obviously being polite, it's the  
24 Congressman's wife.

25          Q.       Right, but were there any policies or



1 procedures related to her lobbying the office?

2 A. I don't believe so.

3 Q. Okay. And did you have any  
4 conversations with Representative Whitfield about  
5 any ethics rules concerning her lobbying the office?

6 A. No.

7 MR. WRIGHT: This is Mr. Wright here,  
8 I am wondering how often was Mrs. Whitfield in  
9 Representative Whitfield's office, like how often  
10 would she stop by?

11 A. Not very often.

12 Q. Is that once per week, daily, can you  
13 be more specific?

14 A. I mean average that I worked for the  
15 congressman, I would say far far less than a week,  
16 once a week.

17 Q. So maybe like once a month?

18 A. If that, yes, on average over a year,  
19 I'd say maybe -- (inaudible), I would say average if  
20 I saw her 12 times in a year.

21 MR. WRIGHT: How often would she make  
22 requests of people in the office that you were aware  
23 of?

24 A. I wasn't aware -- the way the press  
25 job is set up there, pretty much a lot of times

1 offices are set up where they are communications  
2 heavy or legislative heavy where the Legislative  
3 Director would have pretty much control over the  
4 other employees, and that's how ours was set up,  
5 where I basically was just in my own little world,  
6 for lack of a better term, doing press duties.

7 MR. WRIGHT: Did Mrs. Whitfield ever  
8 make a request of you to do something that you  
9 thought was unusual or you may not want to have done  
10 given all the other duties that you had at the time?

11 A. No.

12 MR. WRIGHT: Alright, were there ever  
13 discussions going back to October 2013, discussions  
14 about getting enough materials for these meetings  
15 that were being set up?

16 A. I guess I don't -- what do you mean  
17 materials?

18 MR. WRIGHT: So you have Mr. Irby  
19 going around and doing a variety of different  
20 meetings and I was wondering, were there any  
21 discussions about we need to make sure that he has  
22 enough materials for all of the meetings that he has  
23 set up in the day?

24 A. I think so, yes.

25 MR. WRIGHT: Does that help you recall

1 at all the number of meetings that he may have been  
2 going to?

3 A. No. I do recall them preparing  
4 packets but, I don't know the quantity of the  
5 packets.

6 MR. WRIGHT: Did you think that -- you  
7 talked about how there were a lot of staffing  
8 constraints at the time. Did you think it was  
9 unusual to do this kind of push to try to set up all  
10 these meetings in October of 2013?

11 A. Nothing was getting done, I don't see  
12 why not, they weren't -- there was a shut down, they  
13 had nothing but time.

14 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. And who in the  
15 office would set the priority to do something like  
16 that?

17 A. All I could say it wasn't me, so I  
18 don't know -- it happens outside of my scope, so I  
19 am not sure who handled that.

20 MR. WRIGHT: Do you remember around  
21 that timeframe meeting with Senator Cochran that you  
22 attended with Mrs. Whitfield?

23 A. She was -- I wouldn't say that I  
24 attended with her, I attended with my Chief of Staff  
25 and I believe Marty.

1 MR. WRIGHT: Why did you leave the  
2 office?

3 A. When?

4 MR. WRIGHT: In, I believe you said --

5 Q. You left in February of '14?

6 A. Oh, leave employment, better  
7 opportunity.

8 Q. And I just want to go back to the  
9 meeting with Senator Cochran. What occurred during  
10 that meeting?

11 A. From what I can recall, Marty just  
12 talked about why the bill was so important, drawing  
13 on his expertise as a former -- I believe he was the  
14 President of the Tennessee Walking Horse whatever,  
15 group, industry, association.

16 Q. And when did that meeting occur?

17 A. I don't know.

18 Q. But it was --

19 A. During the fall.

20 Q. Okay. During that October November  
21 2013 time period?

22 A. Yeah, in the fall.

23 Q. And was Mrs. Whitfield in attendance?

24 A. I believe she joined afterwards, yes.

25 Q. You said joined afterwards, what do

1 you mean, she was -- when the meeting was taking  
2 place, she was present?

3 A. Yeah, I walked over with my Chief of  
4 Staff and then at that time I had no idea she was  
5 going to be attending.

6 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Did you think it  
7 was unusual that she attended?

8 A. No. I mean lobbyists meet with elected  
9 officials all the time, that's how they earn their  
10 paycheck.

11 MR. WRIGHT: And it wasn't unusual,  
12 because you said you thought earlier when these  
13 meetings were being set up and even when she  
14 requested that you set the meeting, you said you  
15 didn't think she was attending these meetings, so  
16 did it surprise you at all when she was there?

17 A. No, because I knew like the groups,  
18 they all had a vested interest in the bill.

19 Q. And you just mentioned that it did not  
20 stand out to you because lobbyists do that every  
21 day. So during that time period, did you know that  
22 she was a lobbyist?

23 A. No, again, as I said I don't know when  
24 I discovered she was a lobbyist, exactly.

25 Q. Okay.

1           A.           But I was speaking from the knowledge  
2 I have now.

3           Q.           From the knowledge you have now is why  
4 you didn't think it was strange at the time? Is  
5 that what you are saying?

6           A.           Can you rephrase that?

7           Q.           What I am unclear about, is the reason  
8 why you did not think it was strange that Mrs.  
9 Whitfield showed up and your reply was that  
10 lobbyists do that type of thing all the time and I  
11 am paraphrasing, but you did say lobbyist, so how at  
12 that time did you not think it was strange and at  
13 the same time not know she was a lobbyist?

14          A.           Okay, a person -- I may have misspoke  
15 because I knew now she's a lobbyist. I knew the  
16 Humane Society had an interest in the bill so it  
17 wasn't a surprise for me to see her there. Again, I  
18 don't know exactly when I found out she was a  
19 lobbyist.

20                       MR. WRIGHT: And it wouldn't surprise  
21 you if she was attending some of the other meetings  
22 that were being set up?

23          A.           I don't know. I hadn't thought about  
24 it. I attended one other meeting and she was not  
25 present. All I remember, attending two meetings,

1 one she was there, and one she was not.

2 MR. WRIGHT: Do you remember if Mrs.  
3 Whitfield said anything during the meeting or what  
4 her involvement in the meeting was?

5 A. No, usually I was just on my work  
6 phone trying to keep track of press. I couldn't  
7 even tell you one thing that was said during that  
8 Cochran -- Corkran -- I don't know -- who was the  
9 Senator?

10 Q. Cochran.

11 A. Yeah, I could tell you that the topic  
12 was the PAST Act, I couldn't really tell you  
13 specifics of what was said.

14 Q. Why exactly were you at the meeting  
15 again, I know you said you were there to join your  
16 colleague, but what was your role in the meeting?

17 A. I don't think I said anything during  
18 the meeting, I think aside from the fact that I was  
19 the person handling that issue at the time, whether  
20 it was the shut down or still looking to fill the  
21 position.

22 MR. WRIGHT: Were there any other  
23 interactions that you had with Mrs. Whitfield at the  
24 Humane Society that stick out in your mind?

25 A. No.

1                   MR. WRIGHT: Were there, you know, any  
2 other interactions with Mrs. Whitfield that might be  
3 helpful for us to know?

4           A.        No.

5           Q.        And were you in the office when Marty  
6 Irby was hired?

7           A.        Was I employed by the office?

8           Q.        Yes.

9           A.        Yes.

10          Q.        Okay. And did you interview Mr. Irby?

11          A.        Interview for his -- I believe now  
12 he's the Press Secretary. Are you talking did him  
13 and I talk when he became Press Secretary or when he  
14 joined the office as a legislative staffer?

15          Q.        When he joined the office as a  
16 legislative staffer around December 2013.

17          A.        I didn't interview him, not that I  
18 remember, no.

19          Q.        And what were his duties when he came  
20 to the office in December of 2013?

21          A.        He took over the issues I was filling  
22 in for.

23          Q.        So you had to transition everything  
24 over to him?

25          A.        There really wasn't much to



1 transition, I basically gave him the co-sponsor  
2 spreadsheet or told him where it was located in the  
3 shared folder.

4 Q. What was your understanding of how he  
5 became employed with the office?

6 A. His expertise on the issues.

7 Q. And what is your understanding of Mrs.  
8 Whitfield's role in his employment with the office?

9 A. I don't know.

10 Q. Okay. Well, those are all of our  
11 questions. We do thank you again for your time. Do  
12 you have any questions for us, anything you want to  
13 clarify?

14 MR. TABUS: Kedric, there was one  
15 thing way back, hang on, let me go to my -- you had  
16 asked -- I think you were asking him about whether  
17 Mrs. Whitfield had him working on any activity on  
18 the PAST Act and it was like the question seem to be  
19 narrowed, and [REDACTED] answered but did you also mean,  
20 and cause [REDACTED] had testified that he also said that  
21 he had helped and worked on the co-sponsors part. I  
22 think your question was so limited, I didn't want to  
23 -- [REDACTED] you worked on helping get co-sponsors was  
24 part of your responsibility. Correct?

25 A. Yes.

1                   MR. TABUS: I just wanted to make sure  
2 that was clarified that he said that to you.

3                   MR. PAYNE: Okay. Thank you,  
4 Lawrence. So, yeah, thank you. Thank you for that  
5 clarification. Alright, anything else?

6           A.        No.

7                   MR. PAYNE: Alright, thank you and  
8 enjoy your weekend.

9           A.        Alright, thank you.

10                   (Whereupon, the recording is  
11 terminated.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

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. XIO1717  
Notary Public of the  
State of New Jersey  
My Commission Expires  
April 18, 2017

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>A</b></p> <p><b>absolutely</b> 5:23 12:3 13:22</p> <p><b>accuracy</b> 10:17 18:8</p> <p><b>accurate</b> 29:4</p> <p><b>accused</b> 9:15</p> <p><b>act</b> 3:11,12 4:2 5:4 5:18 7:14 8:5 10:6 11:11 14:6,9 14:21 15:6,8,9,17 15:20,22 16:4 17:11 25:12 27:18</p> <p><b>action</b> 29:10,13</p> <p><b>activity</b> 17:10 27:17</p> <p><b>actual</b> 11:18</p> <p><b>additional</b> 14:19</p> <p><b>adequately</b> 10:23</p> <p><b>advice</b> 18:15</p> <p><b>advocate</b> 14:5</p> <p><b>ag</b> 3:3</p> <p><b>agriculture</b> 2:24 11:4</p> <p><b>alright</b> 20:12 28:5,7 28:9</p> <p><b>american</b> 15:9</p> <p><b>animal</b> 3:3,7 14:20 16:3</p> <p><b>answer</b> 6:1</p> <p><b>answered</b> 27:19</p> <p><b>answering</b> 3:24 7:24 16:24 17:6</p> <p><b>approximately</b> 7:2 10:4</p> <p><b>april</b> 1:5 2:6 29:24</p> <p><b>area</b> 18:11</p> <p><b>aside</b> 7:7,22 25:18</p> <p><b>asked</b> 16:16 27:16</p> <p><b>asking</b> 8:1 27:16</p> <p><b>assignments</b> 16:9</p> <p><b>assistants</b> 7:25</p> <p><b>association</b> 22:15</p> <p><b>assume</b> 13:12,13</p> <p><b>attend</b> 9:8</p> <p><b>attendance</b> 22:23</p> <p><b>attended</b> 21:22,24 21:24 23:7 24:24</p> <p><b>attending</b> 14:16</p>	<p>23:5,15 24:21,25</p> <p><b>attention</b> 13:3</p> <p><b>attorney</b> 2:6 29:9 29:11</p> <p><b>average</b> 19:14,18 19:19</p> <p><b>aware</b> 4:20 5:15 19:22,24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>B</b></p> <p><b>back</b> 20:13 22:8 27:15</p> <p><b>background</b> 2:8 10:21</p> <p><b>bad</b> 9:15</p> <p><b>basic</b> 2:25</p> <p><b>basically</b> 20:5 27:1</p> <p><b>bates</b> 12:1 16:12</p> <p><b>bed</b> 6:22</p> <p><b>behalf</b> 13:1 14:6</p> <p><b>believe</b> 10:2 17:22 17:22 19:2 21:25 22:4,13,24 26:11</p> <p><b>better</b> 20:6 22:6</p> <p><b>beyond</b> 14:24</p> <p><b>bill</b> 4:9 10:22,23 14:14,23 15:2,15 15:25 17:24 18:10 22:12 23:18 24:16</p> <p><b>bread</b> 18:2,11</p> <p><b>briefly</b> 11:5</p> <p><b>bunch</b> 6:21</p> <p><b>butter</b> 18:2,12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>C</b></p> <p><b>calendar</b> 3:10</p> <p><b>call</b> 2:5 7:18</p> <p><b>called</b> 16:16 17:7</p> <p><b>calls</b> 3:25 7:11,16 7:19 8:8 17:2,3</p> <p><b>cant</b> 5:13 7:8 18:6</p> <p><b>cause</b> 27:20</p> <p><b>ccd</b> 6:21,23 7:10</p> <p><b>certain</b> 2:21</p> <p><b>certificate</b> 29:1</p> <p><b>certify</b> 29:3,8</p> <p><b>check</b> 10:17</p> <p><b>chief</b> 18:8 21:24 23:3</p> <p>█ 1:4,13 2:5</p>	<p>27:19,20,23</p> <p><b>circulated</b> 3:18</p> <p><b>clarification</b> 28:5</p> <p><b>clarified</b> 28:2</p> <p><b>clarify</b> 27:13</p> <p><b>clear</b> 4:5 5:10 6:24</p> <p><b>cochran</b> 21:21 22:9 25:8,10</p> <p><b>coincided</b> 3:1</p> <p><b>colleague</b> 4:11 10:22 11:2,8 25:16</p> <p><b>colleagues</b> 10:16 11:5</p> <p><b>come</b> 7:21</p> <p><b>commission</b> 29:24</p> <p><b>communicating</b> 6:14,15</p> <p><b>communication</b> 5:19,23 6:5 14:15</p> <p><b>communications</b> 2:18 5:22 7:13 8:12 10:14,15,19 15:3,14,24 20:1</p> <p><b>concerning</b> 5:20 8:22 19:5</p> <p><b>conference</b> 2:5</p> <p><b>congress</b> 9:12 10:24</p> <p><b>congressional</b> 2:4 2:10 4:6</p> <p><b>congressman</b> 2:19 8:2 9:15 19:15</p> <p><b>congressmans</b> 4:19 9:23 10:19 18:14 18:24</p> <p><b>connecting</b> 8:7</p> <p><b>connection</b> 14:12</p> <p><b>connie</b> 16:16</p> <p><b>constituent</b> 3:25</p> <p><b>constraints</b> 21:8</p> <p><b>contact</b> 13:18 18:4</p> <p><b>contacted</b> 17:23</p> <p><b>contacts</b> 17:20 18:13,16</p> <p><b>control</b> 20:3</p> <p><b>conversations</b> 5:24 5:25 19:4</p> <p><b>corkran</b> 25:8</p> <p><b>correct</b> 6:12 17:15</p>	<p>17:15 27:24</p> <p><b>cory</b> 16:15</p> <p><b>cosponsor</b> 8:5 10:25 27:1</p> <p><b>cosponsors</b> 3:17,20 4:12,13 8:9,15 15:1 27:21,23</p> <p><b>couldnt</b> 5:2 14:23 14:24 25:6,12</p> <p><b>counsel</b> 29:9,12</p> <p><b>csr</b> 1:16</p> <p><b>current</b> 8:5</p> <p><b>currently</b> 5:16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>D</b></p> <p><b>daily</b> 19:12</p> <p><b>date</b> 5:2 29:6</p> <p><b>dated</b> 13:17</p> <p><b>day</b> 4:18 11:6 16:23 20:23 23:21</p> <p><b>dealing</b> 9:10 18:7</p> <p><b>dear</b> 4:11 10:16,22 11:1,5,8</p> <p><b>december</b> 26:16,20</p> <p><b>describe</b> 6:19 7:19 8:17 13:10 16:19</p> <p><b>described</b> 5:19 17:5 17:11</p> <p><b>didnt</b> 3:9 5:11 23:15 24:4 26:17 27:22</p> <p><b>different</b> 20:19</p> <p><b>direct</b> 6:3 7:6,9</p> <p><b>director</b> 20:3</p> <p><b>discovered</b> 23:24</p> <p><b>discuss</b> 7:11</p> <p><b>discussing</b> 8:19 11:12,23</p> <p><b>discussions</b> 8:14 20:13,13,21</p> <p><b>distinction</b> 6:25</p> <p><b>document</b> 12:1,25 13:4 16:12</p> <p><b>documents</b> 11:21</p> <p><b>dog</b> 4:19 15:17,20</p> <p><b>doing</b> 11:19 16:24 16:25 20:6,19</p> <p><b>donna</b> 9:3 13:15,19 14:4,5,11,17</p>	<p>17:14</p> <p><b>dont</b> 3:9 5:9,12 6:25 8:10 9:19 10:7,8 11:14 12:12,16 13:12,13 14:10,24,25 15:10 15:23 16:1,21 17:9,16 19:2 20:16 21:4,11,18 22:17 23:23 24:18 24:23 25:8,17 27:9</p> <p><b>doping</b> 14:23</p> <p><b>double</b> 16:24</p> <p><b>draft</b> 4:11</p> <p><b>drafting</b> 12:9</p> <p><b>draw</b> 13:3</p> <p><b>drawing</b> 22:12</p> <p><b>due</b> 3:25</p> <p><b>duties</b> 2:17 3:24 7:23 20:6,10 26:19</p> <p><b>duty</b> 16:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>E</b></p> <p><b>earlier</b> 5:19 17:6,8 23:12</p> <p><b>earn</b> 23:9</p> <p><b>effort</b> 2:19</p> <p><b>efforts</b> 9:10,14</p> <p><b>either</b> 15:1</p> <p><b>elaborate</b> 18:17</p> <p><b>elected</b> 23:8</p> <p><b>email</b> 6:1 7:8 11:23 12:8 13:7,23 14:2 15:24 16:21</p> <p><b>emails</b> 5:24 6:3,3,4 6:6,8,10,14,19,20 7:1,5,5,9 8:11 12:14 16:23 17:1 17:3</p> <p><b>emma</b> 9:20</p> <p><b>employed</b> 2:9 5:1,5 26:7 27:5</p> <p><b>employee</b> 29:9,11</p> <p><b>employees</b> 20:4</p> <p><b>employment</b> 22:6 27:8</p> <p><b>enjoy</b> 28:8</p>
--	---	--	--	---

entirety 1:24 entitled 12:10 ethics 2:4 19:5 everybody 11:4 ew3000753 13:4,5 ew4001542 12:4,4 ew4001549 16:13 exactly 23:24 24:18 25:14 example 7:7 expecting 7:17 expertise 22:13 27:6 expires 29:24 explain 8:17 explaining 10:23 exports 15:9 extent 15:13 external 10:19	<b>G</b>	gathering 4:13 general 7:17,18 8:12,18 11:3 generally 3:16 getting 14:9 17:2 20:14 21:11 given 18:15 20:10 go 18:7 22:8 27:15 goes 4:12 going 8:18 20:13,19 21:2 23:5 gop 15:24 government 2:25 9:13,16 group 6:3,5,8,11,20 7:1,5 22:15 groups 4:2,6 23:17 guess 3:8 6:2 15:25 20:16	<b>I</b>	id 19:19 idea 23:4 identify 12:1 im 3:9 7:4,7 important 9:11 11:17 22:12 inaudible 19:19 include 3:3 8:13 industry 22:15 information 8:19 initial 6:1 interactions 25:23 26:2 interest 4:1,6 23:18 24:16 interested 8:24 29:12 interview 1:4 26:10 26:11,17 introduced 3:18 involved 9:18 11:11 12:9 involvement 10:2 25:4 irby 9:3 20:18 26:6 26:10 issue 3:17 11:5 16:25 18:5 25:19 issues 2:21,23,24 3:3,4,7 14:20 17:4 17:19 26:21 27:6	know 2:8 4:10,14 5:5,7,9,11,12 8:4 9:19 10:8,9 13:13 14:10,25 15:23 16:1,13 21:4,18 22:17 23:21,23 24:13,18,23 25:8 25:15 26:1,3 27:9 knowledge 24:1,3 known 11:6	<b>M</b>	main 18:2 majority 6:4 9:9,14 12:16 man 8:7 mark 3:9 marty 9:2 13:15,19 14:3,5,11,17 17:14 21:25 22:11 26:5 material 16:11 materials 20:14,17 20:22 mean 6:3 12:11 18:6,17 19:14 20:16 23:1,8 27:19 meant 16:19 media 9:12 18:5 meet 4:17 23:8 meeting 8:25 13:9 13:10,14,25 14:3 21:21 22:9,10,16 23:1,14 24:24 25:3,4,14,16,18 meetings 3:21 4:1,5 8:9,14,21,23 9:6,8 9:18 10:1,5 13:18 13:19 14:16 17:12 17:13 20:14,20,22 21:1,10 23:13,15 24:21,25 members 10:24 mentioned 7:1 23:19 middle 8:7 16:22 mind 7:21 25:24 misspoke 24:14 moment 16:17 month 19:17 multiple 17:3
<b>F</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>J</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>N</b>			
fact 7:6 25:18 fall 22:19,22 familiar 3:11 9:20 10:20 16:4 far 19:15,15 february 2:11,12 22:5 feel 8:6 fighting 16:3 fill 25:20 filling 26:21 financially 29:12 fire 9:12 first 4:17,18,25 five 10:12 floor 15:25 focus 11:18 focused 3:24 9:10 10:19 18:1 focusing 7:22 17:19 folder 27:3 food 15:9 forcing 9:13 foregoing 29:3 former 3:1 22:13 forth 29:7 found 5:14 24:18 further 29:8	hadnt 24:23 handle 18:2,20 handled 2:18 21:19 handling 2:24 16:25 25:19 hang 27:15 happens 21:18 heard 16:1,2 heavy 20:2,2 help 4:1 20:25 helped 4:11 27:21 helpful 26:3 helping 3:21 27:23 hereinbefore 29:6 hes 26:12 heydlauff 9:20 hicks 13:8 16:16 high 10:13 hire 26:6 honestly 11:14 horse 14:23 22:14 house 15:24 humane 4:21 5:1,5 14:12 24:16 25:24 hundreds 16:23 husband 17:7	jersey 29:23 job 2:14 3:23 11:19 11:19 16:25 17:2 19:25 join 25:15 joined 2:5 22:24,25 26:14,15	lack 20:6 laid 7:25 language 10:21 18:10 lawrence 1:14 2:6 28:4 learn 4:25 leave 22:1,6 leaving 3:1 left 22:5 legal 10:21 legislation 3:15 5:20 14:20 15:12 legislative 2:20 7:25 10:21 20:2,2 26:14,16 letter 11:2,8,12,15 11:24 12:9,10,22 letters 4:11 10:16 11:10,12 license 1:17 29:22 limited 27:22 little 20:5 living 12:15 lobbying 19:1,5 lobbyist 5:8,14,16 23:22,24 24:11,13 24:15,19 lobbyists 23:8,20 24:10 located 27:2 long 3:6 4:16 look 12:7 looking 25:20 lot 7:20 8:6 19:25 21:7 lyn 1:16 29:22	name 14:24 16:1,2 narrowed 27:19 nate 1:10 2:3 nature 7:16,19 need 20:21 needed 8:3			
		<b>K</b>					
		kedric 1:9 2:3 11:25 27:14 keep 25:6 kind 21:9 knew 5:12 23:17 24:15,15					

neither 29:8,11  
 never 18:10  
 new 29:23  
 nine 7:2  
 notary 29:23  
 note 1:24  
 november 22:20  
 number 8:5 10:4,8  
 12:1 21:1

---

**O**

obviously 3:23  
 10:20 12:11 16:25  
 18:23  
 occur 22:16  
 occurred 22:9  
 october 5:3 10:6  
 13:16 17:18 20:13  
 21:10 22:20  
 office 2:4,10 3:2 8:2  
 9:23 16:7 17:20  
 17:21 18:14,15,19  
 19:1,5,9,22 21:15  
 22:2 26:5,7,14,15  
 26:20 27:5,8  
 officer 29:1  
 offices 4:3,6 8:25  
 20:1  
 official 7:23  
 officials 23:9  
 oh 22:6  
 okay 2:13 3:6 4:4  
 4:14,20 6:7 8:11  
 8:17 10:14 12:5  
 13:6 16:6,11  
 17:25 18:22 19:3  
 21:14 22:20 23:6  
 23:25 24:14 26:10  
 27:10 28:3  
 once 11:4 19:12,16  
 19:17  
 ones 7:20  
 opportunity 22:7  
 originator 6:6  
 outreach 2:19  
 outside 21:18

---

**P**

1:4,13 2:5,7  
 packets 21:4,5

papers 17:23  
 paraphrasing  
 24:11  
 part 7:23 27:21,24  
 parties 8:24 29:10  
 party 8:25  
 paycheck 23:10  
 payne 1:9 2:1,3  
 12:3 28:3,7  
 people 9:1,2 19:22  
 percent 3:23 6:5,17  
 7:1,3,4,5,6,22  
 percentage 6:15,18  
 7:2  
 performed 15:22  
 period 5:3 6:9 7:13  
 8:13 9:5 13:16  
 14:17 16:6 17:18  
 18:3 22:21 23:21  
 person 5:24 7:9 8:1  
 9:17 24:14 25:19  
 phone 3:25 7:24  
 8:4,8 17:3 25:6  
 phones 16:24 17:6  
 phonetic 1:25  
 place 23:2 29:6  
 please 1:24  
 point 5:2  
 points 12:13  
 policies 18:25  
 policy 18:19  
 polite 18:23  
 portfolio 2:21  
 position 25:21  
 possibly 9:7  
 potential 8:9,14  
 15:11  
 practice 11:6  
 preparing 18:5  
 21:3  
 present 1:8 23:2  
 24:25  
 president 22:14  
 press 2:15,16 3:24  
 7:23 9:10,15  
 10:18 11:20 12:13  
 12:16,19 15:11  
 17:19 18:1,7  
 19:24 20:6 25:6

26:12,13  
 pretty 11:6 19:25  
 20:3  
 prevent 3:12  
 primarily 2:25 6:1  
 10:18  
 priority 21:15  
 probably 13:14  
 procedures 19:1  
 proceedings 29:5  
 professionally 4:15  
 prohibition 16:4  
 project 16:17  
 projects 16:8  
 protect 9:14  
 protection 15:6  
 public 12:25 29:23  
 publically 10:20  
 publicly 18:9  
 puppy 15:5  
 purpose 13:10,13  
 push 21:9

---

**Q**

quantity 21:4  
 question 12:5,7  
 13:21 14:1 15:19  
 27:18,22  
 questioning 2:1  
 questions 2:8 27:11  
 27:12

---

**R**

racing 14:23  
 rahn 1:16 29:22  
 ranging 5:23  
 real 16:25 17:2  
 realize 9:12  
 really 3:9 11:18  
 14:25 18:1,9  
 25:12 26:25  
 reason 24:7  
 recall 4:10 7:8 9:25  
 10:4 11:9,12,14  
 12:12,15 14:18,25  
 15:2,14 16:21  
 17:9,16 18:6,21  
 20:25 21:3 22:11  
 receive 17:3  
 received 6:10

receiving 14:2  
 recipients 6:11  
 recollection 11:22  
 12:8,23  
 recording 28:10  
 refresh 11:22 12:8  
 registered 5:8,15  
 relate 8:8  
 related 10:5,15  
 11:11 14:20 15:22  
 17:4,10,19 18:4  
 19:1  
 relative 29:9,11  
 release 12:19  
 releases 12:13,16  
 remaining 6:18 7:2  
 remember 7:17  
 8:10 11:17 15:10  
 15:13 21:20 24:25  
 25:2 26:18  
 remembering  
 15:11  
 rephrase 4:16 8:12  
 24:6  
 reply 24:9  
 reported 29:5  
 representative 2:9  
 13:1 16:7 17:21  
 19:4,9  
 request 11:7 12:18  
 12:21,24 13:24  
 20:8  
 requested 23:14  
 requesting 17:9  
 requests 18:20  
 19:22  
 respect 6:13 18:13  
 respond 13:9  
 response 18:4  
 responsibilities  
 2:21  
 responsibility  
 27:24  
 responsible 3:7  
 restrictions 18:16  
 18:18  
 right 18:25  
 role 3:14 14:8  
 15:21 25:16 27:8

royce 11:12,15,24  
 12:10  
 rules 19:5

---

**S**

safe 15:8  
 safeguard 15:8  
 safety 15:6  
 saw 19:20  
 saying 5:10,11  
 15:25 24:5  
 says 13:8 16:16  
 scheduled 10:5  
 scheduler 9:22  
 scheduling 8:9,14  
 8:20,22 9:18 10:1  
 scope 21:18  
 secretary 2:15,16  
 10:18 11:20 26:12  
 26:13  
 see 21:11 24:17  
 seen 15:24  
 senator 21:21 22:9  
 25:9  
 send 11:1,8  
 sends 13:7  
 sent 7:8 11:21  
 13:24 16:12  
 set 3:21 4:1,5 13:8  
 13:14 14:3 19:25  
 20:1,4,15,23 21:9  
 21:15 23:13,14  
 24:22 29:6  
 setting 13:17,19,25  
 17:13  
 shared 27:3  
 sharing 8:19  
 shes 5:15 6:14  
 24:15  
 short 3:22,25  
 showed 24:9  
 shut 2:25 3:22 7:21  
 9:11,13,16 11:19  
 12:14 16:23 17:7  
 21:12 25:20  
 side 16:17  
 six 3:8  
 society 4:21 5:1,5  
 14:12 24:16 25:24

soring 3:12	talked 21:7 22:12	training 15:17,20	5:20 6:9 7:12 9:7	1
sorry 7:4,4	talking 12:13 26:12	transcribed 1:16	10:15 11:7,13,23	12 19:20
speak 8:3	telephone 1:12 5:24	transcript 1:25	12:18 13:1,7,18	13 13:16
speaking 24:1	7:11,12 17:1	29:4	14:3,16 15:3,14	14 22:5
special 16:8	tell 5:13 14:23,24	transition 26:23	16:8 17:4 18:4,14	15 10:11
specific 5:2,13,21	25:7,11,12	27:1	18:20 19:4,8 20:7	18 29:24
6:2 12:1 19:13	tennessee 17:23	true 29:3	21:22 22:23 24:9	
specifics 7:18 25:13	22:14	truly 18:10	25:3,23 26:2	2
spectator 16:3	term 20:6	truthfully 16:21	27:17	20 11:5
speculate 10:7	terminated 28:11	try 4:1 21:9	whitfields 2:9 14:8	2013 2:11 3:12 5:4
spellings 1:24	testified 27:20	trying 9:14 25:6	16:7 17:20,21	7:14 10:6 15:6,8
spent 9:13	testimony 29:4	two 8:24 9:1,2	19:9 27:8	15:18,21 17:18
spreadsheet 27:2	thank 27:11 28:3,4	24:25	wife 18:24	20:13 21:10 22:21
staff 3:25 9:17 18:8	28:4,7,9	type 8:18 24:10	wondering 19:8	26:16,20
21:24 23:4	thats 12:10 17:15	typically 9:1	20:20	2014 1:5 2:6,12
staffed 3:22	17:15 18:1 20:4		work 5:18 14:19	2017 29:24
staffer 3:1 26:14,16	23:9	U	15:5,21 25:5	25 1:5 2:6
staffing 21:7	therapy 15:17,20	uhhuh 16:18	worked 4:21 19:14	
stamped 16:12	thing 11:3 13:9,24	unclear 24:7	27:21,23	3
stand 23:20	18:2 24:10 25:7	understanding 9:7	working 5:4 7:14	30 11:5
standard 11:6	27:15	13:23 27:4,7	9:6 10:1 16:6,8	
started 4:18	think 4:11 9:11	understood 18:10	27:17	4
starting 9:16	11:3,17 12:17	uniform 15:6	world 20:5	5
state 29:23	13:20 14:13,22	unusual 20:9 21:9	wouldnt 21:23	50 10:10,11,12
statement 12:25	18:6 20:24 21:6,8	23:7,11	24:20	
16:20	23:6,15 24:4,8,12	usually 18:7 25:5	wright 1:10 2:3	6
statements 18:9	25:17,18 27:16,22		19:7,7,21 20:7,12	7
stenographically	thought 20:9 23:12	V	20:18,25 21:6,14	8
29:5	24:23	variety 20:19	21:20 22:1,4 23:6	9
stephanie 1:16	time 2:13 5:3,7,11	various 17:4	23:11 24:20 25:2	
29:22	5:12,13 6:9 7:13	verify 10:22 18:8	25:22 26:1	9
stick 25:24	7:23,24 8:6,13 9:5	vested 23:18	write 12:14,19,21	90 3:23 6:5,25 7:22
stop 19:10	10:6 13:16 14:17	veterans 15:17,20	12:25	99 7:4
strange 24:4,8,12	16:6 17:18 18:3		writing 12:12,13,14	
suggested 11:1	20:10 21:8,13	W	wrote 12:16	
supporters 4:2 14:7	22:21 23:4,9,21	walked 23:3		
14:9,13	24:4,10,12,13	walking 22:14	X	
sure 3:9 4:4 7:7	25:19 27:11 29:6	want 2:7 6:2 10:7	xio1717 1:17 29:22	
10:23 13:9,24		13:3,13,22 16:22		
20:21 21:19 28:1	timeframe 21:21	20:9 22:8 27:12	Y	
surprise 23:16	times 19:20,25	27:22	yarmouth 13:9	
24:17,20	title 2:14	wanted 10:24 28:1	yeah 22:22 23:3	
	today 5:16	wasnt 19:24 21:17	25:11 28:4	
T	told 27:2	23:11 24:17 26:25	year 19:18,20	
tabus 1:14 2:6	top 16:15	way 19:24 27:15		
11:25 27:14 28:1	topic 25:11	week 19:12,15,16	Z	
tactics 3:12	tough 15:10	weekend 28:8	zero 10:12	
take 6:7	track 25:6	weeks 3:8		
talk 26:13	tracking 3:16,19	welfare 3:4,7 14:20	0	
	4:12 15:1	whitfield 2:19 4:14		

# **EXHIBIT 48**



---

From: Keith Dane [REDACTED]@humansociety.org  
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 3:49 PM  
To: Heydauff, Emma  
Subject: Senale 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  
Coats  
Scott  
Fischer  
Johnson, Ron  
Conker  
Burr\*  
Coburn\*  
Murkowski

EW4 004518

14-2940\_0491

# **EXHIBIT 49**

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humaneociety.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 10:20 PM  
**To:** Cory Hicks <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>; Emma Heydlauff <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Subject:** Fwd: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

---

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Keith Dane <[REDACTED]@humaneociety.org>  
**Date:** October 15, 2013, 10:16:19 PM EDT  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humaneociety.org>; Sara Amundson <[REDACTED]@hslf.org>  
**Subject:** FW: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Can Cory try to get a meeting with Corker's office for Marty and Donna?

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 3:29 PM  
**To:** Keith Dane  
**Cc:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Michael Markarian; Cece Kremer; Sara Amundson  
**Subject:** RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Mike Markarian had reached out to Sen. Vitter's staff, but I haven't heard more about whether they connected. Kirk and Vitter are particularly friendly (as is Collins -- already on). Wayne is also having me draft an email for him to send to Thune's and Burr's offices. Wayne thought Heller might be a good bet, too. It would be great if you could do outreach on your end to Senate Rs with whom the advocates in town may have a connection. At this point, I wouldn't characterize it as "taking the lead in cosponsoring," since that may scare them off and Collins is already cosponsoring. Thanks, Keith!

Mimi

**From:** Keith Dane  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:52 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Excellent -- thank you. It wasn't clear that the memo for Wayne was about getting the cosponsors listed -- I thought it was more about the bounce backs...which I took to mean email bounce backs (perhaps full mailboxes, due to the shutdown?).

Do we have any strong ties to Rs in the Senate that we could press to sign on ASAP? Mr. Kirk, perhaps?

Whitfield's office is setting up meetings with Senate Rs, so hopefully that will bear fruit. But if there are any HSUS-friendly Rs, I think we should be asking them to take the lead in cosponsoring...and we should be able to get those meetings.

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:47 PM  
**To:** Keith Dane  
**Cc:** Wayne Pacelle  
**Subject:** RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

I have been asking, and am drafting an email for Wayne to send to Ayotte's staff to press this. Thanks for the intel, Keith.

**From:** Keith Dane  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:33 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody  
**Cc:** Wayne Pacelle  
**Subject:** RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Aside from whatever technical issues are causing the bounce backs, Connie is being told by Senate offices (Alexander and Manchin) that the fact that cosponsors are not showing up on THOMAS is actually hurting us with offices we're visiting; they think no one is cosponsoring the Senate bill, and think there's no reason to hold them back (even if there are more Ds than Rs).

Can we ask Ayotte to please start adding all the cosponsors who've signed up thus far? Thanks!

Keith

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:18 PM  
**To:** Sahar Fshghi; Jacqueline Tiaga; Cece Kremer; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane; Cherie Beatty  
**Subject:** FW: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

I spoke with Wayne about his reaching out to Ayotte's staff to start adding the other D cosponsors. I'm going to draft an email on it for him. Just wanted you to be aware of the bounce-back issue below, FYI...

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:12 PM  
**To:** Durand, Adam (Klobuchar)  
**Subject:** RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Thank you for the heads up, Adam! We'll keep checking, too, and your boss will get credit on the scorecard regardless of THOMAS, but I really appreciate your flagging the difficulties so we'll be aware!

**From:** Durand, Adam (Klobuchar) <[REDACTED]@klobuchar.senate.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:10 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Just on background. We have gotten some bounce backs on email requests to join this bill. I'm hoping that it will get resolved in the next few days, but I'll continue to monitor Thomas to make sure it happens.

Thanks,  
Adam

From: Mimi Brody [redacted]@humanesociety.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:07 PM  
To: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar)  
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

That's wonderful, Adam – thanks so much for your help on it and for Sen. Klobuchar's cosponsorship of this important bill! Let me know if you need any additional info on the other bills, and many thanks again! :)  
Mimi

From: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar) [redacted]@klobuchar.senate.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:02 PM  
To: Mimi Brody  
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Mimi,

Senator Klobuchar is cosponsoring S.1406, the Horse Soring bill. We have reached out to the bill's sponsor as well.

Thanks,  
Adam

Adam Durand  
Senior Legislative Assistant  
Office of Senator Amy Klobuchar  
302 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510  
202-224-[redacted]

From: Mimi Brody [redacted]@humanesociety.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 12:40 PM  
To: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar)  
Subject: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Dear Adam:

We wanted to give you a quick look at the preview version of the 2013 Humane Scorecard before it's launched publicly early next week:  
<http://www.hslf.org/assets/pdfs/humane-scorecard/113th-congressional-scorecard-preview.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/BAETKKPTE/9925564881>>

If Senator Klobuchar is not yet cosponsoring all four of the bills whose cosponsors will be counted, please join during the next few days so your constituents will see your support for these priority bills on the preview! The scorecard will give credit to all Members who ask to cosponsor – whether they've officially shown up on THOMAS yet or not – if you let us know, as well as contacting the prime sponsor's office. Current cosponsor counts are indicated below, along with staff contacts for the prime sponsors.

Thanks again,

Mimi

On behalf of both the Humane Society Legislative Fund and the Humane Society of the United States, we want to flag for you the items we plan to include in our 2013 Humane Scorecard covering the first session of the 113th Congress. Note: if any recorded votes occur during the remainder of the session on legislation affecting animals, the scorecard may also include them. As of now, we expect the 2013 Humane Scorecard will count the following:

**Horse Soring – Cosponsorship of S. 1406, the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act** – currently with 17 cosponsors; introduced by Sens. Ayotte and Warner – to crack down on the cruel practice of "soring," in which unscrupulous 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 unfair competitive advantage at horse shows. Soring methods include applying caustic chemicals, using plastic wrap and tight bandages to "cook" those chemicals deep into the horse's flesh for days, attaching heavy chains to strike against the sore legs, inserting bolts, screws or other hard objects into sensitive areas of the hooves, cutting the hooves down to expose the live tissue, and using salicylic acid or other painful substances to slough off scarred tissue in an attempt to disguise the sores. More than 40 years ago, Congress tried to rein in this abuse by enacting the Horse Protection Act, but rampant soring continues, according to a 2010 audit by the USDA Inspector General that recommended reforms incorporated in the PAST Act. S. 1406 will 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 soring of a horse for the purpose of showing or selling it illegal, as well as directing another to do so. This legislation is endorsed by the American Horse Council and more than 30 other national and state horse groups, as well as by the American Veterinary Medical Association, American Association of Equine Practitioners, and many others (for full list, see [www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/horse/past-act-endorsements.pdf](http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/horse/past-act-endorsements.pdf) <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/DPDPTKKPTE/9925564881>>). Staff contacts: Samantha (Sam) Roberts (Ayotte) / Caitlin Runyan (Warner).

**Eggs and Hen Housing – Cosponsorship of S. 820, the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments** – currently with 12 cosponsors; introduced by Sen. Feinstein, with Sens. Stabenow and Collins as original cosponsors – to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, phased in over a period of 15-16 years (during the normal course of replacing aged equipment for many producers), which will significantly improve animal welfare and provide a stable and secure future for U.S. egg farmers. The legislation is supported by the egg industry and animal welfare groups, and expressly does not affect any other livestock sector or food product other than eggs. Under this legislation, each laying hen will ultimately be provided nearly double the amount of current space, along with enrichments such as nest boxes and perches that permit hens to better express natural behaviors. Egg farmers will be able to invest in these enriched colony cage systems with the assurance that they will face regulatory certainty and not a patchwork of conflicting state laws – helping industry at no cost to the federal government (the preliminary CBO score on this legislation is zero). Studies have shown higher productivity for hens in enriched colony cage systems – i.e., more eggs and lower hen mortality. An economic study by the independent research group Agralytica concluded that the bill's reforms are expected to increase consumer prices by less than 1 penny per egg, spread out over the lengthy phase-in period. Consumers support this legislation by a margin of 4-to-1, and it has been endorsed by leading consumer organizations, as well as by the American Veterinary Medical Association, more than 1,000 individual family farms across the country, and many others (for full list, see [www.humanesociety.org/egg\\_bill\\_endorsements](http://www.humanesociety.org/egg_bill_endorsements) <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/JOHJTKKPTG/9925564881>>). Cage-free and free-range systems, as well as operations with fewer than 3,000 laying hens, will be unaffected by S. 820, except that they may see increased sales as consumers are able to more clearly distinguish what's available on store shelves, thanks to the bill's labeling provisions. For responses to frequently asked questions, see [http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/egg\\_bill\\_faq.pdf](http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/egg_bill_faq.pdf) <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/OWZJTKKPTH/9925564881>>. Staff contact: Devin Rhinerson (Feinstein).

Animal Fighting Spectators – Cosponsorship of S. 666, the Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act – currently with 24 cosponsors; introduced by Sens. Blumenthal, Kirk, Cantwell, and Vitter – 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 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 handlers who try to blend into the crowd when a raid occurs. This legislation is widely supported by nearly 300 national, state and local law enforcement agencies (covering all 50 states), including the Fraternal Order of Police and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association: [http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/law\\_enforcement\\_endorsements\\_animal\\_fighting\\_bill.pdf](http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/law_enforcement_endorsements_animal_fighting_bill.pdf) <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/CRQOTKKPT/9925564881>>. The preliminary CBO estimate on this legislation is zero. It has been approved three times by the full Senate – in June as part of the Farm Bill (S. 954), and last year as a floor amendment to the Farm Bill and as free-standing legislation (S. 1947) on a vote of 88-11. Related language is also in the House-passed Farm Bill (H.R. 2642), as it was in last year's House Agriculture Committee bill. Staff contacts: James Mikolowsky (Blumenthal) / Sarah Walter (Kirk).

Horse Slaughter – Cosponsorship of S. 541, the Safeguard American Food Exports (SAFE) Act – currently with 26 cosponsors; introduced by Sens. Landrieu and Graham – 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. The shocking discovery of horse meat in beef products in the U.K. <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/MPCFTKKPT/9925564881>> underscores the potential threat to American health if horse slaughter plants were to open here. Horse slaughter is cruel and cannot be made humane, and the U.S. public overwhelmingly opposes it. Horses are shipped for more than 24 hours at a time without food, water, or rest in crowded trucks in which the animals are often seriously injured or killed in transit. Horses are skittish by nature due to their heightened fight-or-flight response, and the methods used to kill horses rarely result in quick, painless deaths; they often endure repeated blows during attempts to render them unconscious and sometimes remain alive and kicking during dismemberment. The horse slaughter industry is a predatory, inhumane enterprise. They don't "humanize" old horses – but precisely the opposite: they buy up young and healthy horses, often by misrepresenting their intentions, and kill them to sell the meat to Europe and Japan. It makes no sense for the federal government to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to oversee new horse slaughter plants at a time when Congress is so focused on fiscal responsibility. Staff contacts: Megan Blanco (Landrieu) / Courtney Titus (Graham).

Funding Letter – Cosigning 4/26/13 group letter – led by Sens. Boxer and Vitter – or submitting a parallel individual request to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, seeking funds for USDA 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, through student loan repayment, the critical maldistribution of veterinarians practicing in rural and inner-city areas and USDA inspection positions: <http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/fv14-senate-animal-welfare.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/BMTNTKKPT/9925564881>>.

Letter Opposing Rep. Steve King Amendment to House Farm Bill – Extra credit will be given to those who co-signed an 8/7/13 group letter – led by Sen. Feinstein – or who send their own letters to the leaders of the Senate Agriculture Committee voicing opposition to a provision in the House-passed Farm Bill (Sec. 11312 of H.R. 2642) known as the “King Amendment.” Rep. Steve King offered this amendment during committee markup and it was adopted with minimal debate; opponents were then denied an opportunity to have a House floor vote on an amendment to strike it. The letter urges committee leaders to reject this provision in any form or context it may take (final Farm Bill conference report or otherwise), calling it “a serious infringement on states’ rights with far reaching impacts”: <http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-senate-letter.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/BCRRTKKPT/9925564881>>.

For a complete list of those who have publicly stated opposition to the King amendment, please see: <http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-opposition-master.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/EKWSYTKKPT/9925564881>>.

This amendment is so widely opposed because it 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. A broad coalition of 89 organizations joined in a letter calling for the King Amendment to be kept out of any final House-Senate package: [http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king\\_amdt\\_opposition\\_group.pdf](http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king_amdt_opposition_group.pdf) <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/AUYWTKKPT/9925564881>>. And others such as the National Conference of State Legislatures (<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-ncsl.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/IOZTKKPT/9925564881>>), County Executives of America (<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-letter-cea.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/NCQVTKKPT/9925564881>>), the Fraternal Order of Police (<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-fop.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/AJHTTKKPT/9925564881>>), and the National Sheriffs’ Association (<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-letter-nsa.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/HLTYTKKPT/9925564881>>)) have sent their own letters, as have the California Food and Agriculture Secretary and Mississippi Attorney General. Numerous editorials have also run in newspapers across the country, including USA Today <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/NGBR TKKPT/9925564881>> and the Washington Post <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/MELETKKPT/9925564881>>.

Leaders – Prime sponsors of pro-animal legislation or a letter to an agency will receive extra credit.

As in the past, our 2013 Scorecard will be prepared by the Humane Society Legislative Fund and distributed widely. If you have not already done so, we urge you to cosponsor the bills on sourcing of show horses, eggs and hen housing, animal fighting spectators, and horse slaughter. Please contact us if you need more information on these or other animal protection issues. Thank you so much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sara Amundson, Executive Director  
Humane Society Legislative Fund  
(202) 676-  
@hslf.org <@hslf.org>

Mimi Brody, Director of Federal Affairs  
The Humane Society of the United States  
(202) 955-  
@humanesociety.org <@humanesociety.org>  
<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/9925564881/img/spacer.gif>

# **EXHIBIT 50**

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humane-society.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 9, 2012 7:12 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humane-society.org>  
**Cc:** Sara Arundson <[REDACTED]@hslf.org>; Cece Kremer <[REDACTED]@humane-society.org>  
**Subject:** Re: do you think Cong. Whitfield might be able to get Cong. Roe engaged?...FW: update on leads for Horse Protection Act bill  
**Attach:** image001.gif

---

I will talk to Ed tonight in-between votes.

Sent from my iPhone

On May 9, 2012, at 6:25 PM, "Mimi Brody" <[REDACTED]@humane-society.org<[REDACTED]@humane-society.org>> wrote:

Connie, Cong. Roe's staff hasn't responded to Wayne's/Mike's initial effort, but I wonder if we need to throw in the towel yet on him? He did send his own letters to Ag Approps 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?

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 09, 2012 6:21 PM  
**To:** Michael Markarian; Wayne Pacelle; Cece Kremer; Kate Wall; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane  
**Cc:** Akisha Townsend; Mila Zain; Kimberly Ockene; Jonathan Lovvorn; Tracie Letterman  
**Subject:** RE: update on leads for Horse Protection Act bill

I don't really understand why it would go to E&C, so I'm not sure which subcommittee would be likely - maybe Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade (Bono Mack chair)? I think Ag will get at least a joint referral, so maybe we could also consider trying to have an R on that committee be part of the team. Perhaps Chris Gibson (he cosponsored horse slaughter and animal fighting, and seems to want to work with us)?

**From:** Michael Markarian  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 09, 2012 6:13 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody; Wayne Pacelle; Cece Kremer; Kate Wall; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane  
**Cc:** Akisha Townsend; Mila Zain; Kimberly Ockene; Jonathan Lovvorn; Tracie Letterman  
**Subject:** RE: update on leads for Horse Protection Act bill

Roe has not been responsive to us, so let's pivot to some other R's. Let's look at members of E&C Committee. Do we know which subcommittee it will go to?

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 09, 2012 6:10 PM  
**To:** Wayne Pacelle; Michael Markarian; Cece Kremer; Kate Wall; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane  
**Cc:** Akisha Townsend; Mila Zain; Kimberly Ockene; Jonathan Lovvorn; Tracie Letterman  
**Subject:** update on leads for Horse Protection Act bill

I had a wonderful talk with Marilyn Dillihay in Cong. Cohen's office. Though she couldn't speak for him, she thinks he will want to co-lead on the HPA bill with Cong. Whitfield and sounded enthusiastic about it. I said I'd send her the draft bill as soon as it's finalized.

We touched on the recent law enforcement actions under current law (first time in 40 years), the Senate Approps Committee approval of increased enforcement funding for FY13, our pending petition for regulatory reforms, the IG's audit identifying serious problems, and the need to fix gaps in the underlying statute that hasn't been updated since the 70's. We discussed potential jurisdiction for the bill (E & C / Ag) and our desire to have the bill introduced quickly.

Mike also asked me to check with Connie about Cong. Cooper as a possible part of the leadership team. She said Cooper is very unlikely, since he was strongly against us on horse slaughter and is quite tied in with the Tennessee Walking Horse industry. On Cong. Chandler, she feels he's not one to do a lot of legwork. But if you want his name on the bill to help demonstrate regional support, he'd be ok for that. She really liked the idea of having Cong. Roe as part of the team, and likewise on Sen. Landrieu if she's willing. She also suggested maybe Sen. Lindsey Graham, and that we consider the list Keith compiled showing which states have significant TWH industries (besides TN and KY, Keith recalled TX, MO, CA, AL, MS, SC, and GA).

Mimi Brody  
Director, Federal Affairs  
[REDACTED]@humane-society.org <[REDACTED]@humane-society.org>  
t 202/955-[REDACTED] f 202/676-2302 c [REDACTED]  
The Humane Society of the United States  
2100 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037  
humane-society.org <<http://www.humane-society.org/>>  
Join Our Email List <<https://community.hsus.org/humane/join?source=gabhl>> Facebook <<http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=6041057841>>  
Twitter <<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety>>  
<image001.gif> <<http://www.humane-society.org/>>

The Humane Society of the United States is rated a 4-star charity (the highest possible) by Charity Navigator <<http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search.summary&orgid=3848>>, approved by the Better Business Bureau <<http://www.bbb.org/charity-reviews/national/animal-protection/humane-society-of-the-United-states-in-washington-de-3129>> for all 20 standards for charity accountability, voted by GuideStar's Philanthropedia <<http://www.myphilanthropedia.org/blog/2011/08/24/humane-society-of-the-United-states-hsus-1-expert-identified-animal-rights-and-welfare-nonprofit/>> experts as the #1 high-impact animal protection group, and named by Worth Magazine <[http://www.humane-society.org/assets/pdfs/about/worth\\_top\\_10\\_fiscally\\_responsible\\_charities.pdf](http://www.humane-society.org/assets/pdfs/about/worth_top_10_fiscally_responsible_charities.pdf)> as one of the 10 most fiscally responsible charities.

# **EXHIBIT 51**



**From:** Buchanan, Melissa <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 18, 2012 9:38 AM  
**To:** 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield' <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>; Blackberry, Ed <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Cc:** Hicks, Cory <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Subject:** meeting with Congressman Roe

---

Good Morning Congressman and Mrs. Whitfield:

I just set up a meeting for you both with Congressman Phil Roe from Tennessee regarding the Tennessee Walking Horse Issue. The meeting is next Tuesday, July 24 at 4:30pm in Congressman Roe's office (419 Cannon).

Thank you:  
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan  
Scheduler  
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)  
2358 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
Phone: (202) 225-[REDACTED]  
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:



[Click here](#) to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

# **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

1 QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

2

3 Q. This is Kedric Payne and Nate Right  
4 with the OCE and we are joined with Congressman [REDACTED]  
5 [REDACTED] and his counsel Rob Walker. It is April 25,  
6 2014. We have noticed the member of the False  
7 Statements Act and he said that he will supply us  
8 with the acknowledgment form.

9 Congressman [REDACTED], do you know Connie  
10 Harriman-Whitfield?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And how long have you known her?

13 A. I guess -- let me see, I have been in  
14 Congress five and a half years, I guess five years.

15 Q. And how did you first meet her?

16 A. You know, Mr. Payne, I don't really  
17 recall when I first met her.

18 Q. Okay. And do you know that she is a  
19 lobbyist for the Humane Society?

20 A. Only by -- only by what you have said  
21 or what I have read, I haven't seen any official  
22 documents that say she is.

23 Q. Do you recall any meetings with Mrs.  
24 Whitfield concerning issues related to animal  
25 welfare?

1           A.           I had one, that was in July of 2012,  
2 almost two years ago.

3           Q.           And can you describe what you recall  
4 from that meeting?

5           A.           Basically, Mr. Payne, Congressman  
6 Whitfield has a bill on horse soring, and he knows  
7 my interests -- my interests in animal welfare, knew  
8 of it because of our family. My wife serves on the  
9 local Humane Society board and we are very active in  
10 the local Humane Society and animal welfare. He  
11 knew that and set up a meeting in our office, my  
12 office to come by and talk to me about his bill.

13          Q.           And who attended that meeting?

14          A.           Well, again, this is a recollection,  
15 and my recollection is myself and Congressman  
16 Whitfield, his wife Connie and my Chief of Staff was  
17 there and I also think that at that time my  
18 Legislative Assistant who is now my Communications  
19 Director now was there.

20          Q.           And was the conversation related --  
21 well, I should ask you, what was the conversation  
22 focused on, you mentioned that there is a bill  
23 pending, but what specifically was discussed to the  
24 best of your recollection?

25          A.           That's a ways ago, but basically that

1 horse soring is an obviously a huge conflict, a very  
2 controversial issues and the horse business is very  
3 big in our state of Tennessee and in Kentucky. We  
4 discussed horse soring and basically the bill, I  
5 never did have it to this date co-sponsor the bill  
6 yet, because of one provision in the bill, just  
7 troubled me a little bit, basically that was it just  
8 discussing the bill as best I recall.

9 Q. Was the discussion then related to you  
10 possibly sponsoring or co-sponsoring the bill?

11 A. Sure, that's why they came by.

12 Q. And you mentioned that Representative  
13 Whitfield set up the meeting, I don't want to  
14 mischaracterize what you said?

15 A. You know, I'm not sure who set up the  
16 meeting. My staff handles all that, obviously we  
17 have multiple meetings every day and I have a  
18 scheduler that does that, so probably what happened  
19 is, typically what happens is there will be a staff  
20 contact with our staff, and see if there is a time  
21 available for both members, and that's how it's  
22 typically done for anything, not just this meeting  
23 but any meeting we have.

24 Q. And what was Mrs. Whitfield's role in  
25 the meeting?

1           A.        She was just there with him advocating  
2 for this. I know Mrs. Whitfield is very passionate,  
3 at least she was, about animal rights.

4           Q.        Did you consider the meeting to be a  
5 meeting with Representative Whitfield or the Humane  
6 Society or with any other --

7           A.        It was with the Congressman.

8           Q.        Was there any follow-up after that  
9 meeting with Representative Whitfield's office or  
10 Mrs. Whitfield?

11          A.        Now with Mrs. Whitfield, no. With the  
12 office, I think that his office contacted my office,  
13 but I don't think -- I don't -- wasn't involved in  
14 any of that. I think his staff talked to my staff.

15          Q.        Okay. In 2012, was there any other  
16 meeting possibly in September of 2012 related to  
17 that same issue?

18          A.        Not that I am aware of.

19          Q.        Okay.

20          A.        Certainly wasn't in my office, I know  
21 that.

22          Q.        Do you recall a meeting in March 2013  
23 with Mrs. Whitfield related to animal welfare  
24 issues?

25          A.        No, I think that there was a meeting

1 scheduled, I didn't attend that meeting because I  
2 had votes on the house floor. I think my staff did  
3 but I did not.

4 Q. And with -- are you familiar with the  
5 PAST Act of 2013?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. Did Representative Whitfield or his  
8 office have any meetings or discussions with you  
9 concerning possibly co-sponsoring that bill?

10 A. Not my office, and again, on the house  
11 floor which is very typical for members, we will  
12 talk about various legislation that we have, it's an  
13 opportunity that have during votes or motions to  
14 recommit or just times that the votes have been not  
15 completed, we do discuss this, I do it frequently, I  
16 have worn everybody's ear out on my health care  
17 bill. That could have happened. I don't remember  
18 if it did or didn't.

19 Q. Okay. And do you recall any meetings  
20 in 2013 with Marty Irby and Mrs. Whitfield?

21 MR. WALKER: Can you say that first  
22 name again?

23 Q. Marty, M-A-R-T-Y, and the last name is  
24 Irby, I-R-B-Y.

25 A. Irby?



1 MR. WALKER: Are you talking about  
2 meetings that the Congressman [REDACTED] participated in?

3 Q. Yes, meetings where Congressman [REDACTED]  
4 participated and related to animal welfare issues.

5 A. Mr. Payne, let me understand this  
6 correctly, with Mr. Irby and Mrs. Whitfield?

7 Q. That's correct.

8 A. The answer would be no, I didn't.

9 Q. Do you recall a meeting just with Mr.  
10 Irby?

11 A. I think he was, there was -- there  
12 have been people in who have, and again, I am going  
13 to have to rely on my staff as far as Mr. Irby, but,  
14 yes, there have been people in my office who have  
15 advocated for this bill.

16 Q. Okay.

17 A. But not with Mrs. Whitfield.

18 Q. Do you recall any additional meetings  
19 then with Mrs. Whitfield around that time, October  
20 2013 or 2013 after what we have already discussed?

21 A. No, sir.

22 Q. You said no?

23 A. Not myself.

24 Q. Okay.

25 MR. WRIGHT: Congressman, this is Mr.

1 Wright here, are there any other interactions with  
2 Mrs. Whitfield and Representative Whitfield's office  
3 related to animal welfare issues that stand out in  
4 your memory?

5 A. No, sir.

6 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Is there any other  
7 information that you think might be helpful for us  
8 to know about your interactions with Mrs. Whitfield  
9 and Representative Whitfield's office?

10 A. You know, I don't think so. I think  
11 there was, as you pointed out, I think in March of  
12 '13, there was another meeting set up which I  
13 couldn't attend because of duties on the house  
14 floor, but the answer is no.

15 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Well, Congressman,  
16 we thank you for your time, and Rob, if you don't  
17 have any other questions, clarifications or  
18 comments, we are done.

19 MR. WALKER: Just back to the  
20 transcription, you will provide a copy of that to  
21 us?

22 MR. PAYNE: Yes, I'll provide a copy  
23 to you basically with an errata form and you can  
24 review it and make any suggested corrections.

25 MR. WALKER: Alright, thanks very

1 much.

2           A.       Thank you, Mr. Payne.

3                   MR. PAYNE: Thank you.

4                   (Whereupon, the recording is

5 terminated.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

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. XIO1717  
Notary Public of the  
State of New Jersey  
My Commission Expires  
April 18, 2017

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>A</b></p> <p>accurate 10:4  acknowledgment 2:8  act 2:7 6:5  action 10:10,13  active 3:9  additional 7:18  advocated 7:15  advocating 5:1  ago 3:2,25  alright 8:25  animal 2:24 3:7,10 5:3,23 7:4 8:3  answer 7:8 8:14  april 1:5 2:5 10:24  assistant 3:18  attend 6:1 8:13  attended 3:13  attorney 10:9,11  available 4:21  aware 5:18</p>	<p>concerning 2:24 6:9  conflict 4:1  congress 2:14  congressman 1:4 1:13 2:4,9 3:5,15 5:7 7:2,3,25 8:15  connie 2:9 3:16  consider 5:4  contact 4:20  contacted 5:12  controversial 4:2  conversation 3:20 3:21  copy 8:20,22  correct 7:7  corrections 8:24  correctly 7:6  cosponsor 4:5  cosponsoring 4:10 6:9  couldnt 8:13  counsel 2:5 10:9,12  csr 1:16</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>F</b></p> <p>false 2:6  familiar 6:4  family 3:8  far 7:13  financially 10:12  first 2:15,17 6:21  five 2:14,14  floor 6:2,11 8:14  focused 3:22  followup 5:8  foregoing 10:3  form 2:8 8:23  forth 10:7  frequently 6:15  further 10:8</p>	<p>issue 5:17  issues 2:24 4:2 5:24 7:4 8:3</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>J</b></p> <p>jersey 10:23  joined 2:4  july 3:1</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>K</b></p> <p>kedric 1:9 2:3  kentucky 4:3  knew 3:7,11  know 2:9,16,18 4:15 5:2,20 8:8,10  known 2:12  knows 3:6</p>	<p>name 6:22,23  nate 1:10 2:3  neither 10:8,11  never 4:5  new 10:23  notary 10:23  note 1:24  noticed 2:6</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>O</b></p> <p>obviously 4:1,16  oce 2:4  october 7:19  office 3:11,12 5:9 5:12,12,12,20 6:8 6:10 7:14 8:2,9  officer 10:1  official 2:21  okay 2:18 5:15,19 6:19 7:16,24 8:6 8:15  opportunity 6:13</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>B</b></p> <p>back 8:19  basically 3:5,25 4:4 4:7 8:23  best 3:24 4:8  big 4:3  bill 3:6,12,22 4:4,5 4:6,8,10 6:9,17 7:15  bit 4:7  board 3:9  business 4:2</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>D</b></p> <p>date 4:5 10:6  day 4:17  describe 3:3  didnt 6:1,18 7:8  director 3:19  discuss 6:15  discussed 3:23 4:4 7:20  discussing 4:8  discussion 4:9  discussions 6:8  documents 2:22  dont 2:16 4:13 5:13 5:13 6:17 8:10,16  duties 8:13</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>G</b></p> <p>going 7:12  guess 2:13,14</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>H</b></p> <p>half 2:14  handles 4:16  happened 4:18 6:17  happens 4:19  harrimanwhitfield 2:10  havent 2:21  health 6:16  helpful 8:7  hereinbefore 10:6  horse 3:6 4:1,2,4  house 6:2,10 8:13  huge 4:1  humane 2:19 3:9 3:10 5:5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>L</b></p> <p>legislation 6:12  legislative 3:18  license 1:17 10:22  little 4:7  lobbyist 2:19  local 3:9,10  long 2:12  lyn 1:16 10:22</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>P</b></p> <p>participated 7:2,4  parties 10:10  passionate 5:2  payne 1:9 2:1,3,16 3:5 7:5 8:15,22 9:2,3  pending 3:23  people 7:12,14  █ 1:4,13 2:4  phonetic 1:25  place 10:6  please 1:24  pointed 8:11  possibly 4:10 5:16 6:9  present 1:8  probably 4:18  proceedings 10:5  provide 8:20,22  provision 4:6  public 10:23</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>C</b></p> <p>care 6:16  certainly 5:20  certificate 10:1  certify 10:3,8  chief 3:16  clarifications 8:17  come 3:12  comments 8:18  commission 10:24  communications 3:18  completed 6:15</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>E</b></p> <p>ear 6:16  employee 10:9,11  entirety 1:24  errata 8:23  everybodys 6:16  expires 10:24</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>I</b></p> <p>ill 8:22  im 4:15  information 8:7  interactions 8:1,8  interested 10:12  interests 3:7,7  interview 1:4  involved 5:13  irby 6:20,24,24,25 7:6,10,13</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>M</b></p> <p>march 5:22 8:11  marty 6:20,23,23  meet 2:15  meeting 3:4,11,13 4:13,16,22,23,25 5:4,5,9,16,22,25 6:1 7:9 8:12  meetings 2:23 4:17 6:8,19 7:2,3,18  member 2:6  members 4:21 6:11  memory 8:4  mentioned 3:22 4:12  met 2:17  mischaracterize 4:14  motions 6:13  multiple 4:17</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Q</b></p> <p>questioning 2:1  questions 8:17</p>
			<p style="text-align: center;"><b>N</b></p>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>R</b></p> <p><b>rahn</b> 1:16 10:22  <b>read</b> 2:21  <b>really</b> 2:16  <b>recall</b> 2:17,23 3:3              4:8 5:22 6:19 7:9              7:18  <b>recollection</b> 3:14,15              3:24  <b>recommit</b> 6:14  <b>recording</b> 9:4  <b>related</b> 2:24 3:20              4:9 5:16,23 7:4              8:3  <b>relative</b> 10:9,11  <b>rely</b> 7:13  <b>remember</b> 6:17  <b>reported</b> 10:5  <b>representative</b> 4:12              5:5,9 6:7 8:2,9  <b>review</b> 8:24  <b>right</b> 2:3  <b>rights</b> 5:3  <b>rob</b> 1:14 2:5 8:16              █ 1:4,13 2:5,9 7:2              7:3  <b>role</b> 4:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>S</b></p> <p><b>scheduled</b> 6:1  <b>scheduler</b> 4:18  <b>see</b> 2:13 4:20  <b>seen</b> 2:21  <b>september</b> 5:16  <b>serves</b> 3:8  <b>set</b> 3:11 4:13,15              8:12 10:6  <b>sir</b> 6:6 7:21 8:5  <b>society</b> 2:19 3:9,10              5:6  <b>soring</b> 3:6 4:1,4  <b>specifically</b> 3:23  <b>spellings</b> 1:24  <b>sponsoring</b> 4:10  <b>staff</b> 3:16 4:16,19              4:20 5:14,14 6:2              7:13  <b>stand</b> 8:3  <b>state</b> 4:3 10:23</p>	<p><b>statements</b> 2:7  <b>stenographically</b>              10:5  <b>stephanie</b> 1:16              10:22  <b>suggested</b> 8:24  <b>supply</b> 2:7  <b>sure</b> 4:11,15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>T</b></p> <p><b>talk</b> 3:12 6:12  <b>talked</b> 5:14  <b>talking</b> 7:1  <b>telephone</b> 1:12  <b>tennessee</b> 4:3  <b>terminated</b> 9:5  <b>testimony</b> 10:4  <b>thank</b> 8:16 9:2,3  <b>thanks</b> 8:25  <b>thats</b> 3:25 4:11,21              7:7  <b>think</b> 3:17 5:12,13              5:14,25 6:2 7:11              8:7,10,10,11  <b>time</b> 3:17 4:20 7:19              8:16 10:6  <b>times</b> 6:14  <b>transcribed</b> 1:16  <b>transcript</b> 1:25              10:4  <b>transcription</b> 8:20  <b>troubled</b> 4:7  <b>true</b> 10:3  <b>two</b> 3:2  <b>typical</b> 6:11  <b>typically</b> 4:19,22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>U</b></p> <p><b>understand</b> 7:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>V</b></p> <p><b>various</b> 6:12  <b>votes</b> 6:2,13,14</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>W</b></p> <p><b>walker</b> 1:14 2:5              6:21 7:1 8:19,25  <b>want</b> 4:13  <b>wasnt</b> 5:13,20  <b>ways</b> 3:25</p>	<p><b>welfare</b> 2:25 3:7,10              5:23 7:4 8:3  <b>whitfield</b> 2:24 3:6              3:16 4:13 5:2,5,10              5:11,23 6:7,20 7:6              7:17,19 8:2,8  <b>whitfields</b> 4:24 5:9              8:2,9  <b>wife</b> 3:8,16  <b>worn</b> 6:16  <b>wright</b> 1:10 7:25              8:1,6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>X</b></p> <p><b>xio1717</b> 1:17 10:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Y</b></p> <p><b>years</b> 2:14,14 3:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Z</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p> <p><b>13</b> 8:12  <b>18</b> 10:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></p> <p><b>2012</b> 3:1 5:15,16  <b>2013</b> 5:22 6:5,20              7:20,20  <b>2014</b> 1:5 2:6  <b>2017</b> 10:24  <b>25</b> 1:5 2:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>8</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9</b></p>
--	--	--

# **EXHIBIT 53**

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 22, 2012 11:23 AM  
**To:** Ed Whitfield <[REDACTED]@verizon.net>  
**Subject:** Fwd: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

---

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Wayne Pacelle <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>  
**Date:** May 22, 2012 2:11:06 AM EDT  
**To:** Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>, Cece Kremer <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>  
**Cc:** Keith Dane <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>, Kate Wall <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>, Tracie Letterman <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>, Kira Svirsky <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>  
**Subject:** RE: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

That sounds good.

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Monday, May 21, 2012 7:19 PM  
**To:** Wayne Pacelle; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cece Kremer  
**Cc:** Keith Dane; Kate Wall; Tracie Letterman; Kira Svirsky  
**Subject:** RE: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

I'm thinking the "right pieces" are your blog from today, the Tennessean editorial from 5/17/12 and the David Climer editorial from today. Are there any other pieces you want included? I can send to staff for all the TN delegation in the morning, but want to make sure to include what you have in mind. Note: we're meeting with staff for Sens. Alexander and Landrieu and Rep. Cohen tomorrow, and I'm waiting to hear back from Rep. Cooper's staff.

Mimi

**From:** Wayne Pacelle  
**Sent:** Monday, May 21, 2012 2:03 PM  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cece Kremer  
**Cc:** Keith Dane; Mimi Brody; Kate Wall; Tracie Letterman  
**Subject:** RE: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

I am writing a blog about that. I am about to circulate a devastating Sports columnist piece in today's Tennessean. We must get the right pieces distributed to all Tennessee lawmakers.

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Sent:** Monday, May 21, 2012 2:02 PM  
**To:** Cece Kremer  
**Cc:** Wayne Pacelle; Keith Dane; Mimi Brody; Kate Wall; Tracie Letterman  
**Subject:** Re: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

I believe I would be more effective talking to Alexander directly ---along with Ed if Ed is available. Can we summarize our counter to the "lone incident" argument?

Sent from my iPhone

On May 21, 2012, at 1:36 PM, "Cece Kremer" <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>> wrote:  
Ok, meeting set tomorrow with Alexander's office at 12:30 pm with Curtis Swager. Curtis, Alexander's LA on Ag, Environment, Energy and Transportation. He is an old pal, decent guy and former collegiate wrestling star athlete. Who will be attending? Keith? Connie?

**From:** Wayne Pacelle  
**Sent:** Monday, May 21, 2012 1:30 PM  
**To:** Cece Kremer; Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Mimi Brody; Kate Wall  
**Subject:** RE: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

Separate meeting. Soonest. Our priority with him is Walking Horses.

**From:** Cece Kremer  
**Sent:** Monday, May 21, 2012 1:30 PM  
**To:** Wayne Pacelle; Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Mimi Brody; Kate Wall  
**Subject:** RE: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

Kate and Lauren have meeting set in Alexander's office on Wednesday at 3 pm to talk GAPCSA.

We could expand meeting to include TWHorse issue or set up separate meeting. I'm trying to reach Curtis Swager in Alexander's office for possible meeting tomorrow. Will advise.

**From:** Wayne Pacelle  
**Sent:** Monday, May 21, 2012 1:18 PM  
**To:** Legislation List; Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Subject:** FW: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

I want everyone in GA to read this story carefully. Look at Alexander's comments. We need to get into his office pronto. Can we get someone in who can talk about this with great clarity today or tomorrow?

<http://www.tennessean.com/article/20120521/NEWS21/305210017/Tennessee-Walking-Horse-celebration-keeps-most-sponsors?odyssey=tab%7Ctopnews%7Ctext%7CFRONTPAGE>

<image001.jpg>



Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors  
Supporters regard abuse on video as isolated incident

4:22 AM, May. 21, 2012

Written by G. Chambers Williams III <[gcwilliams@tennessean.com](mailto:gcwilliams@tennessean.com)>  
The Tennessean

Sponsors with financial and emotional ties to the Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration, some with family roots deep in the multimillion dollar sport, have risen to defend the industry after PepsiCo dropped its support because of shocking video of a trainer <<http://www.tennessean.com/article/20120517/NEWS03/305180035/Humane-Society-releases-video-Tennessee-Walking-Horse-abuse>> scaring and beating horses to get the perfect gait.

"We're still in it and have no intention of pulling out," said Joe Green Jr., manager of the Shelbyville Farm Center, a feed and supply operation that caters to Middle Tennessee's huge equine community.

"The Celebration (held in late August every year) is like the Super Bowl for us, and horse people are our biggest customers."

Last week's decision by the giant soft drink brand to withdraw its \$25,000 sponsorship of the walking horse event came after ABC-TV's Nightline news show aired an undercover video <<http://www.tennessean.com/video/network/1644527149001/Humane-Society-releases-graphic-and-disturbing-video-of-soring-at-TN-Walking-Horse-barn>> of horses being beaten in a trainer's barn in Collierville, Tenn. That West Tennessee trainer, Jackie McConnell, had his license revoked <<http://www.tennessean.com/article/20120518/NEWS/305180089>> late last week by the state association after the video aired.

"Pepsi withdrew their sponsorship, but they're the only ones that have," said Dr. Doyle Meadows, chief executive of the Walking Horse National Celebration, part of the business fabric in this tight-knit town 50 miles south of Nashville.

Rather than sparking a mass exodus of money and bookings by other advertisers and corporate sponsors, the fresh criticism of the horse industry has spurred numerous defenders to action.

TV report criticized

Rutherford County-based Celebration Feeds, a division of Burkmann Feeds in Danville, Ky., took its name from the Shelbyville walking horse showcase and counts horse owners among its best customers. It specializes in premium horse feed.

Division manager Joe Green Sr., whose son runs Shelbyville Farm Center, called the Nightline report "a bad picture."

"The good guys have tried so hard to make it right, then that bad guy comes along and tries to ruin it for everybody. We try to be involved in all breeds, but the Celebration is the bulk of our business," the elder Green said. "This won't deter our support."

Turning prized horses into higher steppers by "soring" — painful cutting and chemical treatments on the animals' legs — has plagued the industry for decades. Critics and animal rights activists contend owners and trainers won't stop the problem for fear of losing championships if a classic stepper loses height on its gait.

The Nightline segment relied on undercover video by the Humane Society of the United States. It revealed cruel beatings and chemical drips on a horse's legs to force a very high, "big lick" gait, which is popular among the judges at competitive shows.

People sticking up for the walking horse industry say the video showed a renegade trainer — not horse lovers — at work. These defenders say soring is no longer common practice, especially at national events such as the Shelbyville show, the world's most prominent walking horse exhibition, which draws 250,000 visitors to Middle Tennessee in late August.

"The walking horse industry has been under such a microscope for so long that most of the bad guys have been weeded out, and it was unfortunate that ABC tried to paint all of them as bad," argues the younger Green, who sells animal feed and farm supplies. "The way they did that TV piece wasn't even journalism."

Self-policing is hard

Meadows said only 1 percent of the horses entered in last August's Celebration showed signs of soring during U.S. Agriculture Department inspections, down from 13 percent in 2009. Others argue that the practice has gone deeper underground and self-policing by the industry doesn't work since evidence of soring may be hidden to make horses appear healthy even when injured.

Soring has been illegal under the federal Horse Protection Act since 1970. But federal veterinarians charged with enforcing the law can make it to only a few horse shows because of budget constraints. That's where self-regulation by the industry comes into play. The horse industry hires inspectors, but critics say they aren't always thorough enough, and more federal oversight is needed.

A check of USDA Horse Protection Act violations reveals that inspectors issued more citations to Shelbyville trainers than any other horse industry organization for 2010-11.

What's clear about the horse business in Tennessee is that it's a big money maker <<http://www.tennessean.com/article/20120519/NEWS2/1305180095>>, and walking horses are a major component of that.

U.S. Sen. Lamar Alexander is vowing to push for better enforcement.

"Anyone who cares about horses should be shocked by this video, which is why there is a 52-count criminal indictment under the U.S. Horse Protection Act," Alexander said in a news release. "I will work in the senate to strengthen the act and add more money to enforce it. The walking horse industry should step up its self-policing so that a few bad actors don't destroy one of our state's most treasured traditions."

Events draw dollars

A University of Tennessee Department of Agricultural Economics study of spending, sales and jobs in 2010 found that equine businesses and their spinoffs — across all breeds of horses — provided a \$1.4 billion economic impact for the state.

According to an equine census five years ago, Tennessee ranked sixth nationally for the number of horses and ponies owned. About 40 percent of horses statewide were classified as Tennessee walkers, known for their small, well-placed ears, sloping shoulders and short back. Perhaps 15,000 walking horses are bred to compete.

Shelbyville, and its showpiece Calsonic Arena, are crown jewels of the walking horse business.

Meadows' organization operates the 105-acre Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Grounds in Shelbyville, which hosts the annual event over 11 days. Hundreds of other walking horse shows are held throughout the U.S.

Nearly a quarter-million fans come to Shelbyville's Celebration from as many as 40 states, Meadows said. The complex has 53 barns with 1,500 stalls. There is an outdoor stadium that seats 30,000, along with a 4,500-seat indoor arena.

Smaller events are held there 40 weekends a year, including a three-day spring fun show, a mini-version of the main walking horse show set for Thursday through Saturday this week.

Losing Pepsi's \$25,000 contribution as a sponsor "is unfortunate," but the soft drink company will lose even more, Meadows contends. That's because only Pepsi products were being sold at events in the complex, which brought in more than \$50,000 in revenue each year for Pepsi during the main Celebration alone.

Pepsi had been a sponsor since 2010. Middle Tennessee Ford dealers have been supporting the Celebration for about 18 years, and that's probably not going to change, Meadows said, although he added that he hadn't talked with anyone from Ford.

Jack Pirtle, general manager of Mark Pirtle Ford in Shelbyville, said he can't imagine the dealers pulling their support.

"The Celebration has been here for years and is very important to the community," he said. "Of course, I don't want to see anyone mistreat an animal. But to paint a broad stroke on the industry because of one person's mistreatment is not right."

Some sponsors put up big dollars to play a part in the Walking Horse National Celebration, which offers corporate sponsorships from \$6,500 on the low end to \$250,000 as title sponsor. Perks include box seats, VIP parking, advertising signage, electronic message board scrawls and access to exclusive mailing lists.

'Isolated incident'

Longtime event sponsor Yearwood Equipment Co., a farm equipment dealer in Fayetteville, Tenn., also is backing the industry

"This was really an isolated incident, and I hate it as bad as anybody," said P.D. Shelton, Yearwood's manager. "But I wouldn't be supporting the Celebration if I thought that was what they were about"

"I believe they will come through it OK, but it's going to hurt every breeder, every trainer," he said. "The trainers as a whole have been doing an outstanding job getting these horses ready to show naturally."

Another vocal supporter is the Tennessee Farmers Co-Op, based in La Vergne, which has feed and farm supply stores.

"I did see the story, and I can tell you that we will be continuing our support of the Celebration," said Joe Huffline, manager of corporate and member services for the group, which is owned by its 70,000 Tennessee farmer members.

"We don't condone what has come out the past few days from a few individuals, and we're saddened by that," he said. "The story does raise some concern. It's unacceptable conduct, but it is not the norm. Are we going to do what Pepsi did? Of course not. We want to do everything we can to promote Tennessee agriculture."

Jennifer Jordan <<http://www.tennessean.com/video/network/1648099583001/Shelbyville-merchant-Jennifer-Jordan-discusses-support-of-walking-horse-industry>>, who operates J. Jordan Boutique on the square in Shelbyville, said her business is closely connected with the Celebration and her sponsorship won't be affected.

"I have a lot of customers who show horses, and they're just great people," she said. "Do I think regulations should be in place and enforced to prevent soring? Yes, and that's what they're doing. But I don't think this should shut down the horse show."

Contact G. Chambers Williams III at 615-259- or <[gcwilliams@tennessean.com](mailto:gcwilliams@tennessean.com)>

\*\*\*

# **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.
10. The witness did not recall Senator Alexander having any additional meetings with Rep. Whitfield or 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:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 7, 2011 6:07 PM  
**To:** Buchanan, Melissa <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Meeting with Sen Scott Brown

---

Fantastic!

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 7, 2011, at 5:55 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Congressman and Mrs. Whitfield  
>  
> I have a meeting confirmed for you for tomorrow afternoon at 4pm with Sen. Scott Brown. The meeting will be in his office, 359 Dirksen.  
>  
> Thank you:  
> Melissa  
>  
> Melissa Buchanan  
> Scheduler  
> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)  
> 2368 Rayburn House Office Building  
> Washington, DC 20515  
> Phone: (202) 225-[REDACTED]  
> 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: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [mailto:[REDACTED]@humansociety.org]  
> Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2011 2:25 PM  
> To: Buchanan, Melissa  
> Cc: Sparkman, John  
> Subject: Meeting with Sen Scott Brown  
>  
> Ed and I need to meet with Senator Scott Brown sometime tomorrow to mention a bill Landrieu is introducing. Can you please set something up?  
> Sent from my iPhone

# **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



1 MR. PAYNE: All right. This is Kedric Payne and Bryson  
2 Morgan with the OCE, and we are joined by  
3 conference call with Senator [REDACTED] and his  
4 attorney Vincent Divito (phonetic). It's April  
5 22, 2014. The Senator has been made aware that  
6 the false statement act applies, and we are  
7 going to begin the interview.

8 Senator, do you know Connie Harriman-  
9 Whitfield?

10 SENATOR [REDACTED] (the "Witness"): Yes.

11 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And how long have you known her?

12 WITNESS: I just met her in a meeting or two, so that  
13 would have been about two and a half years ago  
14 maybe, the first time I met her; and it was only  
15 on a couple of occasions, various events for the  
16 Humane Society or, you know, office meetings  
17 that were set up.

18 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And did you know her to be a lobbyist for  
19 the Humane Society?

20 WITNESS: I knew her to be (inaudible), and Vincent asked  
21 me -- you know, told me about this (inaudible)  
22 in terms of the people. I needed someone to  
23 refresh my memory about the subject matter. So  
24 I was not aware that she was a lobbyist. She  
25 probably told me, but since a meeting with my

1 office -- set up a meeting (inaudible) and, you  
2 know, I would pop in, do, you know, (inaudible)  
3 and that sort of thing. So I'm not sure if I  
4 knew she was a lobbyist. I think she was the  
5 wife of a member of Congress; is that correct?

6 MR. PAYNE: Yes. She -- she is married to Congressman Ed  
7 Whitfield.

8 WITNESS: Yeah. So I'm sure that I was aware of it at  
9 that time.

10 MR. PAYNE: Can you describe these meetings, to the extent  
11 that you remember? Approximately how many  
12 meetings did you have with Ms. Whitfield?

13 WITNESS: Well, I have been very active in issues of dog  
14 fighting/horse slaughter long before I got to  
15 the U.S. Senate. Those are issues that peaked  
16 my interest back when I was a state Senator back  
17 in Massachusetts. So the only occasion I would  
18 have met her would have been in our office  
19 situation or at an event in which those issues  
20 are being discussed. So I would say my total  
21 interaction is probably two or three times, you  
22 know. The length would vary. It was probably,  
23 you know, 10 to 15 minutes max total.

24 MR. PAYNE: When you met with her, do you recall whether  
25 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,

1 you know, a hundred other people would have been  
2 in there.

3 MR. PAYNE: Let me make sure I understand. So there's one  
4 meeting that was in your office with a  
5 legislative assistant --

6 WITNESS: Yeah.

7 MR. PAYNE: -- you, and Congressman Whitfield, and Ms.  
8 Whitfield, just the four of you?

9 WITNESS: There could have been a fifth, but I would say  
10 safely it was just the four of us. Yeah.

11 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And what was the name of your legislative  
12 assistant?

13 WITNESS: Probably Dan Diorio (phonetic) would have  
14 handled it.

15 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Can you spell his last name?

16 WITNESS: Yeah. It's D-i -- D-i-o-r-i-o.

17 MR. PAYNE: Okay.

18 WITNESS: I-o-r-i-o, Diorio.

19 MR. MORGAN: Diorio.

20 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And then you said following that you  
21 would have possibly seen the two of them at a  
22 larger meeting with hundreds of people; is that  
23 correct?

24 WITNESS: Well, I don't know if it was the two of them. I  
25 do remember -- I do remember seeing her. It

1 would have been hundreds. It would have been --  
2 you know, how the (inaudible), you know, there's  
3 legislative copies in the various -- like if you  
4 have an issue (inaudible) to sound the event  
5 that I would have gone to, to learn more about,  
6 you know, various issues that they were working  
7 on.

8 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Going back to the meeting that took place  
9 in your office, who actually led that meeting?  
10 Who was leading the conversation?

11 WITNESS: Oh, it would have been Dan Diorio from my  
12 office, you know, checking and, you know, asking  
13 what the issue was. (Inaudible) I had an  
14 interest in it anyway as a -- you know, my  
15 daughter was a former horse owner, so she's very  
16 keen and aware of a lot of those issues.

17 But Dan would have led the meeting. I  
18 would have popped in, and then the first two  
19 minutes was, "Hi. How you doing?" You know,  
20 they were telling me about the history with the  
21 Rep, you know, just finding out who, what, when,  
22 wheres, the basic formalities. And the  
23 information regarding the horse slaughter, if  
24 I'm not mistaken, is the one issue that they  
25 were focusing on, and they were asking for my

1 support because they had known, I believe of my  
2 previous support when I was a Legislature on  
3 those issues.

4 So it was -- I don't think anyone was  
5 leading it, except, you know, Dan from my office  
6 would have, you know, been -- we used to  
7 (inaudible), especially when I was kind of  
8 playing catch up all the time because we  
9 started, you know, with the special election,  
10 and I was just in (inaudible) meetings. So we  
11 were like (inaudible) booked, and they were -- I  
12 had my staff, during the meetings, I'd pop in  
13 during the meeting, give them a courtesy thank  
14 you. I look forward to viewing the information  
15 later, you know, Dan will brief me. And, "It's  
16 great to see you. Thank you very much." You  
17 know, that's how it is.

18 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And do you recall the role of Mrs.  
19 Whitfield in that meeting?

20 WITNESS: Yeah. I see her more as a spouse sort of at  
21 that point, you know; that they were working on  
22 this issue together, you know, because of an  
23 interest in horses. So, you know, it didn't  
24 raise my -- it didn't raise the radar at all  
25 that she was there because, you know, we meet

1 with -- you know, we'll meet with pretty much  
2 anybody on any issue just, you know, as long as  
3 they set up a request. So, no, it didn't -- you  
4 know, nothing kind of peeked my interest. It  
5 seemed like a normal, everyday, you know, meet  
6 and greet, "Thank you very much," you know.  
7 Leave your information. I'll speak to Dan  
8 later. So --

9 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And I'm trying to make sure I understand  
10 the date of that meeting. Do you think that  
11 meeting occurred around June 2011?

12 WITNESS: Yeah. I have no knowledge of that, and I can't  
13 remember my names sometimes during that time  
14 period. You know, I'm not sure if we have a  
15 list somewhere of it, but I've have to refer it  
16 to Dan and his knowledge of it.

17 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And did that meeting result in your  
18 supporting the slaughter prevention act, horse  
19 slaughter prevention act?

20 WITNESS: I don't think it did. I think I was already on  
21 board anyway. That was already something -- the  
22 dog fighting bill was one that I had a lot of  
23 concern about and the horse slaughter one. It's  
24 something I had a concern about, and there was  
25 also one about -- you know, I mean, I was pretty

1 active in those issues (inaudible) as a state  
2 elected official, you know. I'm not -- I'm not  
3 a dog fighting proponent, and, you know,  
4 (inaudible) horse slaughter, you know, I think  
5 there are other options, you know. Adoption and  
6 stuff like that. So I don't think it led to my  
7 support. I think I was already on board, based  
8 on my memory.

9 MR. PAYNE: Okay.

10 WITNESS: I think they were really coming, now that I  
11 thinking about it -- to say, hey, thanks for  
12 your support, you know. More of a courtesy type  
13 of situation.

14 MR. PAYNE: And did you view that meeting as a meeting with  
15 the Humane Society or as you described it, I  
16 guess as a meeting with Representative  
17 Whitfield?

18 WITNESS: Yeah. No. It would have been with Mr.  
19 Whitfield because I had met with the head of the  
20 Humane Society, with (inaudible) on issues. He  
21 came in personally, you know (inaudible). So I  
22 had already been (inaudible) with all their  
23 legislative priorities. So, no, I didn't think  
24 that they were representing the Humane Society.  
25 No. It was more of a Rep to a Senator, you



1 know, knowing I have interest in this issue.

2 (Inaudible) issues (inaudible), if I'm not

3 mistaken. So, no.

4 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Well, I'm checking my notes. This pretty

5 much covers what we wanted to discuss with you.

6 I just want to confirm that there are no

7 additional meetings that you recall or other

8 communications that you had with the Whitfields

9 concerning any type of legislation or animal

10 welfare issues?

11 WITNESS: Well, not to -- to the best of my knowledge, no.

12 Like I said, it was -- it was sometime in 2011,

13 and we're in 2014 now, you know. If you have

14 something to refresh my memory, but that's based

15 on my, you know, knowledge at this point, you

16 know. What's -- we were working on so many

17 other things. I mean, if my memory serves me,

18 (inaudible) involved in that. We were doing

19 (inaudible), insider trading. I (inaudible).

20 There were so many other things that were a

21 priority in terms of the legislation that we

22 were working on and obviously running for

23 reelection too and establishing, you know, a

24 good record.

25 So, you know, if you had something to

1 refresh my memory, bit, no, it was just all  
2 casual, you know, not even set up type of  
3 things, except that one meeting in our office.  
4 And the staff could have been in other meetings,  
5 but I'm not -- I'm not aware of it.

6 MR. MORGAN: Senator, this is Bryson Morgan with the OCE.  
7 You said that Ms. Whitfield's role in that  
8 meeting was as a spouse. I'm wondering, do you  
9 recall her being actively involved in the  
10 discussion of the horse slaughter?

11 WITNESS: Yeah, yeah. Of course, yeah. They were both  
12 actively -- it was more of a -- it was a  
13 (inaudible) type of (inaudible), you know.  
14 They're going to have horses, and you enjoy  
15 horses too. You've owned a horse, and, you  
16 know, what do you think of these issues. Yeah.  
17 It was, you know, just a regular, normal, free-  
18 flowing, you know, conversation. I had no, you  
19 know, no rhyme or reason, no itinerary. There's  
20 no checklist that anyone was going through.

21 It was just like, hey, this is the  
22 issue. We know you had an interest in it, you  
23 know. Thanks for supporting it and, you know,  
24 we wanted to come over and pay you a courtesy  
25 call. Okay. Thanks. Bye. Next.

1 MR. MORGAN: Yeah. I see. Do you recall if you discussed  
2 strategy on the legislation at all or next steps  
3 on the legislation?

4 WITNESS: I could have -- she could have said or they  
5 could have said, you know, how do you think we  
6 could pass something like this? I have a  
7 standard kind of -- a standard recommendation  
8 for people -- like those (inaudible) who come in  
9 with 30 things that they -- you know, absolutely  
10 top priorities that they need to do, absolutely  
11 positively. There's no butts.

12 And I more than likely said because I  
13 saw it with everybody, "Hey, tell me your top  
14 three items," you know. Tell me the top three  
15 items, and, you know, the best way to go, you  
16 know, to attack these things is take one or two  
17 of your top priorities and go around and try to  
18 get -- you know, get the support on one of those  
19 items because, you know, everybody I know is  
20 against dog fighting, you know. So I think  
21 would be your best issue, the dog fighting bill.

22 If my memory serves me, we actually  
23 did that one, or they did it after I left, you  
24 know. They actually got some legislation on  
25 that issue passed. And then on this horse

1 slaughter, I don't know what the ultimate  
2 outcome was on it, you know. I just don't know.  
3 But I would have probably, as I do  
4 with every group that comes in, whether it be  
5 the Humane Society, or the veterans or -- that  
6 is my approach to everything because you're not  
7 get everything. You guys know that. Take a  
8 couple of items, you know, you go full tilt  
9 trying to get as much support and then move  
10 forward.

11 MR. MORGAN: Right. And do you happen to recall any specific  
12 to do items or action items coming out of that  
13 meeting by chance?

14 WITNESS: No, no. I would have just said, you know, go  
15 meet the new -- (inaudible) with everybody. You  
16 should probably go meet the, you know, the new  
17 Legislature (inaudible) that have just come in  
18 and establish relationships with their staff.  
19 If you can meet with them, which is very common,  
20 you know, you should feel confident when you  
21 speak with the staff because, you know, when  
22 you're speaking to my staff, you're speaking to  
23 me. And, you know, I get briefed every day and  
24 (inaudible). What were their issues? What were  
25 their concerns? What is our position

1 (inaudible)? You know, we have a form that we  
2 try to follow almost every day. So --

3 MR. MORGAN: Okay.

4 WITNESS: No. I don't remember like a (inaudible). I  
5 didn't tell them here are your marching orders.  
6 They didn't tell me here are your marching  
7 orders. It was like this is what I would do if  
8 it was me, and I says, you know, I'd go; and I'd  
9 work. (Inaudible) folks. You give them the  
10 information so they can make the logical  
11 decision.

12 MR. PAYNE: Well, that is -- those are all the questions  
13 that we have. Do you have any other information  
14 you think that may be helpful, or anything else  
15 that you wanted to share or clarify?

16 WITNESS: No. I -- no. Since there -- when you said --  
17 when Vincent first told me, I had no idea who  
18 you were talking about. I didn't know who the  
19 people were. Then he said there's an issue with  
20 the horse slaughter. Oh, okay. Those people,  
21 okay. And that's how infrequent (inaudible)  
22 contact, but, you know, I tried -- tried to  
23 think since that time of anything that would be  
24 helpful certainly. And there's nothing that I,  
25 except from what I just told you, that I have

1 any, prior memory of. So that's about it.

2 MR. PAYNE: Okay. All right. Well, thank you for your  
3 time.

4 WITNESS: Sure. Anytime, anytime. Something else, please  
5 let me know.

6 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Will do.

7 WITNESS: Again, thank you.

8 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

10 MR. DIVITO: All right. See you guys. Bye.

11 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Thank you.

12 END OF INTERVIEW

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 1

10

11

12

13

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>A</b></p> <p>absolutely 12:9,10 act 2:6 8:18,19 action 13:12 active 3:13 9:1 actively 11:9,12 additional 10:7 adoption 9:5 ago 2:13 animal 10:9 anybody 8:2 anytime 15:4,4 anyway 6:14 8:21 applies 2:6 approach 13:6 approximately 3:11 april 2:4 asked 2:20 asking 6:12,25 assistant 5:5,12 assistants 4:6 attack 12:16 attended 3:25 attorney 2:4 available 4:25 aware 2:5,24 3:8 6:16 11:5 awareness 4:20</p>	<p>bye 11:25 15:10</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>C</b></p> <p>call 2:3 11:25 cant 8:12 casual 11:2 catch 7:8 certainly 14:24 chance 13:13 checking 6:12 10:4 checklist 11:20 chief 1:9 clarify 14:15 come 4:9,15 11:24 12:8 13:17 comes 13:4 coming 9:10 13:12 common 13:19 communications 10:8 concern 8:23,24 concerning 10:9 concerns 13:25 conference 2:3 confident 13:20 confirm 10:6 congress 3:5 4:12 4:14 congressman 3:6 5:7 connie 2:8 contact 14:22 conversation 6:10 11:18 copies 6:3 correct 3:5 5:23 counsel 1:9 couple 2:15 13:8 course 11:11 courtesy 4:11 7:13 9:12 11:24 covers 10:5</p>	<p>decision 14:11 deputy 1:9 describe 3:10 described 9:15 di 5:16 didnt 7:23,24 8:3 9:23 14:5,6,18 diorio 5:13,16,18 5:19 6:11 discuss 10:5 discussed 3:20 12:1 discussion 11:10 divito 2:4 15:10 dog 3:13 4:22 8:22 9:3 12:20,21 doing 6:19 10:18 dont 5:24 7:4 8:20 9:6 13:1,2 14:4</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>E</b></p> <p>ed 3:6 elected 9:2 election 7:9 enjoy 11:14 especially 7:7 establish 13:18 establishing 10:23 event 3:19 6:4 events 2:15 everybody 4:13 12:13,19 13:15 everyday 8:5 extent 3:10</p>	<p>formalities 6:22 former 6:15 forward 7:14 13:10 four 5:8,10 free 11:17 full 13:8</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>G</b></p> <p>give 4:16 7:13 14:9 go 4:13 12:15,17 13:8,14,16 14:8 going 2:7 4:17 6:8 11:14,20 good 10:24 great 7:16 greet 8:6 group 13:4 guess 9:16 guys 13:7 15:10</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>H</b></p> <p>half 2:13 hand 4:16 handled 5:14 happen 13:11 harriman 2:8 head 9:19 hello 4:10 helpful 14:14,24 hey 4:17 9:11 11:21 12:13 hi 6:19 history 6:20 horse 3:14 4:23 6:15,23 8:18,23 9:4 11:10,15 12:25 14:20 horses 7:23 11:14 11:15 hows 4:17 humane 2:16,19 9:15,20,24 13:5 hundred 5:1 hundreds 5:22 6:1</p>	<p>8:14 9:2,2 10:2,4 11:5,5,8 inaudible 2:20,21 3:1,2 4:7,8,18 6:2 6:4,13 7:7,10,11 9:1,4,20,21,22 10:2,2,18,19,19 11:13,13 12:8 13:15,17,24 14:1 14:4,9,21 information 4:25 6:23 7:14 8:7 14:10,13 infrequent 14:21 insider 10:19 interaction 3:21 interest 3:16 6:14 7:23 8:4 10:1 11:22 interview 1:4 2:7 15:12 involved 10:18 11:9 iorio 5:18 issue 4:9 6:4,13,24 7:22 8:2 10:1 11:22 12:21,25 14:19 issues 3:13,15,19 4:7 6:6,16 7:3 9:1 9:20 10:2,10 11:16 13:24 items 12:14,15,19 13:8,12,12 itinerary 11:19 ive 8:15</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>B</b></p> <p>back 3:16,16 4:13 6:8 based 9:7 10:14 basic 6:22 basically 4:25 believe 7:1 best 10:11 12:15,21 bill 8:22 12:21 bit 11:1 board 8:21 9:7 booked 7:11 brief 7:15 briefed 13:23 ██████ 1:4,11 2:3 2:10 bryson 1:10 2:1 11:6 buildings 4:21 butts 12:11</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>D</b></p> <p>dan 5:13 6:11,17 7:5,15 8:7,16 date 8:10 daughter 6:15 day 13:23 14:2 days 4:20</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>F</b></p> <p>fact 4:14 false 2:6 feel 13:20 fifth 5:9 fighting 3:14 4:22 8:22 9:3 12:20,21 finding 6:21 first 2:14 4:3 6:18 14:17 flowing 11:18 focusing 6:25 folks 14:9 follow 14:2 following 5:20 form 14:1</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>I</b></p> <p>id 7:12 14:8,8 idea 14:17 ill 8:7 im 3:3,8 6:24 8:9</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>J</b></p> <p>joined 2:2 julie 1:16 june 8:11</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>K</b></p> <p>kedric 1:9 2:1 keen 6:16 kind 7:7 8:4 12:7 knew 2:20 3:4 know 2:8,16,18,21 3:2,2,22,23 4:9,13 4:15,16,19,20,24 5:1,24 6:2,2,6,12</p>



6:12,14,19,21 7:5 7:6,9,15,17,21,22 7:23,25 8:1,2,4,5 8:6,14,25 9:2,3,4 9:5,12,21 10:1,13 10:15,16,23,25 11:2,13,16,17,18 11:19,22,23,23 12:5,9,14,15,16 12:18,19,19,20,24 13:1,2,2,7,8,14,16 13:20,21,23 14:1 14:8,18,22 15:5	3:1 4:4,18 5:4,22 6:8,9,17 7:13,19 8:10,11,17 9:14 9:14,16 11:3,8 13:13	<b>options</b> 9:5 <b>orders</b> 14:5,7 <b>outcome</b> 13:2 <b>owned</b> 11:15 <b>owner</b> 6:15	<b>radar</b> 7:24 <b>raise</b> 7:24,24 <b>really</b> 9:10 <b>reason</b> 11:19 <b>recall</b> 3:24 7:18 10:7 11:9 12:1 13:11	11:2 <b>setting</b> 4:7,11 <b>shake</b> 4:16 <b>share</b> 14:15 <b>shes</b> 6:15 <b>situation</b> 3:19 9:13 <b>slaughter</b> 3:14 4:23 6:23 8:18,19,23 9:4 11:10 13:1 14:20
<b>knowing</b> 10:1 <b>knowledge</b> 8:12,16 10:11,15 <b>known</b> 2:11 7:1	<b>meetings</b> 2:16 3:10 3:12,25 7:10,12 10:7 11:4 <b>member</b> 3:5 4:12 4:14 <b>memory</b> 2:23 4:4 4:21 9:8 10:14,17 11:1 12:22 15:1 <b>met</b> 2:12,14 3:18,24 9:19 <b>minutes</b> 3:23 4:10 4:17 6:19 <b>mistaken</b> 6:24 10:3 <b>morgan</b> 1:10 2:2 5:19 11:6,6 12:1 13:11 14:3 15:9 <b>move</b> 13:9	<hr/> <b>P</b> <hr/> <b>pass</b> 12:6 <b>passed</b> 12:25 <b>pay</b> 11:24 <b>payne</b> 1:9 2:1,1,11 2:18 3:6,10,24 5:3 5:7,11,15,17,20 6:8 7:18 8:9,17 9:9,14 10:4 14:12 15:2,6,8,11 <b>peaked</b> 3:15 <b>peeked</b> 8:4 <b>people</b> 2:22 5:1,22 12:8 14:19,20 <b>period</b> 8:14 <b>personally</b> 9:21 <b>phonetic</b> 2:4 5:13 <b>place</b> 6:8 <b>playing</b> 7:8 <b>please</b> 15:4 <b>point</b> 7:21 10:15 <b>pop</b> 3:2 7:12 <b>popped</b> 6:18 <b>position</b> 13:25 <b>positively</b> 12:11 <b>possibly</b> 5:21 <b>prepping</b> 4:8 <b>present</b> 1:8 <b>pretty</b> 8:1,25 10:4 <b>prevention</b> 8:18,19 <b>previous</b> 7:2 <b>prior</b> 15:1 <b>priorities</b> 9:23 12:10,17 <b>priority</b> 10:21 <b>probably</b> 2:25 3:21 3:22 4:21,22,23 5:13 13:3,16 <b>proponent</b> 9:3	<b>recommendation</b> 12:7 <b>record</b> 10:24 <b>reelection</b> 10:23 <b>refer</b> 8:15 <b>refresh</b> 2:23 10:14 11:1 <b>regarding</b> 6:23 <b>regular</b> 11:17 <b>relationships</b> 13:18 <b>remember</b> 3:11 4:2 4:11 5:25,25 8:13 14:4 <b>rep</b> 6:21 9:25 <b>representative</b> 3:25 9:16 <b>representing</b> 9:24 <b>request</b> 8:3 <b>result</b> 8:17 <b>rhyme</b> 11:19 <b>right</b> 2:1 13:11 15:2,10 <b>role</b> 7:18 11:7 <b>rooms</b> 4:24 <b>running</b> 10:22	<b>sort</b> 3:3 7:20 <b>sound</b> 6:4 <b>speak</b> 8:7 13:21 <b>speaking</b> 4:8 13:22 13:22 <b>special</b> 7:9 <b>specific</b> 13:11 <b>spell</b> 5:15 <b>spouse</b> 7:20 11:8 <b>staff</b> 7:12 11:4 13:18,21,22 <b>standard</b> 12:7,7 <b>started</b> 7:9 <b>state</b> 3:16 9:1 <b>statement</b> 2:6 <b>steps</b> 12:2 <b>strategy</b> 12:2 <b>stuff</b> 9:6 <b>subject</b> 2:23 <b>support</b> 7:1,2 9:7 9:12 12:18 13:9 <b>supporting</b> 8:18 11:23 <b>sure</b> 3:3,8 5:3 8:9 8:14 15:4
<hr/> <b>L</b> <hr/> <b>larger</b> 5:22 <b>leading</b> 6:10 7:5 <b>learn</b> 6:5 <b>leave</b> 8:7 <b>led</b> 6:9,17 9:6 <b>left</b> 12:23 <b>legislation</b> 10:9,21 12:2,3,24 <b>legislative</b> 4:5,6,19 5:5,11 6:3 9:23 <b>legislature</b> 7:2 13:17 <b>length</b> 3:22 <b>list</b> 8:15 <b>lobbyist</b> 2:18,24 3:4 <b>logical</b> 14:10 <b>long</b> 2:11 3:14 8:2 <b>look</b> 7:14 <b>lot</b> 4:19 6:16 8:22	<hr/> <b>N</b> <hr/> <b>name</b> 5:11,15 <b>names</b> 8:13 <b>need</b> 12:10 <b>needed</b> 2:22 <b>new</b> 13:15,16 <b>normal</b> 8:5 11:17 <b>notes</b> 10:4	<hr/> <b>Q</b> <hr/> <b>questions</b> 14:12	<hr/> <b>S</b> <hr/> <b>s</b> 3:15 <b>safely</b> 5:10 <b>saw</b> 12:13 <b>says</b> 14:8 █ 1:4,11 2:3,10 <b>see</b> 7:16,20 12:1 15:10 <b>seeing</b> 5:25 <b>seen</b> 5:21 <b>senate</b> 3:15 <b>senator</b> 1:4,11 2:3 2:5,8,10 3:16 9:25 11:6 <b>serves</b> 10:17 12:22 <b>set</b> 2:17 3:1 8:3	<hr/> <b>T</b> <hr/> <b>take</b> 12:16 13:7 <b>talking</b> 14:18 <b>tell</b> 12:13,14 14:5,6 <b>telling</b> 6:20 <b>terms</b> 2:22 10:21 <b>thank</b> 7:13,16 8:6 15:2,7,8,9,11 <b>thanks</b> 9:11 11:23 11:25 <b>thats</b> 7:17 10:14
<hr/> <b>M</b> <hr/> <b>marching</b> 14:5,6 <b>married</b> 3:6 <b>massachusetts</b> 3:17 <b>matter</b> 2:23 <b>max</b> 3:23 <b>mean</b> 8:25 10:17 <b>meet</b> 4:13 7:25 8:1 8:5 13:15,16,19 <b>meeting</b> 2:12,25	<hr/> <b>O</b> <hr/> <b>obviously</b> 4:15 10:22 <b>occasion</b> 3:17 <b>occasions</b> 2:15 <b>occurred</b> 8:11 <b>oce</b> 2:2 11:6 <b>office</b> 2:16 3:1,18 4:5 5:4 6:9,12 7:5 11:3 <b>official</b> 9:2 <b>oh</b> 6:11 14:20 <b>okay</b> 2:11,18 5:11 5:15,17,20 6:8 7:18 8:9,17 9:9 10:4 11:25 14:3 14:20,21 15:2,6,8 15:11	<hr/> <b>R</b> <hr/>		

14:21 15:1	<b>want</b> 10:6	<hr/> <b>3</b> <hr/>		
<b>theres</b> 4:3 5:3 6:2	<b>wanted</b> 4:15 10:5	<b>30</b> 12:9		
11:19 12:11 14:19	11:24 14:15	<hr/> <b>4</b> <hr/>		
14:24	<b>way</b> 12:15	<hr/> <b>5</b> <hr/>		
<b>theyre</b> 11:14	<b>welfare</b> 10:10	<b>54:10</b>		
<b>thing</b> 3:3	<b>went</b> 4:24	<hr/> <b>6</b> <hr/>		
<b>things</b> 10:17,20	<b>whats</b> 10:16	<hr/> <b>7</b> <hr/>		
11:3 12:9,16	<b>wheres</b> 6:22	<hr/> <b>8</b> <hr/>		
<b>think</b> 3:4 4:6 7:4	<b>whitfield</b> 2:9 3:7,12	<hr/> <b>9</b> <hr/>		
8:10,20,20 9:4,6,7	3:25 5:7,8 7:19			
9:10,23 11:16	9:17,19			
12:5,20 14:14,23	<b>whitfields</b> 10:8			
<b>thinking</b> 9:11	11:7			
<b>thompson</b> 1:16	<b>wife</b> 3:5			
<b>three</b> 3:21 12:14,14	<b>witness</b> 2:10,12,20			
<b>filt</b> 13:8	3:8,13 4:2 5:6,9			
<b>time</b> 2:14 3:9 7:8	5:13,16,18,24			
8:13 14:23 15:3	6:11 7:20 8:12,20			
<b>times</b> 3:21	9:10,18 10:11			
<b>told</b> 2:21,25 14:17	11:11 12:4 13:14			
14:25	14:4,16 15:4,7			
<b>top</b> 12:10,13,14,17	<b>wondering</b> 11:8			
<b>total</b> 3:20,23	<b>work</b> 14:9			
<b>trading</b> 10:19	<b>working</b> 6:6 7:21			
<b>transcribed</b> 1:15	10:16,22			
<b>tried</b> 14:22,22	<hr/> <b>X</b> <hr/>			
<b>try</b> 4:12 12:17 14:2	<hr/> <b>Y</b> <hr/>			
<b>trying</b> 8:9 13:9	<b>yeah</b> 3:8 4:2 5:6,10			
<b>two</b> 2:12,13 3:21	5:16 7:20 8:12			
5:21,24 6:18	9:18 11:11,11,11			
12:16	11:16 12:1			
<b>type</b> 9:12 10:9 11:2	<b>years</b> 2:13			
11:13	<b>youre</b> 13:6,22,22			
<hr/> <b>U</b> <hr/>	<b>youve</b> 11:15			
<b>u</b> 3:15	<hr/> <b>Z</b> <hr/>			
<b>ultimate</b> 13:1	<hr/> <b>0</b> <hr/>			
<b>understand</b> 5:3 8:9	<hr/> <b>1</b> <hr/>			
<hr/> <b>V</b> <hr/>	<b>1</b> 16:9			
<b>various</b> 2:15 4:20	<b>10</b> 3:23 4:10			
6:3,6	<b>15</b> 3:23			
<b>vary</b> 3:22	<hr/> <b>2</b> <hr/>			
<b>veterans</b> 13:5	<b>2011</b> 8:11 10:12			
<b>view</b> 9:14	<b>2014</b> 2:5 10:13			
<b>viewing</b> 7:14	<b>22</b> 2:5			
<b>vincent</b> 2:4,20	<hr/> <b>W</b> <hr/>			
14:17				

# **EXHIBIT 57**

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2011 5:46 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
**Cc:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>; Nancy Perry <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>; Keith Dane <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>; Michael Markarian <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
**Subject:** Re: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (1) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

---

I have already talked to Ed about this. He is willing to talk to Rogers. Ed thinks Kingston is a lost cause, but I am willing to reach out to him.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 24, 2011, at 5:36 PM, "Mimi Brody" <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

Yes, tip of the iceberg was a metaphor that came to my mind, too, but then I worried that if we put in writing that this is just one of MANY more prosecutions that could happen, it may spook Kingston and/or Rogers, who might be concerned about over-zealous regulators and then hear industry's objections in a more sympathetic light? Maybe DO/USDA's new enforcement is a point that would lend itself best to personal briefing of Kingston/Rogers and their staffs? Connie, 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!

Mimi

---

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2011 5:28 PM  
**To:** Nancy Perry  
**Cc:** Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane; Michael Markarian  
**Subject:** Re: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (1) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Here is the rationale:

HPA was passed a long time ago.(40 years I think)

Enforcement until recently has been non/existent .

Congress does not like to appropriate money for laws that are not enforced.

The recent indictments show the law IS being enforced but do not in any way suggest DOA has sufficient funds for uncovering the many violations that are occurring. The indictments are addressing only the tip

of the iceberg.

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 24, 2011, at 5:10 PM, "Nancy Perry" <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

That was my first thought too, Mimi. It isn't intuitive to me that showing an example of good enforcement is helpful, but maybe just to demonstrate what would be possible in 90% of the other cases? Or possibly to give them a concrete example of the horrors out there in the very few instances when USDA can delve more deeply? I think we'd have to spell out very clearly what purpose that example is providing to buttress our argument for more funds.

Nancy Perry  
Vice President, Government Affairs  
[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org  
t 202.955. [REDACTED] f 202.878.2302

The Humane Society of the United States  
2100 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037

[humansociety.org](http://humansociety.org)

[Join Our Email List](#) [Facebook](#) [Twitter](#)

<Image001.gif>

---

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2011 5:05 PM  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane  
**Cc:** Nancy Perry; Michael Markarian  
**Subject:** RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Hmm, interesting thought... I like giving them the nod that they are committed to trying to enforce better, but wouldn't want it to undercut our pitch for more money ("If they're already on track to fix the problem with the same amount they've always had, why do they need more?"). What do others think?

---

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2011 5:02 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody; Keith Dane  
**Cc:** Nancy Perry; Michael Markarian  
**Subject:** RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Mimi,

Should we mention the recent indictments by DOJ and DOA to show they are enforcing the Horse Protection Act?

---

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2011 4:58 PM  
**To:** Keith Dane  
**Cc:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Nancy Perry; Michael Markarian  
**Subject:** RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Keith, it'd be good to include some acknowledgment at the beginning about the budget this year. Working from last year's joint House testimony (attached), maybe something like:

On behalf of the undersigned animal welfare and horse industry organizations, with combined supporters exceeding 12 million, we submit the following testimony seeking an increase in funding for the USDA/APHIS Horse Protection Program to \$900,000, as requested in the President's budget for FY 2011. We recognize that Congress is focused on the imperative of cutting federal spending. But we believe that it should be possible to achieve meaningful reductions in the overall budget while still addressing shortfalls in very specific accounts that are vital and have been seriously underfunded. This \$900,000 is urgently needed to begin to fulfill the intent of the Horse Protection Act -- to eliminate the cruel practice of sorring -- by allowing the USDA to strengthen its enforcement capabilities for this law.

Thanks,

Mimi

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Keith Dane  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2011 4:17 PM

To: Mimi Brody  
Subject: RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Yep - will do!

Sent from my Samsung Jack™, a Windows Mobile® smartphone from AT&T

-----Original Message-----

From: Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humansocietv.org>  
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 4:09 PM  
To: Keith Dane <[REDACTED]@humansocietv.org>; Carolyn Schmurr <[REDACTED]@humansocietv.org>  
Cc: Nancy Perry <[REDACTED]@humansocietv.org>; Tracie Letterman <[REDACTED]@humansocietv.org>  
Subject: RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Thanks so much! Since the letter can be VERY close to what they co-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 NWA to do their own again, if they don't want to co-sign the group one. J

From: Keith Dane  
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 4:06 PM  
To: Mimi Brody; Carolyn Schmurr  
Cc: Nancy Perry; Tracie Letterman  
Subject: RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Yes, I'll update the constituent group testimony and circulate to the groups that have signed on in the past; we may not hear back from all of them by 4/1 (I assume we can still submit testimony on that date?), but we'll go with whomever we have confirmed, for the Senate version... and can add any stragglers to the House one by 4/14.

Keith

From: Mimi Brody

Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 3:00 PM

To: Keith Dane; Carolyn Schnurr

Cc: Nancy Perry; Tracie Letterman

Subject: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (1) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Keith,

I've just found out about the deadlines, and am really scrambling re: the group letters. I wanted to flag this to you, since it will be extremely important to have strong joint testimony submitted again for HPA funding. Can you please update last year's testimonies on HPA and reach out to all the groups for cosignature (or doing their own), so they can be submitted by the deadlines?

Senate Ag Approps deadline for outside testimony: April 1

House Ag Approps deadline for outside testimony: April 14

Thank you!!

Mimi Brody

Director of Federal Affairs, Government Affairs Department

██████████@humanesociety.org <██████████@humanesociety.org>

t 202/955-██████████ f 202/676-██████████ c ██████████

The Humane Society of the United States

2100 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037

[humanesociety.org](http://www.humanesociety.org) <<http://www.humanesociety.org>>

Join Our Email List <<https://community.hsus.org/humane/join?source=gabhkl>> Facebook <<http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=6041057841>> Twitter <<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety>>

<<http://www.humanesociety.org/>>



# **EXHIBIT 58**

**From:** Sara Amundson <[REDACTED]@hslf.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 17, 2011 2:07 PM  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Subject:** RE: Quotes/Interview Rep. Whitfield?: Horseracing bill

---

Oh, I know you're the one to ask! I just think we ask A LOT! And, thank you, I already heard from Robert—you work fast! See you soon.

---

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 17, 2011 12:42 PM  
**To:** Sara Amundson  
**Subject:** Re: Quotes/Interview Rep. Whitfield?: Horseracing 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 couple of quotes from him.  
He is in Ky. today, Louisiana tomorrow, then Ky. Thurs. Through Sunday. What is the deadline?

Sent from my iPhone

On May 17, 2011, at 11:47 AM, "Sara Amundson" <[REDACTED]@hslf.org> wrote:

Hi Connie: We're going to do a short story on the horse racing bill in the next issue of Humane Activist and I thought it would be great to have a quote or two from Rep. 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,  
Sara

---

**From:** Michael Sharp  
**Sent:** Monday, May 16, 2011 5:34 PM  
**To:** Sara Amundson  
**Subject:** Horseracing bill

Hello Sara,

Thanks again for your time this morning.

Quick question for you: I had wanted to reach out to either Rep. Whitfield or Sen. Udall about the horseracing bill, and perhaps get a quick quote or two to use with our short story in Humane Activist. Would you have a suggestion, between the two of them, for who to try first? Also, once we nail that down, are you ok with me reaching out directly to their office?

Thanks again!  
--Michael

**Michael Sharp**  
Assistant Managing Editor, Publications  
[REDACTED]@humansociety.org  
t 301.721 [REDACTED] f 301.721.6482

The Humane Society of the United States  
700 Professional Drive, Gaithersburg, MD 20879  
[humansociety.org](http://humansociety.org)  
[Join Our Email List](#) [Facebook](#) [Twitter](#)

<Image001.gif>

# **EXHIBIT 59**

**From:** Lauren Silverman <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 26, 2011 10:18 AM  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Subject:** RE: Deadline --- RE: Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity (deadline 10/25)

---

Cory just emailed that Ed will sign on! Hooray! I have actually only been focusing on getting the R's to sign on, and not the Dems -- but I think having Israel and Stark lead the letter isn't helpful! And those offices have been pushing all the Dem offices to sign.

---

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 26, 2011 10:15 AM  
**To:** Lauren Silverman  
**Subject:** Re: Deadline --- RE: Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity (deadline 10/25)

Cory knows how Ed feels about animals!

Are the paucity of Republicans because they have arguments against, because only Dems signed the letter and/or because too few Republicans have been approached? (I know you have been working feverishly on this and could use additional help.)

I will talk to Ed after he gets out of his Health Subcommittee hearing.

Best,  
Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2011, at 9:29 AM, "Lauren Silverman" <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org> wrote:

Cory just asked me a list of co-signers, so he is working on this! Just wanted to let you know.

---

**From:** Lauren Silverman  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 26, 2011 9:24 AM  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Subject:** FW: Deadline --- RE: Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity (deadline 10/25)  
**Importance:** High

Hey Connie - Would be great if we could get Ed to sign on to this. So sorry for flagging it in the 11<sup>th</sup> hour -- I should have thought to send this to you earlier! Current list of signers are below. Bartlett and Reichert are on -- and a few other R's are pending. Hoping for a few more R's so it's not so partisan!! (That's what happens when the two leads on the letter are both Dems!) I sent this to Cory -- and followed up again with him this AM -- but let me know if there's anything I can do to move this fwd!

Ackerman, Andrews, Bartlett, Bordallo, R. Brady, Capuano, Carson, Conyers, Ellison, Engel, Farr, Filner, Grijalva, Gutierrez, Hinchey, Holt, Israel, Kildee, Kucinich, Langevin, B. Lee, Lowey, Luján, C. McCarthy, G. Miller, Moore, Moran, Nadler, Neal, Olver, Peters, Polis, Rangel, Reichert, Richardson, Rothman, Schakowsky, Schiff, Stark, Towns, Woolsey

---

**From:** Lauren Silverman  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 26, 2011 9:19 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov; [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov  
**Subject:** Deadline --- RE: Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity (deadline 10/25)  
**Importance:** High

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-on's this morning.

I've copied both Michelle (Rep. Stark) and Colleen (Rep. Israel) here for any more info.

Thanks so much. We'd be so grateful for Rep. Whitfield's support on this important letter.

Best,  
Lauren

---

**From:** Lauren Silverman  
**Sent:** Friday, October 21, 2011 3:20 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov  
**Subject:** FW: Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity (deadline 10/25)  
**Importance:** High

Hi Cory,

Hope you had a good week – I am sure you are just as thrilled as I am that Friday is finally here! I want to flag for you an important sign-on letter that is being circulated to protect captive chimpanzees – see below. The deadline to sign is Oct. 25 – next Tuesday – so I wanted to make sure you saw this in time. We'd be so grateful to have Rep. Whitfield sign on to this letter.

**SUMMARY OF THE ISSUE:**

- The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) is currently reviewing whether all chimpanzees should be listed as an endangered species.
- Currently, chimpanzees in the wild are listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as “endangered” – but chimpanzees in captivity are only listed as “threatened.” This special rule (known as a “split listing”) specifically deprives captive chimps in the U.S. of ESA protection, allowing them to be used in commercials, invasive research, circuses, etc.
- A positive finding by FWS – that all chimpanzees should be listed as “endangered” whether in captivity or in the wild – could potentially put an end to all invasive research on these remarkable animals, with the exception of invasive research that qualified for a permit (i.e., if the research benefits chimp conservation).
- The Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, however, goes a few steps further, requiring the retirement of the federally chimpanzees to sanctuary. However, a positive finding by the agency will without a doubt fuel movement for the legislation.

Thanks in advance for taking a look and let me know if you have any questions!

Best,  
Lauren

Lauren Silverman Simon  
Federal Legislative Specialist, Government Affairs  
[REDACTED]@humansociety.org  
t 202.955. [REDACTED] f 202.676.2302

The Humane Society of the United States  
2100 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037  
[humansociety.org](http://humansociety.org)  
[Join Our Email List](#) [Facebook](#) [Twitter](#)

<image001.gif>

## Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity

**From: The Honorable Fortney Pete Stark**  
**Sent By: [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov**  
**Date: 10/4/2011**

*Organizations also requesting the FWS increase protections for chimps: The Humane Society of the United States, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, Jane Goodall Institute, Wildlife Conservation Society, Pan African Sanctuary Alliance, Humane Society International, Fund for Animals, and the New England Anti-Vivisection Society.*

Dear Colleague,

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. laws 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.

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 [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov or by phone at 5-[REDACTED] or Colleen Nguyen in Rep. Israel's office by email at [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov or by phone at 5-[REDACTED].

Sincerely,

/s/

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 Gabon) 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 the 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 citizens 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,

/s/

CC:

Public Comments Processing

Attn: FWS-R9-ES-2010-0086

Division of Policy and Directives Management

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

4401 N. Fairfax Drive, MS 2042-PDM

Arlington, VA 22203

# **EXHIBIT 60**



**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 23, 2012 2:31 PM  
**To:** Hicks, Cory <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Talking points on mandatory penalty protocol

---

**From:** Keith Dane  
**Sent:** Friday, March 23, 2012 12:34 PM  
**To:** Tracie Letterman; Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Subject:** RE: Talking points on mandatory penalty protocol

Yes, thank you for all of your help, Connie.

Keith

**From:** Tracie Letterman  
**Sent:** Friday, March 23, 2012 12:27 PM  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Cc:** Keith Dane  
**Subject:** FW: Talking points on mandatory penalty protocol

Connie,  
Keith and I reviewed these talking points and they're all set for you to pass on to Ed (see below).

Thanks for your help!

Tracie


**From:** Deborah Press <[REDACTED]@aspca.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 23, 2012 12:10 PM  
**To:** Richard Patch; Tracie Letterman; Keith Dane  
**Subject:** Talking points on mandatory penalty protocol

Can someone forward these to Connie? Let me know if these are okay.

Talking Points—Mandatory Penalty Protocol Regs

- Constituents are concerned that USDA has delayed publishing final rules
- The final rules will require Horse Industry Organizations to issue mandatory minimum penalties to individuals entering or exhibiting sore horses at horse shows
- Constituents have been waiting years for these regulations.
- USDA began developing and soliciting industry input on the mandatory penalty protocol several years ago and has been pushing the industry to adopt it since early 2010.
  - USDA began notifying HIOs as early as May 2010 that they should add the mandated penalty protocol to their rulebooks by the end of 2010.
  - In September 2010, in response to an OIG audit of the HPA program, USDA said that they had mandated a penalty protocol for the horse industry to implement and enforce by January 1, 2011.
  - Four out of twelve HIOs refused to adopt the protocol
  - USDA responded by publishing proposed rules on May 27, 2011 and accepting public comment until July 26, 2011.
  - It has been almost 9 months since the comment period closed and the Agency continues to sit on these rules
- The 2012 show season is underway and cruel trainers should not be allowed to coast through another horse show season with impunity.
- USDA has been promising that rules would be coming out this week ( see <http://www.t-g.com/story/1826657.html> ) but rumors are circulating that the rules have stalled in the Secretary's office.

**Deborah Dubow Press**  
Regulatory Affairs Manager  
American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals  
202.621 [REDACTED] - office  
[REDACTED] - cell

 <https://intranet.aspc.org/Tools>

The information contained in this e-mail, and any attachments hereto, is from The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals® (ASPCA®) and is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or use of the contents of this e-mail, and any attachments hereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by reply email and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail and any printout thereof.

# **EXHIBIT 61**

**From:** Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 23, 2012 5:03 PM  
**To:** Keith Dane <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>; Wayne Pacelle <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>; Michael Markarian <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>; Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>; Carol England <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>; Jessica Feingold-Lieberson <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Cc:** Sarah Speed <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Subject:** RE: BloodHorse.com: Congress Sets Hearing on Horse Racing

---

Connie's 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. For the moment (earlier today), they were trying to keep it somewhat quiet, so as not to rouse the opposition. Will follow her lead on what's needed from us. Thanks, Keith!  
Mimi

---

**From:** Keith Dane  
**Sent:** Monday, April 23, 2012 5:00 PM  
**To:** Wayne Pacelle; Michael Markarian; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Carol England; Mimi Brody; Jessica Feingold-Lieberson  
**Cc:** Sarah Speed  
**Subject:** FW: BloodHorse.com: Congress Sets Hearing on Horse Racing

Just learned 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 Speed, our PA director (copied here), or another Equine staffer can attend, unless anyone else here plans to be there.

**From:** Keith Dane  
**Sent:** Monday, April 23, 2012 4:52 PM  
**To:** Keith Dane  
**Subject:** BloodHorse.com: Congress Sets Hearing on Horse Racing

[REDACTED]@hsus.org 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 30 in Pennsylvania, according to an April 23 notice.

[Click here](http://www.bloodhorse.com/horse-racing/articles/69166/congress-sets-hearing-on-horse-racing) to view the full story or copy and paste the following link into your browser: <http://www.bloodhorse.com/horse-racing/articles/69166/congress-sets-hearing-on-horse-racing>



# **EXHIBIT 62**

**From:** Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 14, 2012 8:22 PM  
**To:** Cece Kremer <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>; Michael Markarian <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Cc:** Kira Svirsky <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Subject:** RE: Ed would like to be added to the

---

Thanks so much! Just submitted my timesheets, and need to head home.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Cece Kremer  
**Sent:** Friday, September 14, 2012 7:33 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody; Michael Markarian  
**Cc:** Kira Svirsky  
**Subject:** RE: Ed would like to be added to the

right Mimi, we tried calling Cory this evening but office closed. I'll follow up on Monday. Thanks for everything wonderful you and Kira did...and have a good day on Monday.

---

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Friday, September 14, 2012 5:59 PM  
**To:** Cece Kremer; Michael Markarian  
**Cc:** Kira Svirsky  
**Subject:** RE: Ed would like to be added to the

I think Connie may want to intervene to make sure it happens, if staff is resisting. Let's see how we do reaching out to Cory Hicks ourselves first, though. I can try him on Tuesday. But feel free to contact him yourself on Monday, Cece, if you'd like to get the "ask" moving quickly!

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Cece Kremer  
**Sent:** Friday, September 14, 2012 5:12 PM  
**To:** Michael Markarian  
**Cc:** Kira Svirsky; Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** RE: Ed would like to be added to the

Got it, thanks.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Michael Markarian  
**Sent:** Friday, September 14, 2012 5:11 PM  
**To:** Cece Kremer  
**Cc:** Kira Svirsky; Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** RE: Ed would like to be added to the

Chris has not been able to get confirmation from Cory in Whitfield's office, so he has not been officially added yet. I don't mind if we keep the checkmark for now, but we'll have to get staff confirmation next week before updating again.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Cece Kremer  
**Sent:** Friday, September 14, 2012 5:08 PM  
**To:** Michael Markarian  
**Cc:** Kira Svirsky; Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** FW: Ed would like to be added to the

Mike,

Just want to confirm that you'd like Kira to "delist" Whitfield from on line preview? See Connie's confirmation below.

Thanks,

Cece

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Kira Svirsky  
**Sent:** Friday, September 14, 2012 5:07 PM  
**To:** Cece Kremer  
**Subject:** FW: Ed would like to be added to the

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 12, 2012 11:10 PM  
**To:** Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Kira Svirsky  
**Cc:** Michael Markarian; Cece Kremer; Wayne Pacelle  
**Subject:** RE: Ed would like to be added to the

That is really FABULOUS news, Connie!!! Thank you so much!!! Kira, please give him a check in the egg column and adjust his score. Connie, can you ask his staff to contact Chris Huckleberry in Cong. Schrader's office and indicate that he wants to join? Don't worry if Cory isn't able to do this tomorrow - we'll make sure Cong. Whitfield gets scorecard credit regardless - but we want him to actually be added in due course.  
Mimi

-----Original Message-----

From: Sara Amundson  
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 9:38 PM  
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
Cc: Mimi Brody; Michael Markarian; Cece Kremer  
Subject: Re: Ed would like to be added to the

Sheesh! I told you you were a rock star. Best with HPA tomorrow!

On Sep 12, 2012, at 9:27 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> Egg Bill. Talk about 11th hour!!!  
>  
> Sent from my iPhone

# **EXHIBIT 63**



**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 12, 2012 2:44 PM  
**To:** Michael Markarian <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Subject:** Re: Press Release - New Poll Shows Voters in Tennessee and Kentucky Overwhelmingly Support Bill to Strengthen the Horse Protection Act  
**Attach:** image002.jpg

I will ask him.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 12, 2012, at 1:29 PM, "Michael Markarian" <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>> wrote:

What do you think about asking Ed to give a floor speech on this poll?

<image002.jpg>

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

New Poll Shows Voters in Tennessee and Kentucky Overwhelmingly Support Bill to Strengthen the Horse Protection Act

Legislation would address the widespread abuse in Tennessee walking horse industry

(Dec. 12, 2012)—A new poll conducted by Mason-Dixon Polling & Research reveals statewide voters, by a more than 5-to-1 margin in Tennessee and a more than 3-to-1 margin in Kentucky, overwhelmingly support stronger legislation to prevent the cruel practice of horse "soring," the painful application of chemicals or other training methods to force the animals to perform an artificially high-stepping gait—known as the "Big Lick"—for show competitions.

Members of Congress from Kentucky and Tennessee recently introduced H.R. 6388, the Horse Protection Act Amendments of 2012 <[https://secure.humansociety.org/site/Advocacy?cmd=display&page=UserAction&id=5725&s\\_src=&s\\_src=web\\_in\\_091912](https://secure.humansociety.org/site/Advocacy?cmd=display&page=UserAction&id=5725&s_src=&s_src=web_in_091912)>, which would end the current, failed system of industry self-policing, ban the use of chains and stacks (devices implicated in the soring process) on horses at shows, and increase penalties for violating the law. The legislation has the support of The Humane Society of the United States, other national animal protection and horse industry organizations, as well as the American Association of Equine Practitioners and the American Veterinary Medical Association.

The poll found that 75 percent of Tennessee voters and 69 percent of Kentucky voters support the federal legislation to strengthen the Horse Protection Act, with only 14 percent in Tennessee and 19 percent in Kentucky opposing the bill. Large majorities in all demographic groups and party affiliations support the legislation. In addition, voters polled in Tennessee (62 percent to 26 percent) and in Kentucky (45 percent to 36 percent) support legislation at the state level making the act of soring a felony offense.

"These poll results clearly indicate that in the heart of Tennessee walking horse country, the public strongly supports legislation to crack down on the corrupt 'Big Lick' industry and its widespread practice of horse soring," said Keith Dane, director of equine protection for The HSUS. "Abusing horses for the sake of a blue ribbon is cruel, and the majority of voters have expressed their disdain for this industry by saying they would avoid 'Big Lick' events altogether."

The poll results also show that Tennessee and Kentucky voters, by about a 3-to-1 margin, would avoid buying from companies providing financial sponsorship to horse shows that promote "Big Lick" horses. And by a more than 2-to-1 margin, voters in both states said they would avoid attending a competition where they knew horses would be wearing chains and tall, heavy stacks or pads.

The survey of 625 registered Tennessee voters and 625 registered Kentucky voters interviewed statewide was conducted by Mason-Dixon Polling & Research, Inc., from Dec. 3 through Dec. 5, 2012. The margin of error is plus or minus 4 percent. The full survey results from both states are below.

#### TENNESSEE RESULTS

QUESTION: Tennessee Walking Horses are known for their high-stepping gait, called the "Big Lick." To make the horses lift their legs high in the air, trainers often use a practice called "soring" which means burning a horse's forelegs with caustic chemicals, cutting the horse's hoof painfully short, or using bolts, blocks or other devices to inflict pain to the sole of the horse's foot.

Were you aware or not aware of the details of this practice known as "soring"?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
YES	59%	61%	56%	56%	56%	63%
NO	41%	39%	44%	44%	44%	37%

QUESTION: Chains and chemicals are often used in soring horses' legs. Instead of wearing regular horseshoes, the feet of "Big Lick" horses are fitted with tall, heavy stacks of pads to accentuate their gait. These "stacks" force the horses to stand at an unnatural angle, much like wearing high heel platform shoes all day, every day – even when not performing.

If you were aware that horses were wearing this equipment to perform at an event, would you avoid attending it, or not?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
YES	62%	59%	64%	57%	59%	68%
NO	24%	24%	24%	32%	26%	15%
NOT SURE	14%	17%	12%	11%	15%	17%

QUESTION: A bill recently introduced in Congress, H.R. 6388, the Horse Protection Act Amendments of 2012, would strengthen the law against horse soring. It would end the system of industry self-policing, ban the use of chains and stacks which have been implicated in soring, increase penalties, and hold accountable all those involved in this practice.

Would you support or oppose this federal legislation?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
SUPPORT	75%	70%	80%	74%	74%	77%
OPPOSE	14%	14%	14%	17%	18%	8%
UNDECIDED	11%	16%	6%	9%	8%	15%

QUESTION: Would you support or oppose state legislation that would make the act of soring a felony?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
SUPPORT	62%	56%	67%	70%	53%	64%
OPPOSE	26%	31%	21%	19%	36%	19%
UNDECIDED	12%	13%	12%	11%	11%	17%

QUESTION: Horse shows that promote "Big Lick" events rely on corporate sponsorship to make a profit. Some major corporations, including Pepsi and Ford, have already withdrawn their sponsorship from major Tennessee Walking Horse events due to evidence that cruel methods are used to produce the exaggerated "Big Lick" gait.

Would you buy from companies or avoid buying from companies that provide financial sponsorship to horse shows that promote "Big Lick" horses?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
BUY FROM	18%	28%	7%	10%	23%	18%
AVOID	62%	49%	76%	75%	57%	58%
NOT SURE	20%	23%	17%	15%	20%	24%

KENTUCKY RESULTS

QUESTION: Tennessee Walking Horses are known for their high-stepping gait, called the "Big Lick." To make the horses lift their legs high in the air, trainers often use a practice called "soring" which means burning a horse's forelegs with caustic chemicals, cutting the horse's hoof painfully short, or using bolts, blocks or other devices to inflict pain to the sole of the horse's foot.

Were you aware or not aware of the details of this practice known as "soring"?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
YES	29%	39%	18%	28%	30%	20%
NO	71%	61%	82%	72%	70%	80%

QUESTION: Chains and chemicals are often used in soring horses' legs. Instead of wearing regular horseshoes, the feet of "Big Lick" horses are fitted with tall, heavy stacks of pads to accentuate their gait. These "stacks" force the horses to stand at an unnatural angle, much like wearing high heel platform shoes all day, every day – even when not performing.

If you were aware that horses were wearing this equipment to perform at an event, would you avoid attending it, or not?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
YES	58%	49%	68%	56%	58%	78%
NO	26%	36%	15%	27%	25%	20%
NOT SURE	16%	15%	17%	16%	17%	2%

QUESTION: A bill recently introduced in Congress, H.R. 6388, the Horse Protection Act Amendments of 2012, would strengthen the law against horse soring. It would end the system of industry self-policing, ban the use of chains and stacks which have been implicated in soring, increase penalties, and hold accountable all those involved in this practice.

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
SUPPORT	69%	55%	83%	73%	61%	80%
OPPOSE	19%	35%	4%	18%	21%	20%
UNDECIDED	12%	10%	14%	9%	18%	-

QUESTION: Would you support or oppose state legislation that would make the act of soring a felony?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
SUPPORT	45%	38%	52%	46%	44%	47%
OPPOSE	36%	50%	22%	35%	37%	33%
UNDECIDED	19%	12%	26%	19%	19%	20%

QUESTION: Horse shows that promote "Big Lick" events rely on corporate sponsorship to make a profit. Some major corporations, including Pepsi and Ford, have already withdrawn their sponsorship from major Tennessee Walking Horse events due to evidence that cruel methods are used to produce the exaggerated "Big Lick" gait.

Would you buy from companies or avoid buying from companies that provide financial sponsorship to horse shows that promote "Big Lick" horses?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
BUY FROM	23%	38%	9%	22%	24%	29%
AVOID	63%	54%	71%	65%	59%	69%
NOT SURE	14%	8%	20%	13%	17%	2%

Background:

- \* Last week, The HSUS asked 11 Tennessee District Attorneys General <[http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press\\_releases/2012/12/tenn-walking-horse-investigation-request-120612.html](http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press_releases/2012/12/tenn-walking-horse-investigation-request-120612.html)> to acquire and test all "foreign substance swab samples" collected from Tennessee walking show horses during 2012 and to prosecute violations of state animal cruelty laws.
- \* An HSUS undercover investigation <[http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press\\_releases/2012/05/horse\\_soring\\_investigation\\_051712.html](http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press_releases/2012/05/horse_soring_investigation_051712.html)> led to a 52-count indictment of notorious Tennessee Walking Horse Hall of Fame trainer Jackie McConnell, who pleaded guilty to one count of felony conspiracy to violate the Horse Protection Act, and three of his associates. In September, a federal court sentenced him to three years of probation and a \$75,000 fine. McConnell also faces prosecution for violations of the Tennessee animal cruelty statute.
- \* USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service conducted random testing at various Tennessee walking horse competitions, and the results indicate that a shocking 97.6 percent of the samples tested positive for prohibited foreign substances in 2011. In 2010, 86 percent of samples tested positive. These prohibited substances included numbing agents and drugs that mask evidence of abuse.
- \* The HSUS filed a legal petition <[http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press\\_releases/2012/03/usda\\_petition\\_horse\\_032112.html](http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press_releases/2012/03/usda_petition_horse_032112.html)> asking USDA to treat the use of illegal numbing or masking chemicals on horses' legs as a felony under the Horse Protection Act.
- \* H.R. 6388, the Horse Protection Act Amendments of 2012 <[https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Advocacy?cmd-display&page=UserAction&id=5725&s\\_src=&s\\_src\\_web\\_ip\\_091912](https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Advocacy?cmd-display&page=UserAction&id=5725&s_src=&s_src_web_ip_091912)>, sponsored by Reps. Ed Whitfield, R-Ky., and Steve Cohen, D-Tenn., will end the failed system of industry self-policing, ban the use of certain devices associated with soring, strengthen penalties, and hold accountable all those involved in this cruel practice. The HSUS urges Congress to pass this

bill, which now has 53 co-sponsors in the House.

-30-

Media Contact: Stephanie Twining, 301-258-██████████, ██████████@humansociety.org<██████████@humansociety.org>

Follow The HSUS on Twitter<<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety>> See our work for animals on your Apple or Android device by searching for our "Humane TV" app.

The Humane Society of the United States is the nation's largest animal protection organization, rated the most effective by its peers. Since 1954, The HSUS has been fighting for the protection of all animals through advocacy, education and hands-on programs. We rescue and care for tens of thousands of animals each year, but our primary mission is to prevent cruelty before it occurs. We're there for all animals, across America and around the world. Celebrating animals and confronting cruelty --- on the Web at [humansociety.org](http://www.humansociety.org)<<http://www.humansociety.org/>>.

The Humane Society of the United States  
2100 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
[humansociety.org](http://www.humansociety.org)<<http://www.humansociety.org/>>  
Celebrating Animals, Confronting Cruelty

# **EXHIBIT 64**

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 8, 2013 5:43 PM  
**To:** Hicks, Cory <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Defense report language and request for help reaching out to Cong. Whitfield and Grimm on BEST Practices

---

Cory,  
Do what you think is best. Ed doesn't need to be in everything.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 8, 2013, at 4:40 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> I'll talk to Adam on Monday.

>

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([REDACTED]@humansociety.org)

> Sent: Saturday, June 08, 2013 03:08 PM

> To: Hicks, Cory

> Subject: Fwd: Defense report language and request for help reaching out to Cong. Whitfield and Grimm on BEST Practices

>

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

> Begin forwarded message:

>

> From: Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>

> Date: June 7, 2013, 11:50:18 AM EDT

> To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>, Sara Amundson <[REDACTED]@hslf.org<[REDACTED]@hslf.org>>,  
Michael Markarian <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>, Cece Kremer <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>,&br/>Kate Wall <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>,&br/>Kathleen Conlee <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>>

> Subject: Defense report language and request for help reaching out to Cong. Whitfield and Grimm on BEST Practices

>

> Attached is the report language accompanying the House National Defense Reauthorization Act, following up on last year's NDAA requirement for a timeline from DoD on phasing out use of live animals in medical trauma training. PCRM worked this, and they're also hoping to have the BEST Practices Act reintroduced as a bipartisan bill again. Per Noah's email below, Rep. Grimm's staff has indicated to Noah that they're willing to be an original cosponsor if Rep. Whitfield joins on again, as he did last year, but Adam in Rep. Whitfield's office flagged concerns. Noah is looking for our help encouraging Reps. Whitfield and Grimm on this. I said we'd see what we could do. I know we're hoping to have their help on eggs/King, and that's not in hand yet.

>

> I'd earlier suggested to Noah that he try Rep. LoBiondo also - I don't know yet whether he's done so, but will remind him of that possibility, given Rep. LoBiondo's help on Defense/animal issues in the past.

>

> Thanks for any feedback you can provide.

>

> Mimi

>

> From: Noah Gittel ([REDACTED]@pcrm.org)

> Sent: Friday, June 07, 2013 11:28 AM

> To: Mimi Brody

> Subject: RE: BEST Practices

>

> Sorry, forgot to attach. Here it is.

>

> From: Noah Gittel

> Sent: Friday, June 07, 2013 11:26 AM

> To: Mimi Brody ([REDACTED]@humansociety.org<[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>)

> Subject: BEST Practices

>

> Hi Mimi -

>

> Hope you're doing well. We got some language in the report accompanying the FY14 NDAA. It's not as strong as we would have liked, but we thought it was important to respond to the recent DOD report in some way, while we're still figuring out the logistics of re-introducing BEST Practices. I've attached the language here.

>

> Also - we were hoping that Rep. Whitfield would be an original cosponsor (he was on the bill last year), but his LA, Adam Moore, just told me that they have heard from a company in their district that opposes it and are going to "stay off for now." Could you or someone reach out to him to get more details? His support is very important because Rep. Grimm's LD told me that his boss wouldn't support unless Whitfield does. If you guys could reach out to Whitfield AND Grimm, that would be ideal. In the meantime, I'm setting up meetings with other Republicans.

>

> Thanks.

>

> Noah Gittel

> Director of Government Affairs

> Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine

> 5100 Wisconsin Ave, NW - Suite 400

> Washington, DC 20016

> (p) 202.527. [REDACTED]

> (f) 202.527.7434

>

# **EXHIBIT 65**

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 17, 2013 6:53 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
**Subject:** Fwd: P.S. on Thursday's vote and pushing leadership for commitment on PAST

Cory's reaction to your suggestion.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Hicks, Cory" <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
Date: September 17, 2013, 3:20:35 PM EDT  
To: "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>, "Fareed, Justin" <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
Subject: RE: P.S. on Thursday's vote and pushing leadership for commitment on PAST

I think that ship sailed when we voted in favor of the ag portion earlier this year. Of course, this only works if the vote is so close that they need our vote. Horse slaughter was a last minute exchange to enable the passing of the Medicare prescription drug program. I think Ed will have to make the decision on the floor if the votes are going the wrong way for leadership. I'm not opposed to the idea, but these arrangements are easier said than done.

-----Original Message-----

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 2:39 PM  
To: Hicks, Cory; Fareed, Justin  
Subject: Fwd: P.S. on Thursday's vote and pushing leadership for commitment on PAST

Soliciting your thoughts on this.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
Date: September 17, 2013, 12:42:57 PM EDT  
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
Cc: John Goodwin <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
Subject: P.S. on Thursday's vote and pushing leadership for commitment on PAST

P.S. from JP, whose idea I was passing along when I called - 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 get PAST to the floor this year (as he pressed leadership to do some years ago on horse slaughter, when he extracted a commitment in exchange for his vote), and that he'll play hard ball to get PAST done. Thank you for considering this idea and discussing it with him!

Mimi Brody

Director, Federal Affairs

[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>

1202-955-[REDACTED] f202-676-2302 c [REDACTED]

The Humane Society of the United States

2160 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037

humanesociety.org <<http://www.humanesociety.org/>>

Join Our Email List <<https://community.hsus.org/humane/join?source=gahhk>> Facebook <<http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=6041057841>>

Twitter <<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety>>

[cid:image001.gif@01CD545E.E290C590] <<mailto:mi@01CD545E.E290C590>> <<http://www.humanesociety.org/>>

To support The Humane Society of the United States, please make a monthly donation <[https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df\\_id=2320&2320.donation=form1&s\\_src=dm\\_emstaffsig2320](https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df_id=2320&2320.donation=form1&s_src=dm_emstaffsig2320)>, or give in another way <<http://www.humanesociety.org/donate/>>, via a gift donation <[https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df\\_id=1590&1590.donation=form1&s\\_src=dm\\_emstaffsig1590](https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df_id=1590&1590.donation=form1&s_src=dm_emstaffsig1590)> or memorial donation <[https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df\\_id=1505&1505.donation=form1&s\\_src=dm\\_emstaffsig1505](https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df_id=1505&1505.donation=form1&s_src=dm_emstaffsig1505)> or donating your vehicle <<https://onecarhelpshumane.com/>> utm\_campaign=hsusStaffEmailSig\_2012&utm\_source=emailClient&utm\_medium=email>. You can also volunteer <[http://www.humanesociety.org/community/volunteers/?utm\\_source=staffsignature&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=volunteer](http://www.humanesociety.org/community/volunteers/?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_medium=email&utm_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=email&utm\\_campaign=helpanimals](http://www.humanesociety.org/action/55_actions_to_help_animals.html?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_medium=email&utm_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=3848](http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search_summary&orgid=3848)>, approved by the Better Business Bureau <<http://www.bbb.org/charity-reviews/national/animal-protection/humane-society-of-the-united-states-in-washington-dc-3129>> for all 20 standards for charity accountability, voted by Guidestar's Philanthropedia <<http://www.myphilanthropedia.org/blog/2011/08/24/humane-society-of-the-united-states-hsus-1-expert-identified-animal-rights-and-welfare-nonprofit>> experts as the #1 high-impact animal protection group, and named by Worth Magazine <[http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/about/worth\\_top\\_10\\_fiscally\\_responsible\\_charities.pdf](http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/about/worth_top_10_fiscally_responsible_charities.pdf)> as one of the 10 most fiscally responsible charities.

# **EXHIBIT 66**



**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 26, 2013 9:09 AM  
**To:** Cory Ilicks <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>; Justin Farced <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Subject:** Fwd: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST  
**Attach:** image001.gif, ATT00001.htm; Myths-Facts on PAST Act 9-23-13.doc; ATT00002.htm

---

In view of the poll that is being conducted by the TWHBEA, please give this high priority.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
Date: September 25, 2013, 7:36:41 PM EDT  
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
Subject: Fwd: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
Date: September 25, 2013, 6:15:44 PM EDT  
To: Keith Dane <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
Cc: Sara Amundson <[REDACTED]@hslf.org>, Cece Kremer <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
Subject: RE: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

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. I'm looping Connie and others in here, so they'll be aware of Marty Irby'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 BSL 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 Irby (past president of TWHBEA who has come on in support of PAST in a big way) he mentioned that much of the resistance to the act within the TWH 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 HPA, and that it's appropriate for them to do so when PAST becomes law - not for Congress to proscribe in detail what is allowed through legislation.

Marty 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 quell 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 Dane  
Vice President, Equine Protection  
[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org  
t 301-258-[REDACTED] f 301-258-3078  
The Humane Society of the United States  
700 Professional Drive, Gaithersburg, MD 20879  
humanesociety.org <<http://www.humanesociety.org/>>  
Join Our Email List <[https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/SSurvey?SURVEY\\_ID=2820&ACTION\\_REQUIRED=URI\\_ACTION\\_USER\\_REQUESTS](https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/SSurvey?SURVEY_ID=2820&ACTION_REQUIRED=URI_ACTION_USER_REQUESTS)>  
Facebook <<http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=6041057841>> Twitter <<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety>> Blog <<http://hsus.typepad.com/wayne/>>  
<<http://www.humanesociety.org/>>

# **EXHIBIT 67**

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 10:20 PM  
**To:** Cory Ilicks [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>; Emma Heydlauff <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>  
**Subject:** Fwd: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

---

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Keith Dane <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org<[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>>  
**Date:** October 15, 2013, 10:16:19 PM EDT  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org<[REDACTED]@humanesociety.org>>; Sara Amundson <[REDACTED]@hslf.org<[REDACTED]@hslf.org>>  
**Subject:** FW: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Can Cory try to get a meeting with Corker's office for Marty and Donna?

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 3:29 PM  
**To:** Keith Dane  
**Cc:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Michael Markarian; Cece Kremer; Sara Amundson  
**Subject:** RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Mike Markarian had reached out to Sen. Vitter's staff, but I haven't heard more about whether they connected. Kirk and Vitter are particularly friendly (as is Collins – already on). Wayne is also having me draft an email for him to send to Thune's and Burr's offices. Wayne thought Heller might be a good bet, too. It would be great if you could do outreach on your end to Senate Rs with whom the advocates in town may have a connection. At this point, I wouldn't characterize it as "taking the lead in cosponsoring," since that may scare them off and Collins is already cosponsoring. Thanks, Keith!  
Mimi

**From:** Keith Dane  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:52 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Excellent – thank you. It wasn't clear that the memo for Wayne was about getting the cosponsors listed – I thought it was more about the bounce backs...which I took to mean email bounce backs (perhaps full mailboxes, due to the shutdown?).

Do we have any strong ties to Rs in the Senate that we could press to sign on ASAP? Mr. Kirk, perhaps?

Whitfield's office is setting up meetings with Senate Rs, so hopefully that will bear fruit. But if there are any HSUS-friendly Rs, I think we should be asking them to take the lead in cosponsoring...and we should be able to get those meetings.

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:47 PM  
**To:** Keith Dane  
**Cc:** Wayne Pacelle  
**Subject:** RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

I have been asking, and am drafting an email for Wayne to send to Ayotte's staff to press this. Thanks for the intel, Keith.

**From:** Keith Dane  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:33 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody  
**Cc:** Wayne Pacelle  
**Subject:** RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Aside from whatever technical issues are causing the bounce backs, Connie is being told by Senate offices (Alexander and Manchin) that the fact that cosponsors are not showing up on THOMAS is actually hurting us with offices we're visiting; they think no one is cosponsoring the Senate bill, and think there's no reason to hold them back (even if there are more Ds than Rs).

Can we ask Ayotte to please start adding all the cosponsors who've signed up thus far? Thanks!

Keith

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:18 PM  
**To:** Sahar Rishqi; Jacqueline Tiaga; Cece Kremer; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane; Cherie Beatty  
**Subject:** FW: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

I spoke with Wayne about his reaching out to Ayotte's staff to start adding the other D cosponsors. I'm going to draft an email on it for him. Just wanted you to be aware of the bounce-back issue below, FYI...

**From:** Mimi Brody  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:12 PM  
**To:** Durand, Adam (Klobuchar)  
**Subject:** RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Thank you for the heads up, Adam! We'll keep checking, too, and your boss will get credit on the scorecard regardless of THOMAS, but I really appreciate your flagging the difficulties so we'll be aware!

**From:** Durand, Adam (Klobuchar) [REDACTED]@klobuchar.senate.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:10 PM  
**To:** Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Just on background. We have gotten some bounce backs on email requests to join this bill. I'm hoping that it will get resolved in the next few days, but I'll continue to monitor Thomas to make sure it happens.

Thanks,  
Adam

From: Mimi Brody [redacted]@humanesociety.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:07 PM  
To: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar)  
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

That's wonderful, Adam – thanks so much for your help on it and for Sen. Klobuchar's cosponsorship of this important bill! Let me know if you need any additional info on the other bills, and many thanks again! :)

Mimi

From: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar) [redacted]@klobuchar.senate.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:02 PM  
To: Mimi Brody  
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Mimi,

Senator Klobuchar is cosponsoring S.1406, the Horse Soring bill. We have reached out to the bill's sponsor as well.

Thanks,  
Adam

Adam Durand  
Senior Legislative Assistant  
Office of Senator Amy Klobuchar  
302 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510  
202-224- [redacted]

From: Mimi Brody [redacted]@humanesociety.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 12:40 PM  
To: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar)  
Subject: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Dear Adam:

We wanted to give you a quick look at the preview version of the 2013 Humane Scorecard before it's launched publicly early next week:  
<http://www.hsif.org/assets/pdfs/humane-scorecard/113th-congressional-scorecard-preview.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFA/TKKPRA/BBARTKKPTE/9925564881>>

If Senator Klobuchar is not yet cosponsoring all four of the bills whose cosponsors will be counted, please join during the next few days so your constituents will see your support for these priority bills on the preview! The scorecard will give credit to all Members who ask to cosponsor – whether they've officially shown up on THOMAS yet or not – if you let us know, as well as contacting the prime sponsor's office. Current cosponsor counts are indicated below, along with staff contacts for the prime sponsors.

Thanks again,

Mimi

-----  
On behalf of both the Humane Society Legislative Fund and the Humane Society of the United States, we want to flag for you the items we plan to include in our 2013 Humane Scorecard covering the first session of the 113th Congress. Note: if any recorded votes occur during the remainder of the session on legislation affecting animals, the scorecard may also include them. As of now, we expect the 2013 Humane Scorecard will count the following:

**Horse Soring – Cosponsorship of S. 1406, the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act** – currently with 17 cosponsors; introduced by Sens. Ayotte and Warner – to crack down on the cruel practice of “soring,” in which unscrupulous 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 unfair competitive advantage at horse shows. Soring methods include applying caustic chemicals, using plastic wrap and tight bandages to “cook” those chemicals deep into the horse's flesh for days, attaching heavy chains to strike against the sore legs, inserting bolts, screws or other hard objects into sensitive areas of the hooves, cutting the hooves down to expose the live tissue, and using salicylic acid or other painful substances to slough off scarred tissue in an attempt to disguise the sores. More than 40 years ago, Congress tried to rein in this abuse by enacting the Horse Protection Act, but rampant soring continues, according to a 2010 audit by the USDA Inspector General that recommended reforms incorporated in the PAST Act. S. 1406 will 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 soring of a horse for the purpose of showing or selling it illegal, as well as directing another to do so. This legislation is endorsed by the American Horse Council and more than 30 other national and state horse groups, as well as by the American Veterinary Medical Association, American Association of Equine Practitioners, and many others (for full list, see [www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/hors/past-act-endorsements.pdf](http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/hors/past-act-endorsements.pdf) <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFA/TKKPRA/DPCDTKKKPTF/9925564881>>). Staff contacts: Samantha (Sam) Roberts (Ayotte) / Caitlin Runyan (Warner).

**Eggs and Hen Housing – Cosponsorship of S. 820, the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments** – currently with 12 cosponsors; introduced by Sen. Feinstein, with Sens. Stabenow and Collins as original cosponsors – to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, phased in over a period of 15-16 years (during the normal course of replacing aged equipment for many producers), which will significantly improve animal welfare and provide a stable and secure future for U.S. egg farmers. The legislation is supported by the egg industry and animal welfare groups, and expressly does not affect any other livestock sector or food product other than eggs. Under this legislation, each laying hen will ultimately be provided nearly double the amount of current space, along with enrichments such as nest boxes and perches that permit hens to better express natural behaviors. Egg farmers will be able to invest in these enriched colony cage systems with the assurance that they will face regulatory certainty and not a patchwork of conflicting state laws – helping industry at no cost to the federal government (the preliminary CBO score on this legislation is zero). Studies have shown higher productivity for hens in enriched colony cage systems – i.e., more eggs and lower hen mortality. An economic study by the independent research group Agralytica concluded that the bill's reforms are expected to increase consumer prices by less than 1 penny per egg, spread out over the lengthy phase-in period. Consumers support this legislation by a margin of 4-to-1, and it has been endorsed by leading consumer organizations, as well as by the American Veterinary Medical Association, more than 1,000 individual family farms across the country, and many others (for full list, see [www.humanesociety.org/egg\\_bill\\_endorsements](http://www.humanesociety.org/egg_bill_endorsements) <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFA/TKKPRA/JOHJTKKPTG/9925564881>>). Cage-free and free-range systems, as well as operations with fewer than 3,000 laying hens, will be unaffected by S. 820, except that they may see increased sales as consumers are able to more clearly distinguish what's available on store shelves, thanks to the bill's labeling provisions. For responses to frequently asked questions, see [http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/egg\\_bill\\_faq.pdf](http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/egg_bill_faq.pdf) <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFA/TKKPRA/QWZJTKKPTH/9925564881>>. Staff contact: Devin Rhinerson (Feinstein).

Animal Fighting Spectators – Cosponsorship of S. 666, the Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act – currently with 24 cosponsors; introduced by Sens. Blumenthal, Kirk, Cantwell, and Vitter – 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 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 handlers who try to blend into the crowd when a raid occurs. This legislation is widely supported by nearly 300 national, state and local law enforcement agencies (covering all 50 states), including the Fraternal Order of Police and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association: [http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/law\\_enforcement\\_endorsements\\_animal\\_fighting\\_bill.pdf](http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/law_enforcement_endorsements_animal_fighting_bill.pdf) <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/CRQOTKKPT/9925564881>>. The preliminary CBO estimate on this legislation is zero. It has been approved three times by the full Senate – in June as part of the Farm Bill (S. 954), and last year as a floor amendment to the Farm Bill and as free-standing legislation (S. 1947) on a vote of 88-11. Related language is also in the House-passed Farm Bill (H.R. 2642), as it was in last year's House Agriculture Committee bill. Staff contacts: James Mikolowsky (Blumenthal) / Sarah Walter (Kirk).

Horse Slaughter – Cosponsorship of S. 541, the Safeguard American Food Exports (SAFE) Act – currently with 26 cosponsors; introduced by Sens. Landrieu and Graham – 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. The shocking discovery of horse meat in beef products in the U.K. <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/MPCFTKKPT/9925564881>> underscores the potential threat to American health if horse slaughter plants were to open here. Horse slaughter is cruel and cannot be made humane, and the U.S. public overwhelmingly opposes it. Horses are shipped for more than 24 hours at a time without food, water, or rest in crowded trucks in which the animals are often seriously injured or killed in transit. Horses are skittish by nature due to their heightened fight-or-flight response, and the methods used to kill horses rarely result in quick, painless deaths; they often endure repeated blows during attempts to render them unconscious and sometimes remain alive and kicking during dismemberment. The horse slaughter industry is a predatory, inhumane enterprise. They don't "euthanize" old horses – but precisely the opposite: they buy up young and healthy horses, often by misrepresenting their intentions, and kill them to sell the meat to Europe and Japan. It makes no sense for the federal government to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to oversee new horse slaughter plants at a time when Congress is so focused on fiscal responsibility. Staff contacts: Megan Blanco (Landrieu) / Courtney Titus (Graham).

Funding Letter – Cosigning 4/26/13 group letter – led by Sens. Boxer and Vitter – or submitting a parallel individual request to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, seeking funds for USDA 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, through student loan repayment, the critical maldistribution of veterinarians practicing in rural and inner-city areas and USDA inspection positions: <http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/fy14-senate-animal-welfare.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/BMNTTKKPT/9925564881>>.

Letter Opposing Rep. Steve King Amendment to House Farm Bill – Extra credit will be given to those who co-signed an 8/7/13 group letter – led by Sen. Feinstein – or who send their own letters to the leaders of the Senate Agriculture Committee voicing opposition to a provision in the House-passed Farm Bill (Sec. 11312 of H.R. 2642) known as the "King Amendment." Rep. Steve King offered this amendment during committee markup and it was adopted with minimal debate; opponents were then denied an opportunity to have a House floor vote on an amendment to strike it. The letter urges committee leaders to reject this provision in any form or context it may take (final Farm Bill conference report or otherwise), calling it "a serious infringement on states' rights with far reaching impacts": <http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-senate-letter.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/BCRRTKKPT/9925564881>>.

For a complete list of those who have publicly stated opposition to the King amendment, please see: <http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-opposition-master.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/BKWSKKPT/9925564881>>.

This amendment is so widely opposed because it 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. A broad coalition of 89 organizations joined in a letter calling for the King Amendment to be kept out of any final House-Senate package: [http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king\\_and\\_opposition\\_group.pdf](http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king_and_opposition_group.pdf) <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/AUYWTKKPT/9925564881>>. And others such as the National Conference of State Legislatures (<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-ncsl.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/IOZTKKPT/9925564881>>), County Executives of America (<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-letter-cea.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/NCQVTKKPT/9925564881>>), the Fraternal Order of Police (<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-fop.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/AJHTTKKPT/9925564881>>), and the National Sheriffs' Association (<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-letter-nsa.pdf> <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/HLYTKKPT/9925564881>>) have sent their own letters, as have the California Food and Agriculture Secretary and Mississippi Attorney General. Numerous editorials have also run in newspapers across the country, including USA Today <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/NGBRKKPT/9925564881>> and the Washington Post <<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/MELTKKPT/9925564881>>.

Leaders – Prime sponsors of pro-animal legislation or a letter to an agency will receive extra credit.

As in the past, our 2013 Scorecard will be prepared by the Humane Society Legislative Fund and distributed widely. If you have not already done so, we urge you to cosponsor the bills on sorting of show horses, eggs and hen housing, animal fighting spectators, and horse slaughter. Please contact us if you need more information on these or other animal protection issues. Thank you so much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sara Amundson, Executive Director  
Humane Society Legislative Fund  
(202) 676-  
@hslf.org <@hslf.org>

Mitri Brody, Director of Federal Affairs  
The Humane Society of the United States  
(202) 955-  
@humanesociety.org <@humanesociety.org>  
<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/9925564881/img/spacer.gif>

# **EXHIBIT 68**

**From:** Sara Amundson <[REDACTED]@hslf.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 6, 2014 5:28 PM  
**To:** Irby, Marty <[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>; Keith Dane <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>; Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Cc:** Mimi Brody <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org>  
**Subject:** RE: House Republican Goal

---

Let me know if I can help in any way. Thanks!

---

**From:** Irby, Marty [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 5:24 PM  
**To:** Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Cc:** Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** RE: House Republican Goal

Glad to do it! I will make it a priority tomorrow.

---

**From:** Sara Amundson [REDACTED]@hslf.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 5:23 PM  
**To:** Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Cc:** Irby, Marty; Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** RE: House Republican Goal

I'm afraid I agree with Keith. We've been whipping and whipping these other groups and it would make a big difference coming from the congressman's office. Not about piling more work on poor Marty---it's about getting it done!

---

**From:** Keith Dane  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 5:01 PM  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Cc:** Irby, Marty; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** RE: House Republican Goal

I had thought that Sara felt (and we collectively have felt all along) that it would be best coming from Marty/Mr. Whitfield's office, rather than HSUS... but sure, I can do this. I too have a backlog, so will prioritize this ASAP.

---

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 4:10 PM  
**To:** Keith Dane  
**Cc:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Irby, Marty; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** Re: House Republican Goal

Can you do that, Keith? It would be good coming from you.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2014, at 1:30 PM, "Keith Dane" <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org> 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 lobby.

Since there is still so much ground to cover ☺, maybe give each group a list of ten and ask for a commitment, and ask them if there are any other offices they have a relationship with, and will commit to pursue?

---

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 2:44 PM  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Cc:** Irby, Marty; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane; Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** Re: House Republican Goal

The problem is we need commitments.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2014, at 12:43 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[REDACTED]@humansociety.org> wrote:

That is a great idea. I think it would pay off.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2014, at 12:40 PM, "Irby, Marty" <[REDACTED]@mail.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 Amundson [REDACTED]@hslf.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 2:22 PM  
**To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Irby, Marty  
**Cc:** Keith Dane; Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** RE: House Republican Goal

Thanks Connie. I really feel that a "drill-down" to force actual assignments with some of the other players is necessary. It is likely that the AVMA, for example, has 10 good prospects they could follow-up with but people are reluctant to volunteer. I hate to ask Marty, but it may be best coming from him to contact each party and ask for commitments?

---

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 2:21 PM  
**To:** Irby, Marty  
**Cc:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Mimi Brody  
**Subject:** Re: House Republican Goal

Marty,

How do you propose to do this?

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2014, at 10:14 AM, "Irby, Marty" [REDACTED]@mail.house.gov> wrote:

All-

Cory and I discussed the Republicans in the House today we need to garner on PAST. Currently we have 82 with a few more pending that I am waiting on official responses from. We want to get 100 Republicans on the bill so we can really push to get the bill to the floor. I know we have been focused on the Senate, but let's keep in mind the House is still very important for the bill. We hope to have 100 Republicans within the next few weeks. Please help also focus efforts in this area.

Thanks,  
Marty



# **EXHIBIT 69**

---

**From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield [REDACTED]@humanesociety.org]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 09, 2013 5:28 PM  
**To:** Heydlauff, Emma  
**Subject:** Re: Meetings  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png; image005.png

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, "Heydlauff, Emma"  
<[REDACTED]@mail.house.[REDACTED]@mail.house.gov>> wrote:

Mrs. Whitfield,

Since we are scheduling meetings for next week, I went through the list of Republican E&C 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  
Shinkus  
Scalise  
Harper  
Billy Long  
Cassidy  
Ellmers

Thanks,  
Emma

Emma Heydlauff  
Scheduler  
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)  
2184 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
Phone: (202) 225-[REDACTED]  
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/edwhitfield>><image004.png><<http://www.youtube.com/WhitfieldKY01>> <image005.png><<http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml>>  
Click here<<https://whitfieldforms.house.gov/enews.shtml>> to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

EW3 000946

14-2940\_0580