



Kinder Goat Breeders Association NEWSLETTER

Winter 2006

A DAY IN MY LIFE WITH NAIS

Read for yourself in the NAIS Draft Strategic Plan what the USDA plans to require of you, and then try to apply just one aspect of that – animal tracking and reporting of ‘events’ (NAIS Draft Strategic Plan, page 12 and APHIS FactSheet, page 4) -- to a day in the life on your farm. I did just that, first with only the morning of an ordinary day, starting out with a predator attack on my ducks.

The morning began with a coyote stealing a duck – bold creature! He came within 20 feet of my back as I was loading up with hay for the goats, and that was duck number ??? of 50 or so (event and report #1 – off the property). According to NAIS Technical Supplement to Draft Program Standards, an event report must contain the event type code, the animal’s unique 15 digit ID, species/sex/breed, your name and your 7 character Premise ID with GPS coordinates. Each move off or on the property of each animal constitutes one event.

Next, 3 does were brought in by a fellow Kinder owner for breeding (I’m in trouble for accepting them if they are not properly identified -- events #2-4). Shortly after that, 2 does were picked up after breeding (events #5 and #6) and three buck kids were brought for banding and then went home (events #7-12). That was just the morning! 12 separate reports with all pertinent information to file with the government within 24 hours in order to remain compliant. The USDA does not yet say how this reporting must be done, and how much it will cost me in special equipment or programs, in addition to the time accomplishing the task.

Then I tried walking through our annual Goat Clinic that is held at my farm on the first Saturday in February. It is only one of many activities that center around the farm throughout the year. About 20 families bring their goats (usually about 50 of them in total) for a blood draw to test for CAE. This is an event planned so that our area veterinarian can gather multiple samples all at one time for a greatly reduced price to the goat owners. If NAIS were in place, each family would be responsible for 4 event reports per goat they bring (on/off their property, on/off mine) within 24 hours of the events. As the host, I would be responsible for **100 separate event reports** (on/off for each visiting goat) within the 24 hour requirement, with all the 15 digit goat IDs and their
(Continued on page 2)

THE TATTOO LETTER FOR 2006 IS ‘W’

(Continued from page 1)

source property information, and mine. Multiply that for all those little people who want to participate in fairs, parades, livestock workshops and clinics, shows, 4H and FFA projects, exercise walks, trail rides even just around their neighborhoods...

These two short tales address only part of the administrative burden, with no mention of the cost of the program to the small producer. I don't want to even think what will happen when the goats start kidding, and the chicks and ducks begin hatching! All the fees, tags/chips, equipment to read them, program for reporting, and whatever other hardware or software might be necessary will be up to us to fund! More importantly, the USDA does not consider at all the fact that the NAIS would be a major blow to our privacy, property, and religious rights. Did you join the Voluntary Scrapie Eradication Program? If so, then it is likely that your information has been rolled over into the NAIS database, which is what many farmers are now discovering. Your state might well have already assigned you a premise ID without your knowledge or permission. My state 'mined' web sites and records to locate properties with farm 'potential', assigned them IDs, and immediately sent the information to the USDA for the NAIS database. We were 'volunteered' without our knowledge or permission also.

Not everyone thinks that NAIS is a bad thing, however. Some want to believe it when the USDA says they only want to keep the 'national herd' safe from foreign disease, and it will not be a hardship. Major producers like the idea of spreading the cost down through the system, but unfortunately for the small farmer, we pay the biggest share, because the big producers need only identify 'groups' rather than individual animals. Do your research, and then ask Australia how the system has worked for them in the several years that they have had it. They will tell you that it has been a colossal mess, and the records are so far behind that it is often very difficult to buy and sell animals in any reasonable time frame. The program cannot protect us from disease as the USDA promises, and in fact would likely make us more vulnerable because it would concentrate more animals in fewer hands – great targets for the spread of disease or terrorist mischief. In my opinion, NAIS is a major disaster in the making. Here are some sources of information for you to begin your own research:

<http://www.NoNAIS.org> - This site is a library of information researched by volunteers. Here you have access to links to the original documents, including the paper trail of the

CAST OF CHARACTERS

PRESIDENT: Pat Showalter
Snohomish, WA (360)668-4559
Kinderzed@aol.com

VICE-PRESIDENT: Sue Huston
Miami, MO (660)852-3222
tshuston@iland.net

SECRETARY: Linda Nygaard
Snohomish, WA (360)794-2016
shorttailfarm@sprintmail.com

TREASURER: Duggan Kinne,
Matlock, WA KGBAssn@aol.com

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE

Lisa Lamm,
Columbia, MO, (573)445-2676

Dawn Leaming
Nevada City, CA (503)432-9659

Ramona Birdsall
Beyier, MO (660)775-2411

REGISTRAR: Margi Kehres
Everett, WA
KGBAssn@aol.com

SHOW DIRECTOR: Cindy Coffey,
Custer, WA

PUBLICATIONS EDITOR:
Jan Herleikson, Cinebar, WA
wsh2write@usa.net

YOUTH EDITOR: Open Position
KGBAssn@aol.com

history of NAIS, and a host of excellent articles and handouts dealing with the program and its consequences.

<http://www.stopanimalid.org> – This was the first site to begin to educate the public about NAIS, and they have ready-to-print flyers too.

Pat Showalter
Snohomish, WA

NAIS: What Does it Take to Raise an Alarm These Days?

By Ken Anderson
Jan 18, 2006, 14:02
From Magic City Morning Star
Editor's Desk

I can remember when 1984 was a scary book. Today, it seems that we worry only about those things that we're told to worry about, and accept the answers that are given to us, no questions asked.

On September 11, 2001, three passenger planes were crashed into the World Trade Towers and the Pentagon, while a fourth came to fiery rest in a Pennsylvania field. Less than a month later, the USA PATRIOT Act was introduced in Congress, to be signed - more than 300 pages of it - on October 26, 2001 with few objections from the public or its elected representatives.

I am not about to join those conspiracy theorists who claim that an agency of the United States government was responsible for the 9-11 attacks, but it does seem clear to me that the USA PATRIOT Act had been already prepared, waiting in the wings for just such an occasion.

United States citizens were happy to trade in their rights for the sense of security offered by this Act.

Certainly the 9-11 attacks justified the media frenzy that followed it, but it also served a number of purposes that our government too full advantage of. But that's not what this article is about.

Over the past couple of years, we've been subjected to a series of media scares relating to our meat supply. From Mad Cow, to swine flu, to e.Coli, to mutant flesh-eating viruses, and now the Avian flu, we've been led to believe that if we don't act immediately, we're all going to die.

Enter the National Animal Identification System, a governmental program which utilizes public-private partnerships in an attempt to identify and track every animal in the United States. (Continued on page 4)

And despite the fact that we haven't had a single case of Mad Cow or the Avian flu transmitted to humans in the United States, and that the NAIS couldn't possibly do a thing to prevent contaminations of our meat supply occurring after the meat has been processed, we're all expected to expel a deep sigh of relief.

Uncle Sam has come through for us again.

But at what cost?

The National Animal Identification System will force farmers, hobbyists, and even pet owners to register each animal they own, and tag that animal with an identifying tag, band, or implanted electronic chip, for the purpose of tracking that animal through the food chain whether or not it even enters the food chain.

When fully implemented in January of 2009, the NAIS will require two types of mandatory registration: registration of the premises, and registration of the animal.

Anyone who owns even one horse, cow, pig, sheep, chicken, pigeon, or any other livestock animal will be required to register their home, including the owner's name and other identifying information, along with the address of your farm or home, to be keyed to global positioning system (GPS) coordinates in a federal database under a 7-digit "premises ID number."

Additionally, each animal will have to be identified with a 15-digit ID number, also to be kept in the federal database. Even if you are raising your own food, your animal will be required to have an ID number if it is to be sent to a slaughterhouse. Animals that do not have an ID number cannot be bought or sold, or used to obtain stud service.

Any animal that leaves the owner's premises for any reason will be required to have an ID number, and be tagged. This includes animals that are shown, as well as horses that may be ridden off of the owner's property.

The costs of this program are to be shared by the animal owners and the larger base of taxpayers, meaning that there are likely to be significant fees connected with full implementation of the NAIS program.

Large-scale meat producers are on board with the program, perhaps because they'll be given a break. Large herds of cattle, pigs, or other animals raised and processed together can be identified by a single group ID number, while farmers and ranchers with small groups of animals will, in most cases, have to identify each animal individually for purposes of breeding, sale, or slaughter. If you own two cows, a horse, and twelve chickens, each would require an individual ID number if the animal is ever to leave your property for any reason, or have any contact (commingling) with any other animal.

The form of identification will most likely be an ear tag or implanted microchip containing a radio frequency identification device (RFID) which can be read from a

distance. In addition to RFID tags, some industries may require the use of retinal scans or DNA identification for all animals.

The costs associated with this program may well be beyond the reach of small farmers and hobbyists, and make it impractical, from an economic standpoint, for people to raise their own meat.

The costs are not only economic, but time consuming as well. Within the system, animal owners will be required to report the birthdate of each animal, including chickens, as well as the application of the animal's ID tag. Everytime the animal enters or leaves the premises, this will have to be reported. When a tag is lost or replaced, this will need to be reported. If an animal dies, or goes missing, there will have to be a report. These events will have to be reported to the government within 24 hours.

With full implementation of this program in 2009, the USDA intends to ensure compliance with NAIS regulations in a manner not yet specified, but which could be expected to include fines or seizure of animals.

Another possible reason for the enthusiastic support of the NAIS program by large-scale meat producers is that, as stakeholders in the program, they will likely have control over much of it, perhaps putting them in a position to exert economic pressures on competing small farmers and homesteaders.

Will implementation of the NAIS make our meat supply safer? Probably not, and it's not likely that we'd know if it did. It's not like people are dropping like flies from Mad Cow disease, as it is. The NAIS might be compared to using a cannon to hunt black flies in February.

The NAIS is likely to drive small meat producers out of business, placing an unfair economic burden on the traditional American businesses that have fed us since we've existed as a nation. Once the program is established, animal owners will bear the costs associated with the requirements for registration, identification, and reporting.

Costs to large-scale producers of meat will be absorbed by consumers, raising the cost of living for all of us.

The NAIS will prevent many people from raising animals for their own food. The NAIS is said to be necessary in order to make our food supply secure against disease or terrorism, yet what can be more secure than raising your own food or buying from a local farmer who you actually know?

What of those, such as the Amish in Smyrna, who may have a religious objection to participating in a system of electronically numbering and identifying their animals? When fully implemented, the NAIS is a compulsory registration with the government of all people who wish to raise their own animals for food. As written, the NAIS will force these people to make a choice between abandoning their livestock or violating their

religious beliefs.

As I read the documentation put out by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and as I have searched for additional information on this program, I was struck by the fact that so little has been said about it in the media. Search engine results yield almost exclusively web sites put out by various federal and state agencies, and associations of large-scale meat producers, all of whom are enthusiastically supporting this program.

Sadly, it seems that opposition to the program appears to be limited to the Countryside & Small Stock Journal, published in Wisconsin, and someone in a forum on the Mother Earth News site.

Further information about the National Animal Identification System can be found online at www.usaip.info/. Please read it through for yourselves, but the scariest stuff that I found came from the USAIP's own FAQs. You'll find that when they ask a question and answer it no, the text often goes on to explain that, when the plan is fully implemented, the answer will be yes.

Never one to pass up federal funds or to neglect an opportunity to make government bigger, the State of Maine has implemented its own program, funded in part by a grant from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Its web site can be found at www.maine.gov/agriculture/idme/.

Although it seems to be slow in coming, there is yet time for an outcry over this program to have some effect. Small farmers and landowners can take action to oppose implementation of this plan.

First, do not participate in the "voluntary" state program to register either your farm or your animals, as they'll use your willingness to participate in the program as justification for making it mandatory for everyone in the near future. If state or federal officials urge you to register either your premises or your animals, ask them whether your participation is voluntary or mandatory. Ask to see a copy of any legislation that gives them the authority to require compliance.

More importantly, contact any farming, breeding, or other associations that you might be a member of, asking them to oppose the NAIS. Ask these organizations to sponsor letter-writing campaigns to elected officials, both state and federal. Individually, you can write to your state and federal legislators. Letters sent via the postal service carry more weight than emails or form letters, but anything is better than nothing.

The United States Department of Agriculture plans the issuance of a NAIS rule for public comment in July of 2006. Be aware of this when the time comes, and be prepared to submit an individual comment opposing this rule.

Also, you should be aware of any state rules that might mandate earlier compliance. For example, Maine farmers are already being encouraged to voluntarily join the state's ID

program, and it intends to implement mandatory registration of livestock premises by March 7, 2005.

I am surprised, and discouraged, that there isn't already an outcry over this program.

"... and he provides that no one will be able to buy or to sell, except the one who has the mark, either the name of the beast or the number of his name." -- Rev. 13:17 (NASB)

National Animal Identification System Timeline

- * April, 2005 -- The USDA issued its Draft Strategic Plan & Draft Program Standards for public comment, which ended in July of 2005.

- * July, 2006 -- The target date for the USDA to issue a proposed rule setting forth the requirements for NAIS premises registration, animal identification, and animal tracking. There will be a limited public comment period after publication of the rule.

- * Fall, 2007 -- The USDA will publish a final rule to establish the requirements of the mandatory NAIS.

- * January, 2008 -- Premises registration and animal identification become mandatory.

- * January, 2009 -- Animal tracking becomes mandatory, including enforcement of the reporting of all animal movements.

Reprinted with permission of "All Maine Matters," which can be reached online at www.allmainematters.com.

Remember, this will be your last issue of the Newsletter if you have not renewed your membership. Your address label will let you know about your status. If your membership is Active, Family, or Youth, a green symbol denotes record of current payment, and a red 'time to renew' means just that. Please let us know if your record and ours do not agree: KGBAssn@aol.com.

NEWSFLASH! COAST-TO-COAST AM COVERS NAIS!

If you are a late-night radio fan you might have heard host George Noory interviewing Katherine Albrecht (www.spychips.com), with Kinder breeders Celeste Bishop and Pat Showalter from Washington State. NAIS and RFID technology took up the 3 hour main portion of the program, which aired on Wednesday night, March 17, and is available in the program archives if you are a Streamlink member. <http://www.coasttocoastam.com>

Celeste explained how she found out about how Washington state had identified her property and put her in the NAIS database without her knowledge or permission (see her story in this issue of the Newsletter), and Pat talked about the extreme negative effects that the program would have on her ability to farm. Katherine exposed the myth of RFID 'security', among many other topics that were quite hair-raising, and we were able to clearly present the case against NAIS. Also covered were things that individuals can do – primarily education. Many of the people who will be most severely affected have either not heard about NAIS, or are believing the statements coming from the USDA. Do your own research, don't volunteer for anything, and verify everything that you hear!

"Creative" Eye in the Sky

by Celeste Bishop
Snohomish, WA

November 2005-I was leaving on a trip to a friend's wedding and I scanned the mail briefly as I was heading out the door. Umm.... A 2005 Agricultural Identification Survey Form, complete with bar code, ID, our City, State, miscellaneous numbers, along with the name of our huge agricultural endeavor (one goat) and my husband. Most interesting. This was a first. The information was "odd" to say the least. I made a mental note to call to track down the source of this survey.

Upon my return home the first thing I did was call the phone number on the Ag Survey (Federal). "Where did you get this information?" I asked. The lady responding to my call, "Oh you must have purchased feed at your local feed store". "Not with this name," I replied. "Then you must have used a catalogue to order supplies," she responded. "Not under this name I didn't," I replied. "How did you get his information and what are these numbers? What is this ID?" "Well, if you didn't purchase feed or use a catalogue I really don't know. Why don't I give you the number of your state representative and maybe they can help you."

Within moments I was talking with our state Ag. department. The man I originally asked questions to didn't know how this information may have been obtained so he politely connected me to one of their statisticians. BINGO! Here is the conversation as it played itself out.

CB: "I would like to know how you obtained the information for this 2005 Ag. Survey and what this ID is all about?"

State: "Well, we have had to get very "creative" (emphasis on creative) this year to find out who has the "potential" for selling any products." We have gone to every website, every registry, forum, private enterprise, and collect the data which goes into a database. We then send out the survey. And then, we compare it with satellite shots of your property so that we can verify your potential."

CB: "What is this ID and bar code on this survey?"

State: "Every farm has one."

CB: "What is your definition of a farm?"

State: "Any property that has the potential to make \$1000."

CB: "What if you don't sell anything?"

State: "Well if you have the potential to you go into the database with this ID."

State: "Do you grow herbs?"

I did not answer the question.

CB-“What if I sell our goat? Do I get off the database?”

State: “No. You never get off the database. It is permanent. This ID will stay with your property whether you have animals or not.”

State; “What do you do with your goat?”

CB: Mistakenly, I responded, “She eats blackberry bushes”. Oops! Not a green statement.

CB: “So how did you get this information?”

State: “It appears as though you are on a website or a registry” she said as she decoded the information which she had in her possession.

State: “Do you have any other animals? Do you grow vegetables? Do you grow hay? Or nursery-stock? Do you have bees? Aquaculture products? Agricultural products?”

CB: “No, we live in the forest” I exclaimed.

State; “Do you own or rent your land?”

CB: “Own.”

State: “Do you receive government payments?”

CB: “No”

State: “Then I will put down that you are not active in farming at this time.”

Nevertheless our name and premise ID will remain in the database, for as I discovered yesterday, a minimum of 20 years, to be held at Ft. Collins, CO.

Do you see what I see? This data collection is “creatively” comprehensive and is far more reaching than just your farm. It is encroaching into every area of our lives. Think about the bigger picture and where do I personally draw the line? This is happening across the board in medicine, work place, social services, community service, commuting, natural disasters, now our food source and property. How much of your private information is being swapped between government and their partnerships (big commercial enterprise-also known as stakeholders)?

You may ask, “Is this really happening?” Yes it is. This is not a conspiracy theory, it is reality, and is about ready to affect your constitutional rights, maybe even your life.

THE BIG DEBATE -- FoodChain Radio: The Mark on the Beast I & II

For those of you with computer capability for listening to radio on the internet, there are two programs that might interest you. The first (#478) aired on January 14th, and host Michael Olson interviewed head USDA veterinarian, Dr. John Weimers, and Dr. Mary Zanoni, lawyer and NAIS researcher and opponent. Dr. Weimers used up most of the time for the interview, but made the USDA 'line' about the National Animal Identification System very clear. He tried to convince the audience that the program was voluntary, and when asked if it was not scheduled to become mandatory, he wouldn't say the word, but instead called it '100% participation'. He said a number of things that simply did not line up with what the NAIS Draft Strategic Plan says, and avoided answering about the differences. Dr. Zanoni did have a chance to put in a couple of telling points that piqued the curiosity of the host, so regardless of the fact that she had little time, she was able to cast doubt on the USDA version.

The second program (#479) came about because listeners were not happy that the first interview was so unbalanced. Host, Mr. Olson invited Dr. Zanoni to return, and then asked four small farmers from across the country to sit in as a panel to explain how the imposition of the National Animal Identification System would affect them personally. Two of the panel members were Kinder goat breeders – Celeste Bishop and Pat Showalter from Washington. The other two panelists were from Oklahoma and Maine. All were in agreement that they would not be able to stay in business if this program became mandatory as planned. In fact, the Maine participant and Dr. Zanoni had both abandoned proposed business plans for small-scale dairies because of the threat of NAIS. If you would like to listen to the archived programs, they can be accessed at <http://www.metrofarm.com/index.html>, then click on FoodChain Radio in the menu on the left side of the page. Listen and then make up your own minds!

Note: There is a daily radio program out of Missouri, The Derry Brownfield Show, (also available on the internet) that frequently discusses NAIS and related subjects. It is good listening, and excellent information and interviews. <http://www.derrybrownfield.com/>. Click on 'Podcast/MP3s' in the left hand menu to take you to the archives, and look for the subjects that you want. Then you can just listen.

Included in your Newsletter are copies of two informational flyers that you can photocopy and distribute if you are willing to join the battle against NAIS. In talking to people around us, we have discovered that few have even heard of NAIS, and those who have don't seem to understand the implications of such a massive program. The better informed people become, the more likely they are to stand up for our right to farm without government 'permission' and invasion of privacy.

In particular, be sure to talk to your veterinarians, feed store owners and livestock supply people. In the plan as it now stands, they are considered 'service providers and third parties' and on page 14 of the NAIS Draft Strategic Plan, under 'Cooperative', it reads "Service providers and third parties will assist by providing animal identification and movement records to the NAIS on behalf of their producer clients." In other words, they will be required to be 'snitches'! www.NoNAIS.org And Member-at-large, Dawn Leaming thought that her worst predators were the lions, coyotes and bears (KGBA Newsletter, Fall, 2005)! Unfortunately our own government has placed itself in #1 position!

IT IS BEING CALLED 'THE MARK ON THE BEAST'

By Celeste Bishop
Snohomish, WA.

Animal owners are feeling the impact of federal regulations mandating animal identification beginning this year. There is some confusion as to the type of identification required, as the draft legislation is different from the recent H.R. 1254 requiring an "electronic identification" system for livestock.

Brands - on hides (freeze or hot iron) or horns...

To understand animal identification one needs to look at historical, current and emerging technologies. Branding has been used for visual identification of animal ownership for hundreds of years. Since they do not provide positive identification of individual animals, brands are not suitable for use in national product integrity and traceback system: at best they provide herd identification. They can become illegible over time, and are subject to alteration and duplication by third parties.

Tattoos - on ear, shoulder, lip, tail web...

A tattoo is an indelible design or marking made by the insertion of a pigment into punctures or cuts in the skin. In technical terms, tattooing is micro-pigment implantation.

Tattooing was common among certain religious groups in the ancient Mediterranean world, which probably contributed to the prohibition of tattooing in Leviticus in the Bible. Some Christians, Jews and Muslims believe Leviticus 19:28 prohibits believers from getting tattoos. This was the best known identification system for Jews in the concentration camps during the Holocaust.

Ear tags and more current technology....

One of the most widely used in-herd approaches to identification are metal and plastic ear tags with printed alpha-numeric ID codes traditionally used by beef and dairy producers. The perceived advantages are: ease of application, possibility to visually identify individual animals and perceived low tag cost. Major acknowledged disadvantages are high loss rate and damage to the animal's body.

Falling within the tagging category are numerous tagging methods: Laser etched, harsh environmental electronic identification (EID), dog & cat tags, dog licenses, rabies tags, RFID transponders, RFIS tags, NID, RFID microchip implants, ATS Automatic Tagging System, Wildlife Conservation tags, Poultry Leg Bands, Game tags, and Tree tags.

No larger than a grain of rice, an Animal Transponder is injected into an animal, providing lifelong identification for livestock. Each transponder has a unique identification number, which is laser-programmed into the miniature integrated circuit at the time of manufacture. This number cannot be changed or duplicated, and provides positive identification that cannot be forged for an animal throughout its life. The transponder is sealed and after 2-3 hours the sealant dissolves, leaving the transponder in place for easy traceability. (ed. note: it has been recently proven that the VeriChip version can be hacked, altered, cloned, information stolen or deleted)

Nose printing is a very dependable form of identification in animals and nose patterns do not change and are unique to the animal, just like fingerprinting. Iris scans are expected to be very useful. Iris scans use common digital technology (like a digital camera) for input into and analysis by a computer program. An iris code can be stored in a database and used for later identification of an animal. Optical identification systems (retinal scanning, retinal imaging, and iris imaging) are the only three secure, biometric identification methods for animals.

They are low-cost, reliable, and like all biometric methods, they have an immediate advantage over systems such as radio ear tags because there is no mass-produced equipment requirement. A retinal image is obtained through the pupil, the same view will always be obtained. By combining an encrypted GPS signal of longitude, latitude and time with an image check into a retinal image, it becomes nearly impossible to fake identification.

Lastly, DNA marking: a marker is a piece of the DNA molecule that is associated with a certain trait of an organism. Markers help scientists determine the location (map) of genes that control important traits. The DNA fingerprinting technique is used with traditional genetic analysis of family pedigrees and breeding data to identify DNA markers that are inherited along with important traits. This process is sometimes referred to as marker-assisted selection.

Due to the global economy demands and the perceived disease threat, it appears as though traditional forms of animal identification are being phased-out. They are being replaced with electronic identification, including an alternative identification form -- either biometrics or DNA finger-printing. At this time, we still haven't been told what will be acceptable, but in studying the documents surrounding the Draft Strategic Plan, the intent is to require RFID technology in concert with one of the newer biometric technologies.

KGBA BOARD VOTES TO OPPOSE NAIS

Following a discussion of the issue of the National Animal Identification System, KGBA Vice-President, Sue Huston moved that the Kinder Goat Breeders Association take an official stand opposing NAIS. The motion was seconded by Secretary, Linda Nygaard, and was passed unanimously.

It was agreed that this issue of the Newsletter be used to educate and equip the membership of the KGBA to fight the imposition of this program, which could mean the demise of the Kinder breed. So many of the Kinders are in the hands of the very small farmer or families with just a couple of does for a family milk supply, that the effects of the NAIS could mean that they would be unable to comply with the regulations. None of our several larger herds would be able to comply due to the financial demands and the weight of complex administration.

CHECK TO SEE WHAT YOUR STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE IS DOING TO 'ENSURE FARM AND FOOD SECURITY'

S.1534 (if Passed)

Safe and Secure Food Act of 2005 (Introduced in Senate) United States
'SEC. 411. FOOD SECURITY.

- '(1) developing a security plan that addresses the specific vulnerabilities of the establishment (your farm);
- '(2) developing an emergency response plan for the establishment (Farm);
- '(3) securing establishment boundaries (Gate it Danno, don't let anyone on your property including those predators, human and animal);
- '(4) providing guards, alarms, and outside lighting, as necessary (sounds like a concentration camp to me);
- '(5) performing background checks before hiring new personnel (ok y'all every time you hire a people or an animal it's: a background check);
- '(6) limiting access to the establishment; (Hey, in WA we have to post a sign outside warning people our farm is hazardous-if passed)
- '(7) accounting for missing stock (Now how many chicks did I have?);
- '(8) implementing mail-handling procedures; and
- '(9) such other security procedures (A little vague I would say) as the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent unintentional or intentional contamination of meat and meat food products.

Comments on NAIS "Draft Program Standards" and "Draft Strategic Plan"

<http://www.organicconsumers.org/ofgu/ID060202.cfm>

By Mary Zanoni, Ph.D. (Cornell), J.D. (Yale)

Feb 6, 2006, 18:25 – this is a must read if you want to understand the constitutional/legal implications of NAIS. Dr. Zanoni is a lawyer who has given up her practice in order to devote her full attention to exposing and opposing the USDA's animal identification plans. She is the Executive Director of Farm for Life, an organization that "informs the public about issues affecting small farmers, citizens who produce their own food, and consumers who want to assure the availability of safe, local food." You can support their work by subscribing to their very informative quarterly newsletter – individual subscription is \$25. Make your check payable to "Farm for Life" and mail to: Farm for Life, PO Box 501, Canton, NY 13617. E-mail – mlz@slc.com



The mark of the beast

Posted: January 7, 2006

1:00 a.m. Eastern

By Henry Lamb

© 2006 WorldNetDaily.com

The federal government is launching a National Animal Identification System that will, by 2009, require that every agricultural animal in the nation be equipped with an identification device through which its movement can be traced from birth to slaughter. At the moment, the program is voluntary; by 2009, non-compliance can result in fines of up to \$1,000 per day.

Implementation is coming fast. By April, 2006, 25 percent of all "premises" (any location where animals are kept) are to be registered with the government. By July, an Interstate Certificate of Veterinary Inspection system is to be in place in every state. By January 2008, all premises and all animals are to be registered. By July, 2008, the movement of all animals will be tracked. In January, 2009, the program becomes mandatory.

The stated purpose of the program is to enable government to trace, within 48 hours, the source of a faulty animal food product. The effect of the program is the transfer of the control of private property to the government – while forcing the property owner to pay the cost of the transfer.

Last week's column asked: "What do you call it when government takes away the use of private property, but leaves the title in the name of the property owner?" Dozens of letter writers correctly responded: "Fascism." Last week's column was about government controlling the use of land; this week, the government is controlling the use of animals.

The program is not limited to commercial producers; it includes the half-dozen chickens at grandma's house. Her "premises" and each chicken must be registered with the government as the program now stands. In fact, the pet parakeet in a cage on the 20th floor of a condo in Miami Beach must also be registered, along with the premises. As the program now stands, there are no exceptions.

Surely some of the stupidity will be squeezed out of the program as more people become aware of it and insist that government has gone too far. The question, however, is not how far is too far, but whether government should go there at all.

Nothing among the enumerated powers granted to the federal government by the U.S. Constitution can be construed to include the power to control the use of private property. The federal government is empowered to regulate interstate commerce, but grandma's chickens and aunt Jane's parakeet do not constitute interstate commerce.

Everyone wants a safe, abundant and affordable food supply, which America has enjoyed for years – without a National Animal Identification System. Why is it necessary now? The increased terrorist threat certainly justifies tightening up security in the food chain. But the NAIS does little or nothing to tighten security, while imposing ridiculous burdens upon the small producer.

The NAIS was initiated by the National Institute of Animal Agriculture, a non-government organization consisting of the leaders of agribusiness. The program they designed tends to shift the burden, cost and ultimate responsibility for food safety from the agribusiness giants to the small producer.

Interstate commerce conjures up images of businesses such as Tyson Foods, which has mastered the art of vertically integrated marketing. Tyson controls the production of its chickens from birth to market, using farmers only to provide space and labor to get their product to slaughter. Here is where government should focus its regulatory concern – and leave grandma's chickens alone.

Suppliers of beef, pork and lamb, often buy their animals from small producers who work hard to raise healthy, marketable animals. The agribusiness suppliers are free to buy, or not buy, from any producer. Here, at the point where the product enters the food chain, is where responsibility, security and regulatory control should be focused – not on the already overburdened small producer.

But no. The NAIS requires the small producer to not only bear the cost of the program, but also to be the ultimate scapegoat in the event that an agribusiness supplier's product is found to be faulty, for whatever reason. Should little Johnny get sick after eating a hamburger made with beef supplied by BigAgri Packing Company, BigAgri simply points the finger to the producer, or producers, whose cows were in the batch from which Johnny's hamburger was made. Agribusiness shifts its responsibility for buying only healthy product to the farmer, who must guarantee his animals to be healthy.

The NAIS is an industry-designed program which will drive small producers out of business, reduce competition and ultimately put both supply and price in the hands of industry giants – unless opponents of this program get organized.

Henry Lamb is the executive vice president of the Environmental Conservation Organization and chairman of Sovereignty International.

153 days was the charm!

I guess it just took her a bit longer to finish them out (147 days is the average), but here they are -- all FOUR of them (3 boys, 1 girl, but all healthy and have homes awaiting). The three boys are on the left -- girl on the right. They came between 2:30 and 3:50 AM. Trillium needed no help at all, but gave me a bit of a start when she pushed out number three tail first! They are all between 5 and 6 pounds.



Photo and story contributed by Pat Showalter

Getting to Know You

Please let us hear your story -- about your farm, your Kinders, how NAIS would affect you. Let's continue the discussion and share information! We're also looking for photos to share of those special 'goat' times -- with or without people. This is your Newsletter -- your goat experiences and opinions are important!

Please contact:

Pat Showalter KinderZed@aol.com

Jan Herleikson wsh2write@usa.net.

Kinder Goat Breeders Association

PO Box 1575

Snohomish, WA 98291-1575

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO HARVEY CONSIDINE

From the American Dairy Goat Association Web Site

The worldwide community of dairy goat enthusiasts will miss Harvey James Considine, who passed over peacefully at home surrounded by family the night of March 25, 2006, after complications from prolonged illness. He was one month shy of his eightieth birthday. Many things could be said of this charismatic, dynamic, often controversial, devotee of dairy goats and the use of goat's milk and related products. Some would say he founded a dynasty within the American Dairy Goat Association. Being a deeply committed evangelical Christian, he would most likely prefer to be remembered as the patriarch of an extended Considine clan, composed of a beloved spouse, twelve children, forty-six grandchildren and four great grandchildren. However, one might choose to memorialize his life, those who ever met him face to face can not ever forget him.

Born a fourth son in a farm family on April 25, 1926, his early life was of meager circumstances during the depression era. While attending high school in Portage, Wisconsin, he was very active in debate and FFA, becoming a state officer of the latter. As an FFA student, he first exhibited potatoes at the Wisconsin State Fair in 1941, as it was the only project affordable to him. After attending the University of Wisconsin-Madison for two years, he dropped out to marry and start a family at a young age. For nine years, he worked as a herdsman/manager on two Holstein dairies in southern Wisconsin. He acquired his first registered goat, a Saanen, in 1946, joined ADGA, registered the prefix Diamond and enrolled on official milk test. In 1948, the Diamond herd was first exhibited at the Wisconsin State Fair and continues to do so, making it the most senior exhibitor at what is now one of the consistently largest dairy goat shows in the United States.

In 1952, he moved his family back to Portage and started a dairy cattle artificial insemination business which he operated for seven years. Fifty years ago great tragedy entered his life with the untimely death of his first wife, leaving him a widower with seven children, aged from eleven years to ten months. Seven months later his barn burned to the ground with three quarters of the herd trapped in the inferno. Against many odds, he kept his family together and with the aid of neighbors raised seven children as a single parent. One year later he was first elected to the ADGA board of directors and with only a few years out, continued to do so until 2004. He was by far the longest seated director in the history of ADGA. He has been the second longest licensed ADGA judge as well, actively judging through the 2005 season. He served as second vice-president for thirteen years. He served on many committees throughout the years, including chairing the Spotlight Sale. He was a contributing author to the original unified scorecard for judging and the showmanship scorecard.

In 1959, he moved the family to Waukesha County in southern Wisconsin and began managing a goat dairy that would eventually number one thousand head. In 1960, he met and married the second love of his life, Elaine. (They celebrated their forty-fifth wedding anniversary on December 27, 2005.) Five more children were added to the family, the last and twelfth being born at an ADGA convention. The family moved

back to Portage in 1972 and has lived on the same farm since. In 1976, he became one of the first classifiers for ADGA. Differences of opinion and policy occurred in the 1980's, and he started his own evaluation service which he operated through 2005. He loved dairy goat shows, whether as an exhibitor or as presiding judge. He has been a perennial favorite as a National Show judge. He can rightfully be remembered as the father of ADGA judges, as ten of twelve children have at one time or other held official licenses. Three sons are still actively involved with operating goat dairies and ADGA activities, such as past-President and co-chair of Judges Training Committee. In 2003, he was awarded the Helen C. Hunt Distinguished Service Award by ADGA.

In 2004, he was made Director Emeritus.

His sphere of influence extended far beyond the borders of the United States, much of this due to his prolific writing. Since 1976, he has provided Dairy Goat Journal with the popular Dairy Goat Judging feature. He is co-author of the textbook on Dairy Goat Judging Techniques, as well as two other full length books. He has made numerous judging and speaking tours internationally.

The name of Harvey Considine is certainly the most widely acknowledged in dairy goat circles around the world.

The family will be establishing a memorial fund in his honor to financially assist first and second time candidates at ADGA Judges Training Conferences. Contributions can be mailed to the attention of

Shirley McKenzie at ADGA,
PO Box
865, Spindale NC 28160.

Not mentioned in this tribute written by one of Harvey's sons, but important to Kinder breeders is the fact that from the time he evaluated the first Kinder herd (Zederkamm Farm) on July 11, 1990, Kinder goats found a special place in his heart, and he remained a valuable friend and mentor through the subsequent years. As he was finishing up that first herd evaluation, he asked if he could sample some of the fresh, warm milk in order to judge the quality. His remark was that he had never tasted any better milk! Through evaluating and judging hundreds of Kinder goats, he helped us to refine our Breed Standard, advised us to select for the traits that we wanted rather than alter percentages, and built for us our Kinder Scorecard. His willingness to share his vast knowledge of goats, and his patient teaching whenever he was judging a show or evaluating a herd, made him beloved by many. The Kinders were fortunate to have benefited from his generous spirit.

Harvey's lovely wife, Elaine, was usually his warm and gracious companion and 'secretary', and it has been our honor to have worked with them both over the years. Our prayers go out to her and the rest of the family at this difficult time. Harvey and Elaine are both permanent fixtures in our Kinder history, and we are grateful that they shared a piece of their lives with us.

The Kinder Goat Breeders Association