

breeds, this "antique feature" has been refined into the smart drop, prick, and button ears of modern terrier breeds. Not so for Glens.

In the original Irish standard of 1933, the language regarding ears was confined to four words: *light ear, carried variously*. The founding mothers and fathers of our breed, over time, elaborated a bit on this and articulated the two allowable ear carriage for the breed: rose or half-prick. If this sounds familiar to you, there is a reason; nearly identical language can be found in the AKC standard for the Staffordshire Bull Terrier. (As an interesting footnote, the author of the language in the Irish standard for the Glen was also a breeder of Staffies.)

Perhaps the most common faults in the breed are ear faults. Correct ears for a Glen should manifest four features: They should be small; they should be rose or half-prick; they should be set wide apart and well back; and they should be a matching pair. That last one usually draws a laugh at breed seminars. Yes, we expect there to be two ears on each dog—but the point being made is that they should both be of the same carriage, set, and size. A correct pair of ears contributes mightily to the breed's unique expression.

The most common ear faults are large ears, a mismatched pair, or a pair of full drop ears. A mismatched pair is most often one full drop ear "paired" with one rose or one half-prick ear, and this is most undesirable. A pair of full drop ears, commonly seen, or full prick ears, rarely seen, is especially undesirable, this being one of the few conformation faults that the standard specifically mentions. This objection is common to all three Glen standards in the world—the AKC standard, the Irish/FCI standard, and the Kennel Club (England) standard.

Ears should be small, to the point of appearing small for the size of the head. Large ears are common and incorrect. A heavy, houndy ear is most objectionable. The action of the ears should be expressive and responsive when alert, and thrown back when in repose. Much as there is no preference for color in our

breed (among the allowable colors), there is no preference for either a rose or half-prick ear, and they appear in the breed with about the same frequency.

—Bruce Susman, New York, N.Y.;
BLUEKAFKA@aol.com ♦

Irish Terriers



Call for Legislative Action

We're from the government, and we're here to help.

Watch and learn.

The Lord helps those who help themselves.

These are but a few of the platitudes that came to mind while this column was under construction. The topic is legislation and the need for all of us to remain vigilant, be proactive, and let elected representatives know that we responsible breeders and owners will not sit idly by while our rights are taken away.



At present, the HSUS is going mainstream, with a lot of the group's effort and money devoted to attacking agribusiness, invading corporate boardrooms, and schmoozing with its Congressional Animal Protection Caucus and multitudes of state officials.

While many state legislatures are short of cash and conflicted as to the best use of limited funds, it still seems that misdirected animal-welfare proposals are deemed safe pieces of legislation to sponsor.

Take for example the proposed mandatory spay-neuter ordinance in New Orleans, dog-food tax in sunny California, or barking ordinances in Piscataway, New Jersey. Also abundant are anti-tethering ordinances, breeder licensing, facilities requirements, limitations on the numbers of dogs one can own, and the ever-popular breed-specific legislation. These are all alive and well and could be coming soon to a state legislature or municipality near you.

In New York the topic "Humane Treatment of Animals" was addressed in a roundtable discussion that had as its

objective "the development of regulations that benefit animals and govern their appropriate treatment."

Responsible animal owners were excluded from the event. We can take a little comfort from knowing that we were in good company, since many veterinarians, educators, wildlife experts, farmers, and zookeepers were excluded as well.

So what does all this mean? It means that the fight goes on and that it is not a fair fight. With money and a well-oiled machine, celebrities are taken in and legislators buy in and are bought out for ridiculously small amounts. The result is a very savvy, effective public-relations program with if not respected at least well-known personalities who draw attention to the carefully crafted message. Liberal use of images of emaciated, abandoned, and abused animals rounds out the Madison Avenue-style presentation.

Sad to say, being a responsible breeder-owner-exhibitor is not enough to turn the tide. Dealing with the public in an honest and forthright way, leaving places we visit with our dogs pristine, participating in responsible-dog-ownership programs, being a good neighbor, and so on are just the beginning—and a curse on the heads of those who are not there yet!

For self-protection we have to be politically savvy and proactive. We need to monitor our local and state governments and raise the alarm when trouble brews. We must do more than monitor the websites of organizations that serve as watchdogs; we must personally take action whenever we can. We need to reach out to our elected officials so they know how we feel and how those feelings can impact the ballot box.

Most of all, we must accept the fact that we cannot sit idly by and think that someone else will make the effort on our behalf. Maybe others will act, but without numbers the volume is set too low. Rest assured that the numbers, the cash boxes, and the volume of our adversaries are at full capacity. —Robert Clyde and Marianne Kehoe, Plainfield, N.J.; m_dkehoe@verizon.net ♦