

Raszka Shelley

From: Gallagher Chuck
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2015 1:08 PM
To: Raszka Shelley
Subject: FW: For submission to the Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee, Feb 19 2015

2641 testimony

From: S Harris [mailto:rawhide_braider@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2015 11:41 AM
To: Gallagher Chuck
Subject: For submission to the Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee, Feb 19 2015

February 17, 2015

To: the House Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources. C/O
Chuck Gallagher. Regarding House Bill 2641.

From: Steve Harris, Roseburg Oregon

Greetings; thank you for serving Oregon.

There are ambiguities and problems with House Bill 2641. Here are two examples:

Section 2. (1) says that “prior to awarding an animal as a prize... a person shall: (a) Ensure that the animal is provided with at least minimum care prior to the contest” However OregonLaws.org shows that law 167.325(1) (a) defines “failure to provide minimum care for an animal in such person’s custody or control...” as a crime. This part of HB 2641 is redundant.

HB 2641 has a more severe problem; Section 2. (B) says that a person must “Ensure that the animal is not chased, kicked or otherwise subjected to offensive physical contact prior to or during the contest...” Animals in a natural environment often kick and chase others of their own species and different species; they do so for a variety of reasons. Those actions cannot be defined as inherently offensive to the animals, nor as self-evidently criminal. Defining “offensive physical contact” is impossible. Offensive to whom? People of some religions see any contact with certain types of animals as

offensive. Other people are offended at the thought of touching an animal for hygienic reasons. Certain people believe animals ought not be touched for ethical reasons. However none of these sensibilities has the inherent right to be codified and bind people who believe differently. What constitutes offence to an animal is pure speculation. Animal psychology is a lifetime study for any serious student; it should not be whimsically defined in a phrase like “offensive physical contact”.

HB 2641 has a more fundamental problem. Besides being redundant and hopelessly ambiguous it seeks to replace common decency with police. Those of us who spend our lives with animals care about their welfare, and really know what that means. Most people want to responsibly care for their pets. But responsible care is best defined by the community, and enforced by the words and actions of neighbors and community members. HB 2641 is unworkable and unnecessary, please throw it out. And please have confidence in your constituents; we care about animals and people, and are working to make the world a better place.

Thank you

Steve Harris
Roseburg Oregon