

Submitter: DEBBIE GOODRICH
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure: HB3214

I am writing to oppose HB 3124 as it harms my ability to do educational programs with parrots.

I am a professional individual who cannot afford affiliation with AZA or GFAS but is an professional member of many more organizations like IMATA, IAATE, ABMA, IAABC. My standard of training parrots is high.

We have been traveling to OR for programs for over 10 years. I have been ensured that this bill will not directly harm my business because I am involved with parrots and they are not currently on the list. However, what the legislature seems to fail to understand is that this bill will not remain as intended for even one season. Parrots will eventually be added that are no longer allowed to travel or perform in front of an audience.

These are the primary problems of the bill:

1. There already is animal cruelty law in the State of Oregon to prevent starvation of animals to force them to perform and also hitting animals to force them to perform.
2. Only two institutions are considered for collaborations. GFAS is an institution that does not inspect facilities but insteads relies chiefly on trust for most of its members. AZA is the only one of the two mentioned that actually inspects facilities regularly.
3. The term performance is in this bill as if an animal performing is somehow animal cruelty. It is not. If an animal is alive, it is performing. Animals need function and purpose for their inherent welfare.
4. The term traveling animal act is in this bill as if traveling with an animal to a performance is somehow animal cruelty. It is not. Especially since this bill exempts AZA or GFAS. If anyone is allowed to travel over 12 hours with an animal for any reason, it is clear that the act of traveling with animals is not cruel. Therefore, the very name of the title of this bill is a serious problem.
5. The intent of the bill was to stop bears on bicycles but we have not seen that in decades. No known agents or agencies operating in OR currently are in business as those kinds of performances are already economically dying as public information and perception changes. If it was the intent to stop bears on bicycles, call it the circus ban. If the intent is to stop cub holding of large predators, call it ban on cub holding of large predators. Vs. Traveling animal act.
6. The bill is trying to separate entertainment terms from education terms and this is almost wholly unenforceable. Or will be too expensive to enforce. Imagine an animal control officer or police officer having to follow me to over 100 programs in OR alone with just me to determine IF my program was violating any form of the bill. Or being

called out to every single one that has an animal rights advocate saying this program is not educational enough. Animals require novelty stimuli in order for them to be successful in their overall life. So, yes, I include novel stimuli in my program that can definitely be determined to be entertaining vs. educational.

7. The bill is trying to determine degrees of naturalness when human care situations are unnatural already. Zoos are currently required to disallow animals from receiving novel enrichment devices because they might be construed as unnatural. That is harming their ability to work with puzzles and other novelty.

8. The bill sets a precedence that will not remain within the scope currently set. We have already seen this in WA state with the puppy mill ban that allowed exemptions come back to deny exemptions the very next year. The ask will not end, it is guaranteed.

9. Most of these very expensive animal rights agencies DO NOT EMPLOY NOR HAVE actual animals in their care or current animal caretakers at institutions they are trying to regulate. Instead, they are x-employees not knowing current standards of care that have been employed since their exit and very expensive lobbyist-based lawyers us who are in the animal care industry cannot afford. Our money goes to animals.