



OREGON HUNTERS ASSOCIATION

Protecting Oregon's Wildlife, Habitat and Hunting Heritage

P.O. Box 1706, Medford, OR 97501 • (541) 772-7313
oha@oregonhunters.org • oregonhunters.org

May 4, 2023

Senate Committee On Rules
Re: SB 85

Chair Lieber, Vice-chair Knopp, Members of the Committee,

The Oregon Hunters Association (OHA) is Oregon's largest state-centric hunter conservation organization, representing 10,000 sportsmen and women throughout 26 chapters in the state. Our mission statement is 'to protect Oregon's wildlife, habitat, and hunting heritage' and we have a strong history of advocating for science-based wildlife management.

While SB 85 does not address wildlife management issues, the -4 amendment has included language that requires us to provide testimony in opposition.

Section 10 (b) of the -4 amendment, titled 'Animal Welfare', seeks to create a workgroup to "assess the appropriateness of allowing confined animal feeding operations to use the exemption described in ORS 167.335".

ORS 167.335 lists the following exemptions for ORS 167.315 (Animal abuse in the second degree) to 167.333 (Sexual assault of an animal):

- (a) The treatment of livestock being transported by owner or common carrier;
- (b) Animals involved in rodeos or similar exhibitions;
- (c) Commercially grown poultry;
- (d) Animals subject to good animal husbandry practices;
- (e) The killing of livestock according to the provisions of ORS 603.065;
- (f) Animals subject to good veterinary practices as described in ORS 686.030;
- (g) Lawful fishing, hunting and trapping activities;
- (h) Wildlife management practices under color of law;
- (i) Lawful scientific or agricultural research or teaching that involves the use of animals;
- (j) Reasonable activities undertaken in connection with the control of vermin or pests;

and

- (k) Reasonable handling and training techniques.

Clearly, there is no one specific exemption listed in ORS 167.335 that would address confined animal feeding operations. As such, assigning a workgroup to assess whether a confined animal feeding operations is exempt from criminal animal abuse statutes would require a vast and subjective interpretation of terms such as good animal husbandry practices, good veterinary practices, and reasonable handling and training techniques. Opening this statute for this purpose also put at risk the remaining exemptions, such as lawful fishing, hunting and trapping activities.

The exemptions provided by ORS 167.335 have recently come under attack by a series of initiative petitions, IP13 and IP3. Initiative Petition 3, the current iteration, would remove all of the exemptions listed above except *(f) Animals subject to good veterinary practices as described in ORS 686.030*, thus criminalizing this entire list of lawful activities and practices.

While the attempt to criminalizing these lawful practices and activities may seem too extreme to be deemed serious, the inclusion of the language in Section 10 (b) of the -4 amendment are equally concerning. A workgroup tasked with discerning the exemptions of ORS 167.335 and their applicability to confined animal feeding operations treads dangerously close to these extreme attempts to criminalize animal agriculture practices.

OHA has worked closely with our partners in natural resources, agriculture, and livestock production to fight IP3 and the egregious effects such a movement would have on all Oregonians. As such, we stand with them now to oppose the language included in -4 amendment which carries an inference that animal agriculture is a criminal act of animal abuse.

Oregon Hunters Association staunchly opposes such language and urges the committee to critically assess the intention of including this language. With the inclusion of Section 10, SB 85 tips dangerously close to the anti-animal agriculture rhetoric being put forth by extreme organizations.

OHA urges the committee to vote no on SB 85.

Thank you,
Amy Patrick
Policy Director