

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

Hellow Judicial Committee,

We appreciate your hard work in bringing this matter to your committee once more. It is critical we address humane care of animals. I presented testimony on March 16th virtually. This bill remains concerning no matter what solely based on the title of the measure alone. There are elements in the bill that state making money from animals should be labelled as cruel but also be allowed to do if it is educational only. The bill states that traveling with an animal is cruel but it's okay if a GFAS or Zoological are allowed. It states an animal being unnatural is cruel but does not consider that animals in human care are not animals that live in the natural world. So, does that mean that all animals in human care is just cruel then because it's not natural? How is performance defined? A living animal moves. Needs to move. It's alive. Is it based on where they are moving, why they are moving, when they are moving? Is moving in front of any audience cruelty to the animal that is moving? Only if cruelty in training practice is being used. If it's reported that an animal being trained is being beaten to train them or food removed to get them to perform, that is OREGONIAN animal cruelty law at play. Performing alone is not cruelty. Again, the animals needs to move, needs to be alive. Putting how they move and do on cue is not cruelty. This bill asks for that to be considered cruelty. That jumping for an audience is cruel. Or that it's okay for one organization to allow it to not be cruel, but another organization is considered cruel. If the practice is animal cruelty, it should not matter who does it or why. It is clear and obvious that performance for animals is not cruelty. Being unnatural because of the unnatural environments they live in are not cruelty. That the reason, being entertainment or education is not cruelty. Entertainment cannot be separated from education when it comes to live animals. If we do not engage our audience with entertainment in addition to the educational message, we lose our audiences. Entertainment is required for the message to strike home. It is not cruelty of the animal itself if it's performing for entertainment or for education. Both require payment. Why? To pay for the animal care. So, both are exploitive with one not being less or more exploitive than another unless one is using cruelty for the behavior. If they are using cruelty to get the animal to perform, use Oregon's animal cruelty law to put those bad actors out of business.

My animals love to travel, love to perform, love unnatural enrichment devices like puzzles to solve problems. These three terms cannot be included in this bill for it to pass as it says it is cruel. Better clarification is needed. Clearer messaging required. Is this about cruel circus practices? Then call it a ban on cruel circus practices. Or a ban on cub holding. Instead, this is a flat ban on anything that travels as an animal

just in the title alone. This needs to not pass as is in the title alone.