

THE ENDANGERED BREEDS ASSOCIATION

Bulldog



Banter

NUMBER 92 • SEPTEMBER 2011

Nominations open for board

Nominations for board members to Endangered Breeds Association are due by October 15.

Board members whose terms expire are Jean Carpenter of Louisiana, JoAnn LeBlanc of Texas, and Judith Brecka of California.

Those nominated must be a member in good standing of EBA for a period of at least two years prior to the nomination.

Voting will be in November, and those nominated will be announced in a late October, early November issue of the

Banter. Election results will be posted on EBA's website and announced at the 2012 American Dog Breeders Association convention.

To make a nomination, send the individual's name via e-mail to EBA President Kim Krohn at krohndog@swbell.net



Here's how animal rights laws work

From a comment article in the Texas Tribune in re: HB 1451

Nine out of 10 new laws relating to pets are actually anti-pet in purpose. However, since 'anti-pet' wouldn't sell, the real purpose is never put on the label. Pet laws must be studied to figure out what they will really do. The true purpose will be found among what would ordinarily be considered the 'unintended consequences' and is often the reverse of what we're told.

The 'law of unintended consequences' is familiar in lawmaking. Unlimited welfare benefits seemed like a way to lift people out of poverty but the long-term effect was to build a cycle of dependence in which successive generations grew up and choose to 'get a check' rather than building the skills needed for adult independence. Laws passed with only the best of intentions thus caused the

numbers of the poor to grow, decade by decade.

Everything else is just brightly colored wrapping paper, intended to build support and get the law passed. This tactic has been so well polished that you will find respected and well intended community leaders backing even the worst anti-pet bills.

When animal rights laws are claimed to be needed to prevent tragedy – 'pit bull' bans, extremely punitive dangerous dog laws, sometimes anti-tethering laws – you will often find the mother or other close relative of someone badly hurt or killed by a dog as a figurehead for the effort to pass the law.

These individuals are sincere and you cannot blame them for trying to prevent a repetition. The tactic is effective because it is hard to say "Mrs. Smith, I'm very sorry about Tommy but you don't have a clue what you're

talking about." But these poor people are twice victimized – the second time, by an animal rights movement that is cynically using them to put a human face on an anti-human and inhumane campaign.

A few examples of 'what you see and what you get'

1. 'Mandatory spay neuter (MSN) laws' requiring all dogs to be spayed or neutered, generally with an expensive 'intact animal' licenses offered under tight restrictions, are promoted as a way to reduce 'pet overpopulation.' This seems logical: If there are no excess intact animals, then unwanted births can't happen.

But it doesn't work that way. These laws cannot be enforced -- you can't tell if a dog is spayed or neutered (S/N) at a glance (for females, you may not even be able to locate

See RIGHTS on Page 4

Memberships expire Dec. 31 unless multi-years are paid.



**BULLDOG
BANTER**

**Joan Morrison,
Editor**

**Route 1, Box 71
Gore, OK 74435**

The Bulldog Banter welcomes articles, news clippings, letters and other comments from its readers. The editor reserves the right to edit submissions as needed. All letters for publication must be signed.

Material in the Bulldog Banter may be reproduced, but please credit the Bulldog Banter as the source.

To subscribe to the Bulldog Banter, please see the EBA Membership application on the back page.

**ELECTRONIC
DIRECTORY**

**Endangered Breeds
Association**

www.endangeredbreedsassociation.org

American Kennel Club

www.akc.org

www.animallaw.com

www.responsiblepetowners.org

**American Dog Breeders
Association**

www.adba.cc

**National Animal Interest
Alliance**

www.naiaonline.org

**WE WANT TO MEET
YOUR PET!**

E-mail your photograph to featuresboss@yahoo.com.

Photographs are printed as space allows. Include your name, your pet's name and the town where you live. NO SALES.

Thank you, Colby family

Mr. Louis B. Colby, 90, of Newburyport, MA, died in July in the Country Rehabilitation and Nursing Center, Newburyport, after a brief illness. He was the beloved husband of the late V. Marie (Butt) Colby with whom he shared 69 years of marriage.

Louis was born in Newburyport, son of the late John P. and Florence (Fuller) Colby. He was a lifelong resident of Newburyport and was a graduate of Newburyport High School Class of 1938.

He was a WW II Army veteran and held the rank of Private First Class and was awarded the Asiatic Pacific Theater Campaign Ribbon and was a member of the Pigeon Section of the US Army Signal Corps.

Louis worked as a salesman for Standard Brands for 46 years until his retirement in 1986. Lou was a dog fancier, he was a world renowned breeder of the American Pit Bull Terrier and of game chickens. The Colby family has been breeding Pit Bull Terriers in Newburyport for over 100 years.

Lou's true devotion was his family and friends. He could often be seen driving a team of horses on a hay ride through Maudsley State Park, milking cows and racing his homing pigeons. He had a special talent for telling stories and sharing his life experiences. He also enjoyed driving his standard bred race horses. He was awarded Dog Man of the year in 2000 by American Dog Breeders Association.

He was the father to William A. Colby and his wife, Lisa, of Newburyport, John R. Colby and his wife, Cindy, of Duncanville,



TX, Bruce A. Colby of Newburyport, Marjorie Colby Sullivan of Hamilton, Janice C. Morse and her husband, Charles, of Berwick, ME, Peter L. Colby of Seabrook, NH, Paul F. Colby and his wife, Ann, of Newburyport and Scott P. Colby and his wife, Heather, of

Amesbury. He was the cherished grandfather of his 15 grandchildren, 7 great-grandchildren and many nieces and nephews.

He was the father of the late Louis B. Colby Jr., father-in-law of the late Phil L. Sullivan Jr., brother of the late John Colby, Joseph Colby, Alexander "Mike" Colby, Jackman "Dick" Colby, Marjorie Fuller and Helen Scott.

The family requested donations be made to Endangered Breeds Association in lieu of flowers. The board of directors of EBA gratefully thanks the family for this wonderful gift, and more than \$2,000 was donated to continue the fight against unfair dog legislation and ordinances.

Chihuahuas now join Australia's 'Most Dangerous Dogs' list

Tiny chihuahuas have now been officially declared one of the most menacing dogs in Australia.

The pint-sized dogs are among pets listed as part of new laws aimed at curbing rising dog attacks, reports News.com.au.

They might stand just a few inches tall, but the small pets have now officially been declared menacing creatures by authorities, under controversial new state laws aimed at slowing a rising number of dog attacks.

More than a year after the laws were introduced, only 110 dogs have been declared menacing in Queensland, but authorities predict that will soar as awareness of the new laws spreads.

While the expected bigger breeds, such as German Shepherds, have made the list, it is not just large dogs that are spreading fear.

The list also includes pomeranians, shar pei, maltese-crosses, fox terrier-crosses and doodle-crosses.



EBA BOARD

Kim Krohn, President
Blue Springs, MO
816-228-1512
krohndog@swbell.net

Tom Lundberg, Vice President
Fruitvale, TX
214-662-1971
tom@vmctac.com

Doris Hutson, Secretary
Walker, LA
225-665-0314
kdhutson@cox.net

Joan Morrison, Treasurer
Gore, OK
918-487-5798
morrison@mynewroads.com

Jean Carpenter
Albany, LA
225-567-5120
ebajeanc@aol.com

Russ Krohn
Blue Springs, MO
816-228-1512
ttkck1@swbell.net

Patty Bullock
Riverton, UT
801-913-8197
PBullock04@msn.com

JoAnn LeBlanc
Dayton, TX
936-258-8490
tadpits@aol.com

Linda Emmert
Seneca, MO
417-776-8281
flyinge@netins.net

Jean Keating
Sylvania, OH
canineadvocate1@yahoo.com

Judith Brecka
Santa Monica, CA
310-417-4091
champalf@hotmail.com

Hank Greenwood, ADBA Rep./Advisor
Salt Lake City, UT
801-554-1818
adba@adba.cc

When Animal Control knocks on your door

Dog owners and ethical breeders are increasingly being targeted by the animal control. Some neighbors retaliate against owners just because of a breed; you are a new neighbor; or arguments and misunderstandings about something not related to dogs. The disgruntled person calls the local animal control and makes a complaint. Remember that some animal control agencies are a law enforcement agency. They are bound by the Constitution. Other animal control officers can call for police assistance. In either case, you need to know your rights when they appear at your door.

The Knock:

Do not let them in your home or in your yard.

Do not talk from an open doorway. Step outside and close the door.

If they claim to have a warrant, demand to see it. A warrant will be specific as to which areas the officers are allowed to search.

Some "breeder permits" stipulate that animal control has your permission to enter at any time. You still have the right to revoke the permission at any time. However, if you refuse your permit may be cancelled. If you have a breeder permit, know it by heart as to what animal control or any other inspection agency has the right to do on your property. Consult legal aid if you are not sure and do the consulting as soon as you sign your permit - before would be even better.

Warn anyone watching your home (such as a baby sitter, a roommate, or housekeeper) that they should not give permission to have your home searched.

The Question s:

Only identify yourself. Anything you say

can be used against you.

Be polite, but firm.

Do not lie to an officer.

Keep your hands in plain sight.

Do not touch an officer. Do not threaten the officer.

Demand to speak to a lawyer if the questions persist.

Get the Facts:

Get the name and badge number of each officer and names of any other organizations present.

Ask why they are there. Request the factual basis of the complaint, and the identity of the complainant.

Note the names of any witness to the encounter.

Write down all information, such as the date and time of the incident.

If your rights are violated, file a complaint.

Preventative Measures:

Follow the local laws. Review the dimensions of kennels or tie out lengths, number of animals you can legally own, etc.

Always keep your kennel clean and take good care of your animals.

Consider a P.O. Box for business cards or advertisements.

Screen any potential puppy buyers. Be alert that a buyer can be animal control, or even worse, someone from Humane Society of United States.

Don't allow strangers into your home.

Be fair and honest in all of your dealings.

This information was taken from an article by George J. Eigenhauser Jr. , "What to do when Animal Control comes knocking."



Rights

Continued from Page 1

the scar) and going door to door checking for vet certificates is far too expensive.

The owners who were allowing animals to roam are least likely to have them altered.

The first result is that a few dogs are spayed/neutered, a few more are given up, some dogs are abandoned (shelter intakes always rise for a couple of years where these laws are passed) and most dogs are unchanged but owners of the intact ones are now in violation. The owners who either S/N or give up their dogs are the responsible ones: most of them were already confining their animals. The owners who were allowing animals to roam are least likely to have them altered.

These laws have no favorable effect on pet populations: While animal rightists cite San Mateo County, California (where MSN was passed in the early 1990's) as a great success, an honest study of the numbers shows that the law didn't work at all. And it has been the same in every other jurisdiction: Montgomery County, MD, passed MSN in the 1990's but repealed it just a few years later when a watchdog agency concluded that it had only bad effects.

Good breeders stop, move away, or try to hide, selling their dogs only out of the area.

However 'ineffective' is just the beginning. The restrictions on 'intact animal' and 'breeder' licenses are always set up to make carefully planned multi-year breeding programs impossible. The supply of dogs from people who breed for health and happiness, match puppies to families, help if there are problems, and take them back if it doesn't work, vanishes.

To get a dog license you have to say if the dog is S/N or not. People who are in violation of an MSN law stop getting licenses. Revenues decline and because licensing is the point at which rabies vaccinations are followed up, so does this important public health measure.

Wait – there's even more. Since they generally point to a violation of the law, unplanned puppies are now effectively contraband. They may be abandoned or dumped – not exactly a humane outcome.

'Oops' litters supply around half of all American dogs: Causing them to be destroyed may create a shortage that draws

hidden breeding and flea market imports from outlying areas. The poster child for MSN is Southern California where millions of people now live under these laws and sure enough, increasing numbers of puppies are being brought in from Mexico, often using the same smuggling schemes as for drugs.

Even the basic idea – that restricting dog births will reduce numbers entering shelters – is wrong in most areas. America no longer has a general dog 'overpopulation' (too many puppies) problem. Except in far out (mostly southern) rural areas, places with excessive euthanasia rates have an excess of adult dogs. That's a different problem, one that must be addressed in other ways. To the extent that MSN has any effect at all, it simply lowers dog quality, thus making the adult dog retention problem worse.

MSN laws are a bomb, tossed in the middle of the American 'dog supply system.' But the unintended consequences are the plan. These laws are often supported by the well-intended but they are written by people who know exactly how they will work.

2. Anti-tethering laws either set limits on how long a dog can be tied outdoors ("no more than one hour at a time," "not over three hours daily") or completely forbid it. This sounds okay -- most of us believe that most dogs should be kept as house pets, don't we? Some breeders simply wouldn't sell you a dog as a pet if you said "We will chain him in the back yard."

However, most chained dogs do fine – I grew up with a real sweetheart of a German Shepherd who was perfectly happy on a chain.

There is no evidence that chaining contributes to aggression; such problems come from a combination of poor breeding and poor early socialization. Dangerous temperaments show up among in-home pets just as they do among dogs kept on chains, in fenced yards, or allowed to roam.

Many people cannot afford a secure fence and many of those who can, live where covenants and/or laws make a fence impossible.

Anti-tethering laws lead not to happier dogs, but a reduction in the number of dogs. Sledding and many hunting dogs are routinely chained, ditto many dogs kept for security purposes. These dogs are not intended as

pets and if they were brought indoors, many would lose their reason for being.

Many dogs kept outside are very unhappy if brought inside: depression and/or destructive behavior are common. Some pet dogs kept outside can be trained to live indoors but the project will require at least weeks of close supervision by an adult with good dog skills. If the family works and goes to school during the day, keeping a dog chained because they can't have a fence, the odds are against moving him inside.

The usual recourse when people are forced to stop chaining is a small homemade wire pen -- far more confining and less secure.

The overall result of these laws is more dogs getting loose, more abandonments, and more given up at the animal shelter. Anti-tethering laws lead not to happier dogs, but a reduction in the number of dogs. Again, the unintended consequences are the plan.

There are several other very common types of AR laws:

Breeder licensing schemes. These are mandatory spay/neuter from the flip side. Claimed to be needed to prevent irresponsible or abusive breeding ('fight puppy mills') the real goal is to make home breeding impractical.

Pet limit laws. These laws claim to reduce dog nuisances but since the overwhelming majority of dog owners are already within the limit, they don't replace any other law. The chief effect – and the goal from the AR point of view – is wiping out home based dog rescue and home breeding. Zoning laws are sometimes used in exactly the same way, for example dog breeding may be defined as 'manufacturing' and permitted only in areas so zoned where residential property is uncommon and often not very desirable.

Humane education laws. Who could oppose education? But 'humane' is matter of values and values are best taught by parents. Attempts to teach values in the schools collide with two issues: Whose values? (Is hunting okay? Use of animals for education and research purposes? Eating of meat or wearing of fur and leather?). And where will the teaching materials come from? All current comprehensive 'humane education' materials



Rights

Continued from Page 4

were developed by anti-animal use organizations, HSUS and others. They are strictly propaganda, aimed at training future generations to reject existing and majority values in favor of those of a tiny group of cultists.

A subtle but nasty effect is that these programs undermine the moral authority of parents. PeTA, for example, produced a comic book with a cover showing a woman with a knife, blood, etc. on the cover (slaughtering a rabbit) and the banner "Your Mommy KILLS Animals." It's hard to imagine anything worse for modern society.

Steady increases of the penalties for all forms of animal-related offenses. Laws work well when they reflect settled majority values: All of us agree that murder should be against the law and very strongly punished and all but the alcoholics support strong measures against drunk driving. When laws go beyond protecting us against behavior we all consider wrong and instead try to change the values of the majority, they no longer work well and tend to lessen respect for law. Increasing punishments within practical limits has little or no good effect. The 'war on drugs' shows us the borderland: Does any respected authority believe that doubling the minimum penalties would result in less drug use?

Many areas of animal law are similar. We have laws against abandonment, cruelty, dog (and other animal) fighting, neglect, and other actions that the great majority of us consider wrong. Year by year, we see efforts to double and redouble the penalties but with rare exceptions (such as a very few places where the law still gives deliberate cruelty a slap on the wrist), penalties are already high enough to have whatever deterrent effect is practical. Still more punishment simply means more plea bargains instead of trials, regardless of guilt.

'Bond' requirements when animals are seized. Seizure of owned animals was provided in laws as an emergency measure, to protect animals in immediate danger that cannot wait for a trial. Modern animal control practice in many areas, however, is that if there is (or can be claimed to be) a justification for seizure of any animal, they are all taken. Then, after a time, the owner can go to court and attempt to prove that there were

no grounds for the seizure.

The only check on these abuses is that animal control must hold and care for the seized animals pending trial. The trend is toward laws requiring animal owners to post what is called a bond and is typically \$10/day/animal within a few days following the seizure, often in 30-day chunks. Ten dogs = \$3000; pay now or your animals are forfeited and may be disposed of. Then you go to trial: Generally you don't get your bond back even if you are found not guilty.

A true bond secures performance: show up for trial or finish the job as contracted and you get your money back. These so-called seizure bond provisions are just prepayments to shelters and since actual shelter expense to care for one more dog is \$1-2/day, it's at a very generous rate. An Ohio bill contains an innovation: rather than requiring a bond if animals are seized you have to do it to obtain a license allowing you to have over 15 dogs for breeding or rescue. If any animal is seized; your bond is forfeited.

Where these laws are in force you will generally be offered the choice of pleading guilty to a lesser offense, forfeiting most animals, and capping your bond amount at elapsed days. So much for that annoying 'due process' thing in the U.S. Constitution.

The claimed justification is to protect animal control from the up front expense of large seizures and thus make them possible. The real effect is to complete the conversion of seizures from a limited tool needed for occasional urgent situations, to a profitable and perfectly legal form of abuse 'under color of law.' These laws almost completely eliminate the need for control organizations to make the case that a violation has occurred, thus freeing them to campaign without check against breeders, rescuers and anyone else they don't like.

These trends are just beginning but as they continue, dogs could easily become too expensive for most of us to own.

Laws that give power over dog care to others who don't have to pay. Guardianship (increased government power); private right of action laws (anyone can go to court to get power over your dogs); and increasing values set by courts on the value of a dog's life (because pet ambulance chasing lawyers will make veterinary malpractice insurance necessary) will all drive up costs of ownership.

One final observation. The true effect of an animal rights law may be very well hidden. Long or complicated bills need several readings and at least one should be from the bottom up, since 'killer' provisions often appear near the end. Focus on the real world effects; they're often not as they seem.

An example of 'well hidden.' A 2004 North Carolina proposal promoted to 'end the tragedy of euthanasia' would have taxed pet foods in order to fund (among other things) low cost spay/neuter programs. Sounds okay so far, doesn't it?

But the funds were to be distributed to counties equally and to jurisdictions within counties according to population. The result would have been that the urban counties already having very high S/N percentages would have gotten most of the modest amount of money from the tax and incorporated areas within the remaining counties most of the rest, leaving pennies on the dollar for the less populous unincorporated rural areas that actually had the problem.

The same proposal contained a requirement that all shelters sterilize all animals prior to adoption. The effect on well-off counties would have been small, since most of them already were doing so. However in the poorer counties, 100% pre-adoption sterilization (rather than the weaker measure of requiring it by contract) would have jacked up the price of an adoption from \$50-75 to perhaps \$250 thus essentially ending unsubsidized adoptions. When you looked at the numbers, it was clear that there wouldn't be enough money for more than a fractional subsidy.

The true effect of the proposal would have been to greatly increase euthanasia rates in the rural areas where the problem existed.

Opposition grew, the measure never was introduced as a bill.

A second example of 'well hidden.' The Albuquerque New Mexico 'HEART' ordinance contains a list of the usual sorts of serious mistreatment that will be considered animal cruelty. Much farther down the text of the law there's a short paragraph that lists by number only, several earlier paragraphs of minor violations that will also be charged as cruelty – leash law violations, having bees in an area accessible to your dog, and so on.



Around the nation: *Legislation that affects you*

Ten state legislatures and the District of Columbia are currently in regular session. Four states are in special session and four states have special sessions forthcoming.

For the latest information on state and federal bills you should contact your elected officials. By keeping informed you can be more active in issues affecting your dogs.

CALIFORNIA — Assembly Bill 1121 would offer cities and counties the option of issuing a puppy license for microchipped dogs under 4 months of age. The puppy license would cost the same as a license for a sterilized dog, regardless of the animal's reproductive status, and would expire when the dog reaches 12 months of age. The measure would also allow local governments to accept electronic proof of sterilization. AB 1121 passed the Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee and is now pending in the full Senate.

Senate Bill 702 requires that animals adopted out or returned to an owner by an animal control agency, rescue group or humane society be microchipped. The measure passed the Assembly Appropriations Committee and is now pending before the full Assembly.

HAWAII — Senate Bill 1522 SD2 HD1 establishes an ownership limit of 50 intact dogs of any age and requires licensing as a high-volume dog breeder for anyone who sells 25 or more puppies per year or owns 20 intact female dogs or 30 intact dogs of either sex over the age of 6 months. The Office of the Auditor will review SB 1522 to determine whether the new licensing is necessary to protect consumers and prevent cruel and inhumane treatment of dogs.

MASSACHUSETTS — House Bill 562 would strengthen the Commonwealth's dangerous dog laws by creating a number of provisions, including allowing dogs declared "at risk" to have the designation removed if the dog does not exhibit the behavior again within two years. The legislation also would prevent municipalities from establishing

breed-specific laws or programs. The bill is now pending a decision by an executive session.

House Bill 1023 would significantly change the definition of kennel to encompass "day-time only" facilities that have more than 12 dogs on the premises. This would include any facility used for training, dog shows, or trials. The Joint Committee on Consumer Protection & Professional Licensure conducted a public hearing on July 19, and amendments are expected.

House Bill 1455 would make numerous changes to animal control laws, including establishing intact animal permits for all owners of intact dogs and providing recommended penalties for common nuisance violations that include sterilization or euthanasia. The bill would also allow municipalities to ban or regulate specific breeds and require localities that do so to establish a 3-person board "to identify and determine the breed of dogs." The bill is now pending a decision by an executive session of the Joint Committee on Municipalities and Regional Government.

NEW JERSEY — Assembly Bill 3559/Senate Bill 1506 would prohibit insurance companies from denying homeowner coverage based on the ownership of a specific breed of dog. The bills do permit a company to include a clause excluding liability coverage for a dog or specific breed. It also allows insurance companies to develop guidelines or a rating system to establish rates and premiums for coverage of certain breeds. A. 3559 has been assigned to the Assembly Financial Institutions & Insurance Committee. S. 1506 was referred to Senate Commerce.

NEW YORK — Assembly Bill 259/Senate Bill 3806 would amend the laws regarding the care of animals that have been seized and are being cared for during animal cruelty hearings. A. 259 has passed the Assembly and been assigned to the Senate Finance Committee. S. 3806 is has passed the Senate Finance Committee and is pending in

the Rules Committee.

Assembly Bill 3507 prohibits insurance companies from denying coverage or increasing premiums based on a specific dog breed. It does allow the insurer to deny coverage or increase premiums if the dog has been classified as "dangerous," based on the current definition in statute. The bill has passed the Assembly Insurance Committee and is pending in the Codes Committee.

Assembly Bill 3595 would prevent senior citizens from being denied occupancy or evicted from a multiple-unit dwelling because they own a pet. The bill also recognizes the benefits of pet ownership and allows landlords to create regulations such as leash laws in public places, removal of animal waste, and other health and safety rules. The bill has been assigned to the Assembly Housing Committee.

Assembly Bill 8146 seeks to create an "Animal Breeding Permit" for everyone who breeds a female dog for pay or other compensation. The permit would allow for the whelping of one litter per female in a twelve-month period. The bill also calls for inspections of all licensees. The bill has been assigned to the Assembly Agriculture Committee. No hearings have been held on this bill, and to date none have been scheduled.

Senate Bill 946 revises the definition of "property" in the state's penal code to include pets. It also expands the penalty of grand larceny in the fourth degree to include pet theft. The bill has passed the Senate and is now pending in the Assembly Codes Committee.

OHIO — House Bill 14 as introduced would remove the term "pit bull" from the state's definition of "vicious dog." The term "pit bull" is not defined in current law, but owners of dogs considered to be of this breed must comply with numerous requirements. The bill passed the Ohio Criminal Justice Committee with numerous amendments to clarify the difference between dan-

See LEGISLATION on Page 7



Legislation

Continued from Page 6

gerous and vicious dogs, and to add a classification for "nuisance dog." HB 14 overwhelmingly passed the House on June 28 and is now pending in the Senate.

Senate Bill 130 seeks to regulate "high volume" dog breeding in Ohio, defined as those who produce at least 9 litters of puppies and sell 60 or more dogs in a calendar year. The bill is very similar to Senate Bill 95 from 2010. Items of concern include a definition of "kennel" that could be interpreted to mean any owner of an intact dog and problematic standards for "high volume breeders." The Senate Agriculture, Environment & Natural Resources Committee has heard sponsor testimony on this bill. An opportunity for public comment will be scheduled at a later date.

OKLAHOMA — The Oklahoma State Board of Commercial Pet Breeders has extended its licensing deadline until October 3, 2011. By that date, all who meet the definition of "commercial breeder" in state law must have a state license. "Commercial breeder" is defined as anyone who owns 11 intact female dogs or cats over 6 months of age "for the use of breeding..." Breeders are encouraged to visit the Oklahoma State Board of Commercial Pet Breeders' web site at www.ok.gov/petbreeders for more information.

PENNSYLVANIA — Senate Bill 27 would make several changes to the state's consumer protection laws. Among other provisions, it would change the timeline from 10 days to 14 days from the time of sale for a dog to be determined to be clinically ill or to

have died from an illness that renders it "unfit for purchase," and from 30 days to 90 days for a dog to have a congenital or hereditary defect. The bill also clarifies that a dog may not be found "unfit for purchase" if it has intestinal or external parasites (unless the dog is seriously ill or dies), it has an injury or illness likely contracted after the purchase, or if it has a health problem that is disclosed by the seller in writing prior to the sale. SB 27 unanimously passed the Senate and is now pending in the House Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee.

TEXAS — The Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation (TDLR) has until March 31, 2012, to draft the regulations and affected breeders will have until September 1, 2012 to come into compliance and obtain a license. TDLR has recently established a website to provide updates about this legislation and is accepting applications for the Advisory Committee that will participate in drafting these regulations.

WISCONSIN — Representative Don Pridemore is gathering co-sponsors for LRB 1798/1, a measure that would increase the state commercial breeder threshold from those who annually sell 25 dogs to those that sell 100 dogs. Numerous hobby breeders and fanciers have expressed concerns about the low threshold in current law; particularly since the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection has clarified the threshold does include co-ownerships. The bill is expected to be formally introduced at the end of August.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Congress is currently on recess until after Labor Day. For the latest information on federal measures, you should contact your elected officials.

HR 835/S 707 — Known as the "Puppy Uniform Protection & Safety Act" (PUPS), this bill would require anyone who owns or co-owns dogs that produce 50 or more puppies that are sold in a 12-month period to be regulated under USDA dog dealer regulations. Anyone meeting that criteria would be required to obtain an annual USDA license, maintain minimum federal standards of care, and undergo regular inspections at least biennially. The language in this bill is identical to the 2010 PUPS bill. The bills have been assigned to their chamber's agriculture committees. Neither is scheduled for a hearing.

HR 1406 — This legislation, known as the "Fairness to Pet Owners Act of 2011," would require the prescriber of an animal drug to provide the pet owner with a copy of the veterinary prescription and a written disclosure that the owner may fill the prescription through the prescriber (if available) or through another pharmacy selected by the pet owner. It has been referred to the Health Subcommittee of the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

HR 1725 — This bill would authorize federal grants to states that ban debarking "for purposes of convenience." The grants, which may be up to \$1 million, must be used to fund "activities that prevent or promote the prevention of cruelty to animals." It has been referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. No hearings are scheduled.

Dog deaths lawsuit settled; SPCA euthanized 57 pit bulls; owners acquitted

Richard Burgess

Advocate Adiana Bureau

LAFAYETTE, LA — An animal welfare group and two dog breeders have settled a lawsuit over 57 pit bulls seized and euthanized in an investigation into alleged dogfighting, according to court filings.

Floyd Joseph Boudreaux and his son, Guy Anthony Boudreaux, filed the lawsuit in 2009 against the Louisiana Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals after

a judge acquitted the men on dogfighting charges, citing a lack of evidence.

The father and son had sought damages for mental distress and loss of income from the sale of the animals, which their attorney has said were valued at about \$300,000.

The Louisiana SPCA declined to comment on the terms of the settlement, and the Boudreaux's attorney, Richard Dalton,

did not return two calls seeking comment.

The case had its origins in 2005, when State Police raided the Boudreaux's Youngsville home and seized the pit bulls.

State Police handed the animals over to the SPCA, and the nonprofit group euthanized the pit bulls within days of the raid.

The lawsuit was focused on questions of whether the SPCA overstepped its bounds in euthanizing the animals.



ABOUT THE
ENDANGERED
BREEDS
ASSOCIATION

(EBA) is a non-profit organization founded in 1980 for the purpose of preserving the American Pit Bull Terrier. Our goals are public education, media monitoring, legislative lobbying, and legal intervention to protect responsible owners from breed-specific legislation and unfair harassment by public officials or agen-

cies. We oppose animal abuse or any illegal activities with animals. Membership is \$15-single and \$20-family per year or \$300-lifetime with members receiving three newsletters a year. Canadian and overseas members please send US dollars money orders only. All memberships expire Dec. 31 of each year.

EBA MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

(PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY!)

Name (s) _____ Occupation _____
 Address _____ City _____ State _____ Zip _____
 Phone _____ E-mail _____
By providing your e-mail address, you agree to receive your newsletter via e-mail.

Membership type: New _____ Renew _____ Single _____ Family _____ Lifetime _____

Information packet included

Please make check or money order payable to the Endangered Breeds Association and mail to:
 Joan Morrison, Route 1, Box 71, Gore, OK 74435

ENDANGERED BREEDS ASSOCIATION

Route 1, Box 71
 Gore, OK 74435