



THE HUMANE SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES

humanesociety.org

Support S.3926 (Stavisky) / A.6287a (Lentol)

Strengthen NY's Animal Fighting Law

Sponsors as of Monday, March 22, 2010

S.3926: Stavisky, Dilan, Duane, Hassell-Thompson, Klein, Krueger, Nozzolio, Onorato, Oppenheimer, Valesky
A.6287a: Lentol, Boyle, Brennan, Carrozza, Destito, Dinowitz, Glick, Hevesi, Koon, Latimer, McEneny, Millman, Rosenthal, Weisenberg, Zebrowski,

Animal fighting involves the pitting of two animals – commonly, dogs and roosters – against each other to fight for the purpose of gambling and entertainment. Often these animals fight for hours to the death. Animals used for animal fighting are specifically bred, conditioned, and trained to fight. Animals forced to fight are subject to severe injuries and often die of blood loss, shock, dehydration, or infection hours or even days after the fight.

Strong animal fighting laws help prevent cruelty and protect the public. Animal fighting is an extremely inhumane and cruel activity. Recent arrests have shed light on this epidemic and public outcry for strong animal fighting laws is clear. Animal fights are a public safety risk and often associated with other criminal activities such as gambling, weapons possession, narcotics, and various violent crimes. Dogs used for fighting are bred and trained to be vicious and are a threat to communities. A study by the Chicago Police Department found that 70% of animal offenders had also been arrested for other felonies, 70% had also been arrested for illegal narcotics, 59% were gang members, and 49% had been arrested for battery related violent offenses. Animal fights often involve other illegal activities. Spectators fuel the industry through admission fees and gambling, making animal fights lucrative for the organizers.

New York needs felony spectator and possession provisions in animal fighting laws. Dogfighting and cockfighting are illegal in every state and carries felony penalties in New York. However, being a spectator at an animal fight carries only a traffic ticket-style violation and possessing animals for the purpose of fighting is only a misdemeanor. Under current New York law, animal fighters can claim they were only present as spectators, thereby avoiding any meaningful punishment. The lower penalties for spectators creates a loophole that makes it more difficult for law enforcement officials to effectively prosecute animal fighters. Typically, organized animal fights occur with several matches held one after the other. When police raid an animal fight it is extremely difficult to differentiate between spectators and participants who were going to fight their dog or bird in the next match. *In a state-by-state ranking of dogfighting laws by The Humane Society of the United States, New York is at the very bottom at number 48.* This legislation will strengthen the animal fighting law in New York by making a spectator at an animal fight and possession of fighting animals a felony.

New York is currently a destination for animal fighting criminals and illegal activity. Until New York passes S.3926 / A.6287a to strengthen our current laws, we will remain a destination for animal fighters from other states with stronger anti-animal fighting laws. Law enforcement have found many out-of-state perpetrators in recent raids – many with 50%-70% from outside of New York State, including New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut. In a 2008 case in the Bronx where 16 dogs and 2 roosters were seized, more than half the perpetrators were from New Jersey – currently the state with the nation's strongest animal fighting laws. According to news reports, though neighbors had known about the animal fights for at least three years, they were too afraid to file complaints with the police due to fear of retaliation.

HSUS Contact: Dora Schomberg – dschomberg@humanesociety.org / (518) 478-9760



THE HUMANE SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES

humanesociety.org

Support S. 3223 (Kruger) / A.6788 (Glick)

Put the Lid on Canned Shoots

Sponsors as of Monday, March 22, 2010

S. 3223: Kruger, Adams, Addabbo

A. 6788: Glick, Bing, Carrozza, Colton, Cook, Dinowitz, Englebright, Latimer, Maisel, McDonough, McEneny, Millman, Paulin, Peralta, Pheffer, Rivera J, Rosenthal, Skartados, Sweeney, Titus, Weisenberg

Canned Shoot Overview

Canned shoots are held at private trophy hunting facilities where shooters pay to kill exotic animals – even endangered species – trapped within enclosures. Individuals patronize these facilities to obtain a guaranteed trophy-sized animal to decorate their home, not to participate in a hunting experience. Animals on canned shoots often come from private breeders, animal dealers, and even zoos and circuses. Frequently, the animals have been hand-raised and bottle-fed, so they have lost their fear of people. Even in large enclosures of several hundred acres, guides lure animals to a location where a shooter waits, thus removing any element of sportsmanship. It is not uncommon for a canned shoot with hundreds of fenced acres to still offer a “100% guarantee” to shoot an animal. Passing legislation to ban canned shoots larger than 10 acres streamlines New York with a nationwide effort to ban this type of captive shoot.

Disease

Animals on canned shoots are confined in highly concentrated numbers. Consequently, the risk of disease transmission is greater, posing a threat to animals on the inside and outside of the fences. Diseases such as tuberculosis, brucellosis, and chronic wasting disease (CWD) have been diagnosed in captive wildlife. Although there must legally be fencing around canned shoots, animals often can and sometimes do escape from these facilities. The interstate transport of animals for breeding purposes increases the possibility of spreading the disease. Chronic wasting disease outbreaks have been reported in New York, Colorado, Wyoming, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Montana, Wisconsin, New Mexico and Kansas.

Fair Chase

Long time hunter Jim Posewitz, founder of Orion: the Hunter's Institute, former biologist with Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, and author of *Beyond Fair Chase*, describes fair chase as “a balance between the hunter and the hunted.” Posewitz goes on to say “The concept of fair chase is important to hunting. The general public will not tolerate hunting under any other circumstance.” Fair chase – a concept central to the philosophy of many in the hunting community – doesn't exist in canned shoots. The self-described ethical hunting community (including groups like Boone & Crockett, Pope & Young, and the Izaak Walton League) is becoming increasingly vocal in its opposition to canned shooting.

New York

Twenty-six states have enacted full or partial bans. The recently-closed Catskill Game Farm provided a prime example of this exotic animal trade for canned shoots. Thousands of animals were auctioned off when the petting-zoo closed its gates, and canned shoot dealers bid on many of the tame animals, including “Louise,” the warthog, a coveted animal difficult to obtain in the United States. One dealer told a HSUS investigator that he already had a client booked to shoot the animal. Fortunately, Louise was rescued by an individual willing to pay \$9,000 to save Louise from a certain death at a canned shoot.

HSUS Contact: Dora Schomberg – dschomberg@humanesociety.org / (518) 478-9760



THE HUMANE SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES

humanesociety.org

Support S. 5392a (Squadron) / A.7285b (Paulin)

Crack Down on Puppy Mills

Sponsors as of Monday, March 22, 2010

S. 5392a: Squadron, Diaz, Hassell-Thompson, Krueger, Kruger, LaValle, Onorato, Serrano

A. 7285b: Paulin, Carrozza, Cook, Fields, Gabryszak, Glick, Gottfried, Hooper, Kavanagh, Koon, Latimer, Lupardo, Mayersohn, McDonough, McEneny, Millman, Nolan, Ortiz, Perry, Pheffer, Rosenthal, Thiele, Towns, Weisenberg

What is a Puppy Mill? Puppy Mills are large scale commercial breeding facilities that mass-produce puppies for sale. Puppy Mills commonly house animals in overcrowded, filthy, and inhumane conditions with inadequate shelter and care. The puppies that survive these conditions are taken from their mothers for sale to pet stores and over the internet at approximately 8 weeks of age, when they are more susceptible to contagious diseases and very sensitive to behavioral stress. Puppy mills contribute to pet overpopulation by churning out thousands of puppies a year that are often sold to “impulse buyers” and ultimately end up in shelters. Left behind are the hidden victims of puppy mills – the mothers and fathers – referred to by the operators as “breeding stock” who churn out litter after litter for their entire lives.

Current Laws are Ineffective to Deal with the Problems created by Puppy Mills The U.S. Department of Agriculture licenses and inspects large scale commercial breeding operations to a certain extent and New York requires basic humane standards. However, there are loopholes and a lack of enforcement at both the federal and state level. There are no federal or New York state laws that address the negative impact of large scale breeding operations on pet overpopulation. Legislation to help curb pet overpopulation, prevent massive breeding, and save the state money by limiting the number of intact adult dogs a person can maintain for breeding has been proposed in New York.

Puppy Mills create a drain on the State of New York The bust of a single puppy mill can cause devastating expense, as the costs of shelter, food and vet care for so many animals can add up to tens of thousands of dollars within weeks. For example, a 2007 puppy mill bust in which 249 animals were rescued in Buxton, ME cost the state \$440,000. In addition, approximately \$70,000 was raised by humane organizations to assist with the rescue operation. In 2009, The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) worked with local law enforcement to rescue thousands of dogs from inhumane puppy mills in NC, TN, TX, VA, MS, SD, WA and IL, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars. The estimated cost to the HSUS alone averaged over \$200 per dog. This does not include costs incurred by local law enforcement, animal shelters, and other animal protection groups. An estimated 6-8 million dogs and cats are cared for in animal shelters every year in the United States, of whom approximately 3-4 million are euthanized. Therefore, The ICMA (International City/County Management Association) Animal Control Management Guide suggests that cities and counties budget between \$4-7 per capita for animal control programs. The impact of this pet overpopulation is significant. It is a humane crisis as well as a financial one.

Crack Down on Inhumane Puppy Mills Legislation to address the problems puppy mills by limiting the number of adult intact dogs a person can maintain has been proposed and needs your support. This legislation does not impact hobby breeders, animal shelters, research facilities, pet stores, veterinarians, groomers or boarding facilities. By limiting the size of these facilities, this legislation will enable humane investigators to more effectively and efficiently deal with complaints about dogs living in squalid conditions and receiving inadequate care. It will also help curb pet overpopulation and the stress that large scale breeders place on animal shelters. Similar legislation has passed in Louisiana, Washington, Oregon, California and Virginia.

HSUS Contact: Dora Schomberg – dschomberg@humanesociety.org / (518) 478-9760



THE HUMANE SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES

humanesociety.org

Support A.8163 (Rosenthal)

Protect Farm Animals from Cruel Intensive Confinement

Sponsors as of Monday, March 22, 2010

A.8163: Rosenthal, Castro, Englebright, Gottfried, Kavanagh, Kellner, Maisel, McEneny, Millman, Paulin, Robinson

Billions of animals in the United States live their entire lives confined on factory farms – many of them in cages so small they can barely move for months on end. State legislatures are taking notice: 7 states have banned some of the most restrictive confinement of animals on factory farms. A.8163 will help protect animals on factory farms by restricting intensive confinement of animals including battery cages, veal crates, and gestation crates.

Battery Cages

Approximately 95 percent of the country's egg-laying hens are intensively confined in tiny "battery cages" – wire mesh enclosures stacked several tiers high and extending down long, windowless warehouses. While many countries are banning the abusive battery cage system, U.S. egg producers still overcrowd about 280 million hens in cages so small the birds can't even spread their wings. Each caged hen has less floor space than a sheet of 8½ x 11 paper on which to eat, sleep, lay eggs, and defecate. In such cramped and barren conditions, these birds are unable to engage in many of their natural behaviors, including nesting, dust bathing, or even exercising. Rather than give the hens more room or improved living conditions, most egg factory farmers cut off parts of the birds' beaks when they are chicks. The tips of their sensitive beaks, which the birds use much like we use our hands, are seared off with a hot blade, a physical mutilation performed without painkiller and known to cause acute pain. Published research, as well as an analysis by the egg industry's own economist, show that it costs producers less than one additional penny per egg not to confine laying hens in battery cages. While it's possible that giving these animals better living conditions may increase consumer prices by a few pennies per dozen, the hidden cost of such inhumane confinement is increased cruelty, and it's the animals who are paying that extra price.

Calves Raised for Veal

Most calves raised for veal in the United States are intensively confined and tethered in individual crates and stalls too narrow for them to turn around, let alone walk, during their entire 16-week lives before slaughter. Unfortunately, the practice of confining veal calves to crates is common in the United States, despite public opinion against cramped confinement of these young animals.

Female Breeding Pigs in Confinement

An estimated 60 to 70 percent of sows – female pigs – who make up the "breeding stock" on U.S. hog farms spend nearly all of their four-month pregnancies confined in barren "gestation crates." These individual metal cages are approximately 2 feet wide and 7 feet long – enclosures so small the animals cannot even turn around or take more than a step forward or backward. In these barren crates, the sows stand on slatted floors where excrement is pushed through when they lie down. During their shortened four- to five-year lives, sows are repeatedly impregnated and confined to gestation crates until right before giving birth when they are moved into farrowing crates, a different type of enclosure in which they give birth. On average, sows spend up to four years—nearly 80 percent of their lives before slaughter – in this two-foot-wide space. Unable to exercise or move, they suffer muscle and bone weakness that often leads to lameness.

HSUS Contact: Dora Schomberg – dschomberg@humanesociety.org / (518) 478-9760



THE HUMANE SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES

humanesociety.org

Support A.9732 (Rosenthal)

Tail Docking: A Painful & Unnecessary Practice

Sponsors as of Monday, March 22, 2010

A.8163: Rosenthal, Benedetto, Boyle, Castro, Colton, Dinowitz, Espaillat, Glick, Gottfried, Kavanagh, Latimer, Lavine, Maisel, Mayersohn, McEneny, Meng, Millman, Pheffer, Powell, Robinson, Saladino, Schimel, Skartados, Sweeney, Thiele, Titone, Weisenberg

What is tail-docking? Tail docking is the partial amputation – typically without anesthetic – of up to two-thirds of a cow's tail. The tail is actually an extension of the spine. Amputation is painful when done without anesthesia and follow-up pain medication. It is accomplished in one of two ways: either by using a rubber band to strangulate the blood supply, a painful and slow procedure, which opens up the opportunity for gangrene and other infections or by the use a sharp instrument with which to chop off the tail. Additionally, with a shortened appendage, the cow is far more vulnerable to attacks from biting flies. There no scientific evidence that docked tails are more sanitary or produce cleaner milk. The solution is to maintain a clean environment for cows, and if producers choose to, trimming the hair on the end of the tail.

A 2001 USDA survey found that nearly 51% of U.S. dairy operations practiced tail docking; some tail-docked only a small percentage of their herd, but about one-in-six docked their entire herds' tails. 82.3% of 113 dairies surveyed in a 2005-06 national poll practiced tail docking.

Tail docking causes pain and distress. Scientific studies have shown that tail docking is a serious welfare problem, causing distress, pain, and increased fly attacks. The American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), Canadian Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA) and industry representatives all oppose and criticize routine tail docking of dairy cows. The AVMA asserts that "Current scientific literature indicates that routine tail docking provides no benefit to the animal, and that tail docking can lead to distress during fly seasons." The CVMA states that "it has been shown that cows are unable to effectively keep flies away once the tail is docked." Several European countries and California (the nation's largest dairy-producing state) have banned the practice.

Tail docking is unnecessary. The California Dairy Quality Assurance program (CDQA) advises: "There is no benefit to tail docking normal, healthy tails in dairy cattle based on peer-reviewed scientific studies and governmental sponsored research."

The National Milk Producers Federation writes: "Tail docking of dairy calves is not recommended. A thorough review of the scientific literature does not support anecdotal reports of the benefits of tail docking."

The American Association of Bovine Practitioners concludes that no "sufficient scientific evidence" exists to support the procedure.

"The cumulative body of research on tail docking speaks loudly. **The early reported benefits do not exist, and tail docking is now more of a producer preference than a cow cleanliness/udder health issue.** In light of this new research, and the public's heightened concerns regarding animal welfare, **the dairy industry should eliminate the routine practice of docking tails.**" —Thomas Quaife, editor, *Dairy Herd Management*

HSUS Contact: Dora Schomberg – dschomberg@humanesociety.org / (518) 478-9760

The Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller Empire State Plaza Concourse Level Map

