



PUPS Bill is Back for 2013

Federal "PUPS" legislation (S 395/HR 847), sponsored by Sen. Richard Durbin (D-Ill.) and Rep. Jim Gerlach has been reintroduced in the U.S. Congress and assigned to the House and Senate Agriculture committees. The bill is the same as previous versions introduced in 2011 and 2010. PUPS changes the scope and intent of the AWA by covering private, in-home breeders, sellers and retail venues with federal regulation for the first time.

The bill adds a new definition of a breeding female dog as an intact female dog aged 4 months or older. It is impossible for a 4 month old female dog to be biologically capable of reproduction and therefore this definition should be rejected.

PUPS also creates the new definition high volume retail breeder. A breeder only has to have interest or custody of one breeding female dog to fall under the first test of this criterion. The second criteria includes anyone who sells or offers for sale, via any means of conveyance (including the internet, telephone, or newspaper), more than 50 of the offspring of such breeding female dogs for use as pets in any 1-year period." The 50 offspring are NOT defined by age or as being from litters whelped by the breeder or as being personally owned by the breeder. The 50 offspring does NOT mean 50 puppies. The 50 offspring is not limited to dog breeders and will include rescue organizations as dealers.



PUPS sets a dangerous federal regulation precedent by mandating specific exercise requirements exceeding those currently required for laboratory animals. Supporters minimize this by erroneously stating that PUPS only ensures an opportunity for adequate exercise. PUPS dictates that the exercise NOT be forced or repetitive and requires that each dog must have an area large enough to reach a running stride. In simple terms this new requirement means existing facilities would have to be redesigned to accommodate large enough exercise areas for any dog to reach a running stride. Alternate forms of exercise, such as walking the dog on leash or something as simple as playing fetch for daily exercise, would not meet the new exercise standard.

We encourage readers to write to members of Congress and ask that they oppose the PUPS bill.

More information at AKC: <http://tinyurl.com/a5mqjgf>

And at SAOVA: <http://www.saova.org/PUPS2013.html>

We Are Not Puppy Mills!

There is no legal definition of a “puppy mill”. The term “puppy mill” has been promoted by HSUS and other animal rights activists in the same manner as a racial slur to cast a negative picture on the whole industry of breeding dogs. The goal is to eventually make all the words interchangeable, commercial breeder=“puppy mill”=hobby breeder. It is degrading and offensive to dog breeders to be called “puppy mills”.

Increasingly, animal rights activists have broadened the term until anyone who breeds a dog is fair game for attack. Even someone who breeds only an occasional litter is at risk of being labeled as a dreaded “puppy mill” by activists who do not approve of breeding or procreation in the first place.

The “puppy mill” label is tossed around frequently with no basis of truth, solely to arouse the intense emotion needed to pass crippling legislation against dog breeding. Activists will use photos of run-down kennels and dirty dogs from any state – some even years old – to imply that dogs will lead horribly abused lives unless regulations are enacted.

An arbitrary number is then established for dogs owned or litters bred, and breeders who fall in either category become targets of the anti-breeding zealots lobbying for restrictive kennel regulations.

The animal rights movement is about control, not animal welfare. Although HSUS will argue that their laws are not intended to harm hobby breeders but just those “evil puppy mills”, the truth is that HSUS has a well-documented history of opposing all purposeful breeding of dogs.

In addition to labeling dog breeders, HSUS and their supporters label cities, counties, and sometimes entire states as “puppy mill capitals” – regardless of existing regulation – in an attempt to send the public and legislators on an emotional roller coaster ride demanding new laws.

- Riverside CA was dubbed the “puppy mill capital” of Southern California
- Activists placed billboards in Daviess County calling it the “puppy mill capital” of Indiana
- Clark County was labeled the “puppy mill capital” of Wisconsin
- Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri have each been named as “puppy mill capital” of the entire Midwest and accused of widespread mistreatment of dogs
- HSUS lobbied hard to pass legislation in Pennsylvania labeling that state the “puppy mill capital” of the East.
- Tennessee was labeled a “puppy mill state” with at least 500 mass breeding facilities prior to introduction of a Commercial Breeder Act by HSUS
- HSUS labeled Texas the 10th largest “puppy mill state in the country” prior to introduction of the Commercial Dog and Cat Breeders Act
- HSUS even moved into Canada labeling the City of Quebec as the “puppy mill capital” of Canada.

Fanatics are never satisfied. Now HSUS has turned its lobbying focus on North Carolina and is intensifying its campaign to widely regulate and inspect dog breeders in our state. In an attempt to pass legislation activists coined the slogan: “North Carolina – First in Flight Now in Puppy Mills.”

This defamation cannot be tolerated. No one supports neglect or abuse of animals. However, calling dog breeders “puppy mills” and claiming that they abuse their animals is unfair, unjust, and unacceptable.

Why Large Dogs Die Young

A 70 kg Great Dane has an average lifespan of about 7 years, whereas a 4 kg Toy Poodle can expect to enjoy a lifespan of about 14 years. This well-known pattern poses a conundrum for evolutionary biologists. Across species, large mammals live longer than their small counterparts. In marked contrast, within species, fast growth and/or large size seem to carry costs in terms of an individual's life span. This phenomenon has been documented not only in dogs, but also in mice, rats, and horses, and some have argued that lifespan even tends to be longer in humans with shorter stature. Researchers have yet to determine why the patterns that we observe within species are opposite to those observed across species. In no species is the negative relationship between size and lifespan more evident than in the domestic dog. Artificial selection has led to breeds that range in body size from the 2 kg Chihuahua to the 80 kg Mastiff. Large breeds die at a median age of 5-8 years, whereas small breeds are expected to live on average about 10-14 years, i.e. twice as long. But why do large dogs die young?

Source: *American Society of Naturalists* <http://amnat.org/an/newpapers/AprKraus.html>

ABSTRACT

The Size–Life Span Trade-Off Decomposed: Why Large Dogs Die Young

Kraus et al., 2013, *The American Naturalist*

Large body size is one of the best predictors of long life span across species of mammals. In marked contrast, there is considerable evidence that, within species, larger individuals are actually shorter lived. This apparent cost of larger size is especially evident in the domestic dog, where artificial selection has led to breeds that vary in body size by almost two orders of magnitude and in average life expectancy by a factor of two. Survival costs of large size might be paid at different stages of the life cycle: a higher early mortality, an early onset of senescence, an elevated baseline mortality, or an increased rate of aging. After fitting different mortality hazard models to death data from 74 breeds of dogs, we describe the relationship between size and several mortality components. We did not find a clear correlation between body size and the onset of senescence. The baseline hazard is slightly higher in large dogs, but the driving force behind the trade-off between size and life span is apparently a strong positive relationship between size and aging rate. We conclude that large dogs die young mainly because they age quickly. [*Editor's Note: 1 kilogram = 2.20 pound*]

UK: Animal Rights Group Targets School

A primary school had to call in police after animal rights activists bombarded teachers at the Peasenhall School in Suffolk with vile and sometimes threatening emails over a project in which pupils would raise pigs for food. The school's 25 students helped to build a pen and eco-friendly ark for the three Berkshire-Old Spot Gloucester cross piglets. But since then the school has been targeted by opponents with emails and an online petition. The Headmistress said the school was trying to shield the children from all this but activists had threatened to demonstrate outside the school.

According to the press, an activist involved in the campaign released the following statement, "Children should not be exposed to this sort of thing - these pigs will be slaughtered and eaten and no animal should be used as food. They should not be taught the lesson that we need animals for food because that is a lie."

A school spokesperson noted there was 100 percent backing from parents for this project, and said, 'It is important for children to learn the provenance of their food and animal welfare. We live in a rural area and the children are surrounded by fields that have animals in them that are being reared for consumption.'

Source: *MailOnline*

Raw Meat Diet May Not Be Enough for Cats or Tigers

In a new paper in the Journal of Animal Science, researchers from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and Omaha's Henry Doorly Zoo and Aquarium analyzed the value of raw meat diets for cats and exotic felids. The researchers used several tests to evaluate the nutrients in meat from bison, cattle, horses and elk. To test how the different diets affected cats, the researchers collected blood serum and fecal samples from domestic cats and captive African wildcats, jaguars and Malayan tigers.

They found that raw meat diets met many nutrient requirements for cats, but there were some gaps. None of the diets contained the recommended levels of linoleic acid, the horsemeat did not provide the levels of arachidonic acid recommended for kittens, gestating females and lactating females.

This research is important for animal scientists, zoos and pet owners. The researchers explain that captive tigers, jaguars and African wildcats were traditionally fed horsemeat-based raw diets. "With the closing of horse abattoirs in 2007, the availability of quality grade horsemeat in the United States has decreased, increasing the need for research on the digestibility and composition of possible alternatives," write the researchers.

There is also a growing trend of raw meat diets for domestic housecats. Kelly Swanson, associate professor in animal science at the University of Illinois and coauthor of the study, said the researchers are "a bit wary" of pet owners feeding homemade raw diets. He said pet owners risk exposing cats to increased pathogens and nutrient imbalances.

Pet owners often feed trimmed cuts of meat. These cuts lack fat, which is crucial in feline diets. According to the researchers, if pet owners feed raw meat diets, they will likely have to supplement it with other nutrients, including appropriate sources of fat and essential fatty acids.

Read more at: <http://phys.org/news/2013-02-raw-meat-diet-cats-tigers.html#iCp>

Surry Animal Rights Activist in Court

SURRY, VA — Tamira Ci Thayne, executive director of Dogs Deserve Better's Good Newz Rehab Center appeared in Surry General District Court on misdemeanor animal abuse charges. Thayne was charged with one count each of animal cruelty and inadequate care of animals. Thayne's anti-chaining dog rescue organization is based out of the Moonlight Road house where Philadelphia Eagles quarterback and Newport News-native Michael Vick once ran a dog-fighting operation.

The charges against Thayne were filed Aug. 28, 2012, days after state veterinary and Surry Animal Control officers made an unannounced visit to the facility. The state and local investigation was spurred partially when several former employees, including former office manager Deana Whitfield, emailed pictures and complaints to Surry Animal Control in July.

Dogs Deserve Better had been operating without the state's required approval since opening in June 2011, prompting the state to order all dogs on the site to be placed into foster care last summer.

After a key witness for the prosecution failed to show for court, charges were dropped but could be refiled later. Thayne could have faced a \$2,500 fine and up to one year in jail. In addition, state law prohibits anyone convicted of animal cruelty from owning or working with dogs. *Source: Daily Press*

Is HSUS Against Fishing?

On the Alan Warren Outdoors radio show a few months back, Wayne Pacelle faced a battery of questions about whether HSUS wants to end fishing or ban hunting. Pacelle denied the charge, claiming that it wasn't politically feasible and that HSUS is only against the "most abusive" forms of hunting and doesn't have a campaign on fishing. (We had a few questions for him, but as soon as we came on he hung up. Maybe his favorite animal is the chicken.)

We've heard that "most abusive" line before. Consider Pacelle's reasoning for not campaigning against fishing, from the 1994 book *Bloodties*:

Author: "About fishing ... do you avoid campaigning against it because there isn't a ground-swell movement in our culture to eliminate it?"

Pacelle: "That is correct. We're out to minimize suffering wherever it can be done, and wherever our limited resources can be utilized most effectively—abusive forms of hunting for now, all hunting eventually."

Author: "And fish aren't furry and cute."

Pacelle: "That's right."

Author: "How about pets, Wayne? Would you envision a future with no pets in the world?"

Pacelle: "I wouldn't say that I envision that, no. If I had my personal view perhaps that might take hold. In fact, I don't want to see another cat or dog born. It's not something I strive for, though."

In 1997, after moving to HSUS, Pacelle continued the "we just want to end the most abusive practices" line. And he continues it. Pacelle says these days about farm animals: "[W]e have a moral obligation to ... stop the most extreme forms of abuse. We've made a very pragmatic judgment that the American public is still, by and large, a meat-eating public."

That doesn't rule out HSUS being opposed to all animal farming. It's just saying that HSUS has made a "very pragmatic judgment"—that is, public relations—to not openly espouse the vegan PETA philosophy. To use a football analogy, HSUS is willing to gain first downs instead of throwing the ball deep on every play like PETA does.

Try to find a form of hunting or fishing or animal agriculture that HSUS supports. You'll have an easier time finding an ice cube in the Sahara. HSUS doesn't support eating fish, game, or any other animal or animal product.

To answer the original question, HSUS would probably ban fishing if it could—something that is completely infeasible, at least in the present. But then again, who thought some fish would have lawyers?

Posted on 03/12/2013 at 02:11 PM by the Humane Watch Team

North Carolina Responsible Animal Owners Alliance, Inc. (NCRAOA) is a statewide organization of animal owners and professionals dedicated to animal welfare, responsible animal ownership, and maintaining the rights of responsible citizens to breed and own animals. NCRAOA, a 501(c)3 organization, provides education and information to the public and supports reasonable and humane animal welfare laws. Permission granted to copy and distribute NCRAOA News and Views in its entirety as is.

NCRAOA • PO Box 455, Stem NC 27581 • ncraoa@yahoo.com