



The German Shepherd Dog Club of Reno

www.gsdcreno.org

March 27, 2009

The German Shepherd Dog Club of Reno Dog Club of Reno Strenuously Objects to Senate Bill No. 241

From the Legislative Counsel's Digest -

1 Section 4 of this bill prohibits a person from breeding cats and dogs for sale in Nevada without first obtaining a license as a breeder from the State Department of Agriculture (Department) and makes a violation of the licensure provision a misdemeanor.

- Regions of the country who have passed similar legislation have found that this does nothing to address the problem of over population of stray animals in that reputable hobby breeders are careful where their animals are placed anyway, while the random breeding of unconfined animals on the streets continues whether they should be licensed or not. This does not address the real problem of uncontrolled random breeding or of puppy mills. It simply penalized the hobby breeder who is already overseen by their breed club and AKC or their registry of choice.

4 Section 4 also imposes an annual \$500 licensing fee on breeders.

- While the hobby breeder produces a limited supply of quality animals, they do so for the love of their breed because as any of them will tell you, breeding is not a profit making activity, it is an expensive hobby. The imposition of this large fee will put many breeders out of business, which is desirable for those who are attached to the national animal rights movement, but is offensive to those who are true animal lovers.

Section 5 of this bill:

(1) sets forth the qualifications a person must meet to be issued a license as a breeder, including good moral character and a lack of any convictions of violating a provision of chapter 574 of NRS relating to cruelty to and care of animals;

(2) requires the license to be renewed annually; and

(3) requires the Department to adopt regulations for the issuance and renewal of licenses for breeders.

- This section is vague and unenforceable. "Good moral character" is difficult to define and is not defined in this section. This provides a platform for officiousness in enforcement and violates the rights of a person to own and control personal property.

Section 11 of this bill sets forth the duties of a breeder, including ensuring that cats or dogs he breeds and sells have all their necessary immunizations, that no cat or dog is bred for more than two litters, that each cat or dog is implanted with a microchip before it is sold and that the breeder registers each litter with the Department.

- The implanting of a microchip is medically controversial and should be a decision reached by the owner of an animal and their vet. My personal experience is of a microchip traveling in the body of my dog from the implanted location to the lower abdomen requiring expensive surgery to remove it. It is my choice to not microchip my dogs for medical reasons. The state should not have the power to require that which might harm a pet.
- Limiting the breeding of a dog or cat to two breedings is also arbitrary and not a decision that should be made by legislative process. While some dogs should not be bred at all because of their risk for perpetuating genetic problems, others are fine examples of the breed that are worthy of being models of a breed. And there is a vast difference between male and female dogs. Males are capable of multiple breedings in a week and this bill would limit the breeding of a quality stud to two breedings in his lifetime. This limitation is both unacceptable and without any merit. While this legislation has been proposed by someone who is without expertise as a breeder or veterinarian, it is an intrusion into a highly skilled field that should not be legislated at all. The state should not become a dog registry nor a breeder.
- This decision simply cannot be mandated by law without a total shift in governmental philosophy. If our animals are to remain ours as owner private property, and then the state has no right to make this kind of decision for us. If, however, the animal is to be 'parens patriae' owned by the state, then the state must be prepared to not only make this decision but to deal with any ramifications of its obligation to own all the animals in the state and conduct the business of breeding and make all of the decisions regarding this function. You can't take this right away from the person who is responsible.



**The German Shepherd Dog
Club of Reno**

www.gsdcreno.org

(c) The business of the breeder will be conducted in a permanent structure or building; and

(d) Upon inspection, the premises upon which the breeder proposes to operate conform to this chapter and the rules and regulations of the Department and is a suitable place to conduct the business of the breeder.

- The vast majority of hobby breeders breed their occasional litter in their homes. This provision gives the right to enter and inspect a person's home without warrant and is in violation of the U. S. Constitution.

Sec. 11. A breeder shall:

1. Ensure that each cat or dog he breeds, and each cat or dog resulting from the breeding, has all of the necessary immunizations before the cat or dog is sold;

- Immunization protocols are changing and various veterinary practitioners use different schedules and different products in the immunization process. For some, the puppies may receive puppy shots as early as 4 weeks, but for most it is 6 weeks, but permanent immunization is not administered until 12 weeks or later. This provision would dictate that all animals be immunized before they are sold or placed in their new homes, meaning that all puppies would have to be kept by the breeder until they were older than the traditional 8 week placement time, or that they receive immunizations far earlier than is usually recommended by veterinary science. This provision is totally confusing and is unacceptable to any knowledgeable breeder.

Sec. 13. NRS 574.260 is hereby amended to read as follows:

574.260 "Dealer" means a person who, for compensation or profit, buys, sells, [breeds,] trades or imports cats or dogs for resale.

- We do not like the importation of animals for resale into our state, but that is a totally different issue than the local hobby breeder selling and placing animals in pet homes in our communities. There is a problem with puppy mills mass producing animals for sale in pet stores and on the internet, and there is a problem with the over population of random strays breeding on our streets. Punishing the hobby breeder and show enthusiast does not address either of those issues.

SUMMARY:

This act is unenforceable.

- The state may not enter or inspect a home without a warrant and almost all of the activities proposed to be regulated occur in homes.
- While the legitimate and reputable hobby breeder will attempt to comply, those who create the problem of over population will be ignorant of this legislation, as they are already ignorant of the need to confine and the proper health planning that goes into a breeding. They will not comply and will continue to create the problem that this legislation is attempting to address, but is missing it by a country mile.

This act is fiscally impossible.

The state is cutting budgets and laying off staff. This legislation would require a massive enforcement effort and staff and would not produce sufficient revenue to cover it. To create prohibitions and then not enforce them is not wise and creates an atmosphere of not taking our laws seriously. Unenforceable law, passed to pacify "animal rights" lobbying agenda, does nothing for ANIMAL WELFARE and punishes the wrong people.

This is bad legislation that imposes unconscionable burdens on reputable breeders and does not solve any problems. It plays into the nationwide war between those who propose animal rights as opposed to animal welfare. No breeder that I know is against animal welfare. Animals should be treated with the ultimate respect and care that our code of conduct and breeding requires. But that is different than the animal rights movement which has a stated agenda of eliminating pet ownership and reducing the American people to vegan diets.

There are sufficient laws on our books regarding animal cruelty to cover the problems that exist. The problem is in having the revenue and personnel to enforce them. Our legislative representatives would do well to solve the existing economic problems, rather than increase them.

Sincerely,
David E. Fritsche Th. D.
President, The German Shepherd Dog Club of Reno

3755 Bacon Rind Rd.
Reno, NV 89510
775 475-0303

