Appendix A:

The American Kennel Club's betrayal of dogs

The AKC continues to oppose efforts to protect dogs from extreme weather, puppy mill cruelty, sexual abuse and dogfighting.

Since the beginning of 2018, the American Kennel Club has <u>opposed</u> the following animal protection legislation.

The AKC is not an animal welfare organization. It is a purebred dog registry sustained by dog registration fees. Because of their financial dependence on commercial breeders, the AKC regularly lobbies against animal welfare bills, including those that would provide protections for dogs in puppy mills. The AKC is apparently afraid such laws would cut into its profit.

Since the beginning of 2018, the American Kennel Club has opposed the below bills, which aimed to protect dogs in puppy mills, combat dogfighting, prevent the sexual abuse of animals, and protect dogs from suffering in extreme temperatures.

Extreme weather	S.B. 1025	Virginia	S.B. 1025 aimed to prohibit the tethering of dogs in extreme temperatures, require tethers to be longer, and allow localities to enact their own requirements. The AKC opposed this bill.
Extreme weather	H.B. 501	Maryland	This bill would have protected dogs from being kept outdoors and unattended during episodes of extreme weather. The AKC opposed this bill.
Extreme weather	H.B. 1909	Tennessee	H.B. 1109 would require owners to unchain their dogs during a natural disaster. The AKC opposed this bill.
Extreme weather	S.B. 827	Virginia	This bill would protect dogs from being tethered outdoors when the temperature is below 32 degrees or above 85 degrees. The AKC opposed this bill.



1			·
Extreme weather	H.B.121	Louisiana	This bill aimed to prohibit the tethering of dogs or cats during a flood or hurricane. The AKC opposed this bill.
Puppy Mills	H.F. 738	lowa	This bill aims to provide animal welfare standards for commercial breeders. The AKC expressed opposition to this bill.
Puppy Mills	S.B. 569	New Hampshire	The AKC <u>opposed</u> this bill which would upgrade breeder regulations, allow anonymous reporting of breeders, access to public records at pet stores and commercial kennels. They lobbied to weaken existing cruelty laws as well.
Puppy mills	Ohio Puppy Mill Prevention Amendment	Ohio	The AKC opposed a ballot measure which would have put upgrades to the state's commercial breeder law on the 2018 ballot. The AKC encouraged their supporters to find and question volunteer signature gatherers and report back. ¹
Puppy mills	H.B. 2477	Kansas	The AKC <u>opposed</u> a bill which aimed to provide upgrades to existing breeder regulations, such as unannounced inspections of breeders.
Puppy mills	<u>S.B. 161</u>	New Hampshire	The AKC <u>opposed</u> a bill which aimed to provide upgrades to hobby breeder regulations.
Puppy mills	S.B. 283	Tennessee	The AKC <u>opposed</u> a bill that would provide welfare standards to regulate commercial breeders.
Dog Fighting	H.B. 605	New Hampshire	The AKC opposed ² a bill that would strengthen NH's animal fighting law. It would have prevented a convicted dogfighter from owning animals for 5 years.

Copy of this email available upon request.
Access to verbal testimony available.



Dog Fighting	H.B. 233/ S.B. 222	Tennessee	The AKC <u>opposed</u> a bill that would outlaw the possession of dogfighting paraphernalia.
Sexual Abuse	<u>S.B. 67</u>	Kentucky	The AKC opposed a bill which outlaws bestiality and would make sure the animal is forfeited from the abuser's home.
Other Welfare Bills	A.11242	New York	The AKC opposed a bill that prohibits cropping or docking a dog's ear or tail.
Other Welfare Bills	Law "H"	New York	The AKC opposed a proposed bill that would allow a person to enter and remove an animal from a vehicle to prevent overheating.
Other Welfare Bills	S.B. 4577	New York	The AKC opposed a bill which regulates the weather conditions that a dog can remain outside in.
Other Welfare Bills	S.B. 2249/ H.B. 4191	Illinois	The AKC opposed two bills which allow bystanders to remove a dog from a vehicle.
Other Welfare Bills	H.B. 5265	Rhode Island	The AKC <u>opposed</u> a bill which would create an Animal Advisory Rights Council for the state.
Other Welfare Bills	H.B. 5433	Rhode Island	The AKC <u>opposed</u> a bill which allows the seizure of animals based on the cruelty.



Other Welfare Bills	H.B. 19-1092	Colorado	The AKC <u>opposed</u> a bill to increase penalties for animal abusers and prohibit them from animal ownership.
Other Welfare Bills	Amendment 13 to FL Constitution	Florida	The AKC <u>opposed</u> an amendment that would ban greyhound racing in the state.
Other Welfare Bills	S.B. 2055	Rhode Island	The AKC <u>opposed</u> a bill which provides dogs used in sledding and hunting with minimal standards of care as all other dogs.

The AKC also opposed ordinances that would require the proper shelter and other welfare standards for dogs who live outdoors in Norman, Ok; Roswell, GA; Albany, NY; Onondaga County, NY; Kansas City, MO; Buffalo, NY; Athens, AL and Baltimore, MD.

The AKC Defends Puppy Mills and Pet Stores that Sell Dogs

Every year, AKC-linked breeders, and sometimes even "AKC Breeders of Merit," land on the HSUS Horrible Hundred list of problem puppy mills. The AKC's care standards for breeders are so low that some breeders have been arrested by local law enforcement for animal cruelty or shut down shortly after passing an AKC inspection.

In February 2019, for example, law enforcement seized 18 cocker spaniels from a New Hampshire couple who were the AKC's 2018 Sporting Group Breeders of the Year. And in 2017, the AKC rallied behind its Terrier Group Breeder of the Year even after she was convicted of illegally cropping dogs' ears and the USDA suspended her license.³

³ https://www.chicagotribune.com/lifestyles/pets/ct-dog-breeders-animal-cruelty-20171219-story.html



4

The AKC also promotes and defends pet stores that sell dogs⁴ -- despite the fact it encourages the public to only buy from responsible breeders. They also remind members when buying a dog to "visit the breeder's home or kennel and ask to see at least one of the puppy's parents." ⁵

Of course, it is impossible to "visit the breeder's home" when buying a puppy from a pet store. The reason for the AKC's hypocrisy is clear. Pet stores sell puppies "with AKC papers" and encourage consumers to register their puppies, which puts money in the AKC's pocket.

Why does the AKC also oppose legislation that would protect dogs from extreme weather, dogfighting, greyhound racing and sexual abuse?

This is a more difficult question to answer. The AKC's extreme, anti-welfare positions certainly do not reflect the opinion of a majority of dog owners.

Since 2008 the AKC has opposed nearly 300 local and state laws introduced to protect dogs in puppy mills, prevent the sexual abuse of animals, combat dogfighting and require only veterinarians conduct surgical procedures on dogs, among others. In 2018 and 2019, the AKC has evidently ramped up their opposition to animal welfare bills.

⁵ https://www.akc.org/press-center/articles/responsible-breeders/



5

⁴ https://www.akc.org/legislative-alerts/ask-new-york-not-limit-responsible-pet-choice/; https://www.akc.org/clubs-delegates/government-relations/government-relations-blogs/pet-shop-laws-affect/

AKC DOCUMENTS

From: AKC Government Relations [mailto:doglaw@akc.org] Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 1:50 PM Subject: Ohio: Help Fight Dangerous Ballot Measure Harming Dogs and Breeders April 26, 2018 Petitions are being circulated throughout Ohio to put a constitutional amendment on the ballot in November that would regulate many breeders, sportsmen, and hobbyists and include care standards that are vague and potentially harmful to dogs. If this measure makes it to the November 2018 ballot and is approved, the regulations would not just become law, they would be placed in the Ohio constitution - and extremely difficult to ever change. Summary: The so-called "Ohio Puppy Mill Prevention Amendment" contains many provisions of concern, including: Regulating anyone who owns 8 unspayed female dogs, regardless of age. Supporters claim this bill would not impact hobby breeders, but that is not correct. Anyone who owns 8 unspayed females - regardless of the dogs' ages - would be regulated. This means if someone has 1-2 adult females and then a litter with 6-7 female puppies, they would be regulated. The same is also true if they also have older female dogs that they have chosen not to have spayed. Moreover, the proposal equates ownership of intact animals to breeding, assuming that intact dogs would only be kept "for the purpose of breeding and selling"-and disregards scientific research that demonstrates the dangers of early spay/neuter on a dog's long-term health.



It could also potentially include those who meet the 8 female dog threshold but are not breeding them, if it is believed the owner might breed them at some point. Or, if you have 8 unspayed females, but only breed one of them, you are likely still regulated under this proposal. In addition, the definition of "selling" includes ex change or ownership transfers.

Regulating hobbyists or owners of multiple dogs as commercial breeders is problematic because it subjects those owners to regulations designed for high volume commercial kennels. It also makes it difficult for responsible hobbyists to hand raise a litter of puppies in their homes. Requiring that all kennels be kept at certain temperatures, regardless of breed or an individual dog's needs. All kennels would be required to be kept between 45 and 85 degrees Fahrenheit. This arbitrary range doesn't allow for best practices in animal care. Some dogs may thrive in temperatures outside these ranges, and for others, even the extreme ends of this range could be dangerous. It also does not take into account that when puppies are first born, they often must be kept at temperatures higher than 85 degrees for their safety.

Requiring enclosure sizes that are significantly higher than those mandated by USDA or the Ohio Department of Agriculture. The proposal could require those who already have kennels to completely rebuild. It will also be extremely difficult for owners or individuals who meet the vague threshold and raise an occasional litter of dogs in their homes. Excluding shelters and rescues from the requirements. Dogs kept in shelters and rescues would not be required to be kept according to these standards.

What You Can Do:

Volunteers are working throughout Ohio to collect enough signatures to place this on the ballot in November. They have been seen at public events, stores, and sporting events. It is expected that a major push will be made during the Primary Elections on May 8 to collect signatures as people go to the polls.

We need you to help spread the word about this dangerous amendment and discourage people from signing the petitions. Please do not sign the petition. Please educate your colleagues and friends regarding the problems with the amendment and encourage them not to sign the petition.

Also, consider directly talking to signature gatherers and politely ask them questions about what they believe the ballot measure will do and explain your concerns. If the signature collector misrepresents the either the purpose or the provisions of the constitutional amendment, please review their petition affidavit for their name and advise us of the specifics of the conversation. Be courteous and respectful as many of these petition collectors are just trying to earn a wage.

Talking Points:



There are regulations here that could hurt dogs - and once they are in the constitution they will be very difficult to change. Even standards that may seem a good idea today can change. Science continues to show us new and better ways to care for dogs. This would establish standards that would be almost impossible to ever change - even if someday we learn a new a better way to care for dogs.

If these are truly the best conditions for dogs, then why are shelters and rescues excluded? Don't those dogs matter and deserve to be kept to the same standards?

This is going to regulate a lot of people, and it's very confusing as to who would be included. This will be very difficult and very expensive to enforce. If it can't be enforced, how will it help dogs?

The legislature is working on addressing concerns by bringing everyone to the table and including a broad variety of stakeholders and animal experts. An open process takes better advantage of expert input, is more inclusive, and is ultimately better for dogs.

Why should these provisions such as crate sizes be enshrined in the Ohio Constitution?

AKC Government Relations will continue to closely monitor this process and provide updates.

Please share with us at doglaw@akc.org any experiences you have as you share this information with petition
gatherers and your friends and colleagues.





Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Representative Maxine Grad, Chair Vermont House Judiciary Committee 115 State Street Montpelier, VT 05633-5301

RE: American Kennel Club Deeply Concerned with Senate Bill 123

Chairwoman Grad and Members of the House Judiciary Committee:

The American Kennel Club (AKC) writes today to express our deep concerns with Senate Bill 123, which seeks to provide animal shelter or rescue organizations that assist law enforcement in animal cruelty investigations or seizures with immunity from civil liability damages claimed by owners of animals unless their care and treatment constitutes gross negligence. We respectfully request that S.123 not be approved as currently written.

The American Kennel Club was established in 1884 and promotes the study, breeding, exhibiting, and advancement of purebred dogs. We represent over 5,100 dog clubs nationally, including 11 clubs in Vermont. We advocate for the purebred dog as a family companion, advance canine health and well-being, protect the rights of dog owners, and promote the ideals of responsible dog ownership.

The AKC, which has long maintained a zero-tolerance policy regarding cruelty, recognizes the notable roles private shelter and rescue organizations can play in aiding law enforcement agencies' cruelty investigations. However, as an advocate that also seeks to protect the rights of all dog owners, we are concerned with unforeseen consequences that can result should S.123 be enacted as currently written.

On principle, we contend that no material and non-reversible alteration (including sterilization), alienation, or euthanization of an animal may occur while a case against an animal's owner is pending; and unless and until the termination of ownership rights becomes effective upon a determination of guilt and completion of appeals, other judicial action, or self-forfeiture by the animal owner.

We believe Vermont state law should best ensure that someone acquitted of cruelty charges or against whom charges are dropped will not be erroneously deprived of their property or its substantive qualities. We contend that by significantly raising the burden of proof required of a person to make a civil claim against a shelter or rescue, S.123 will make it unreasonably harder for individuals to seek redress in the civil court system. For these reasons, we oppose Senate Bill 123 and respectfully request that it not be approved as currently written.

Thank you for your consideration. I am happy to provide greater detail and explanations for our concerns with S. 123. Please do not he sitate to contact me for any reason at 919-816-3503.

Sincerely

Phil M. Guidry, JD Director, Policy Analysis AKC Government Relations

CC: Mike Bailey, Committee Assistant

8051 Arco Corporate Drive Raleigh, NC 27617-3390 Tel 919 816-3600 www.akc.org

