

Lou Mansolillo

From: Denise Cabral <goshawk3@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2026 6:28 PM
To: House Corporations Committee
Subject: House Bill 7334, parrot sale ban

You don't often get email from goshawk3@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

I oppose House Bill 7334 as a representative of the American Federation of Aviculture, and on behalf of my bird-owning friends in Rhode Island, and as a responsible animal owner. This bill paints all bird breeders and pet shops as being guilty of animal cruelty. Rhode Island already has animal cruelty laws, including Title 4, Chapter 1, titled Cruelty to Animals (Gen. Laws, 1956, § 4-1). This and other laws can be enforced in cases of animal cruelty. I implore you not to impose this egregious ban on the children, elderly and all citizens of your state.

Pet shops are heavily regulated, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) regulates larger bird breeders and rescues. H7334 is a redundant and superfluous law. Animals in pet shops are already protected under multiple layers of law and regulation. The few Rhode Island shops left with parrots for sale find educated customers are better customers. This bill would simply drive incoming revenue and taxes to other states, or worse, to the tax-free, totally unregulated, scam-ridden, smuggling-plagued Internet market.

I urge you to either vote no or remand this bill to a study committee comprised of at least some of the stakeholders directly affected by this bill. Limited publicity about this bill has left local bird breeders, pet parrot owners, and affected pet businesses often unaware of the consequences of this proposal, in denial, and with inadequate time to formulate objections.

It truly constitutes restraint of trade to restrict the ability of a business to select its stock from one already biased source, as this bill proposes, and with no promise of profit. Further, the writers of this bill are in direct competition with the affected pet stores. Like it or not, trading adoption fees, adoption donations, or donated labor in return for a pet parrot is still a sale, still a transaction, under the uniform commercial code. Please do not give these bill writers an unfair monopoly of the pet parrot business in your state. Animal care facilities or animal rescue organizations requiring any kind of compensation in return for a pet should not be exempt from the definition of a pet store or sale.

Please also consider that the so-called need for this bill comes from groups that accept birds from many other states. Of course they see a huge problem, compared to the actual number coming from RI. It is inherently unfair to generalize the need for a sales ban in one state on data from intakes from many states. In addition, presenting your sponsoring agency as the only possible savior of a situation created by your own inflated figures is exactly what the RICO Act was designed to fight.

It is extremely problematic that this proposal allows bird breeders to sell birds only from their homes, if at all. Visitors can introduce previously unknown diseases to the owners' flocks. I am personally aware of cases where visitors have distracted the homeowner, using children, and stolen birds. In other cases, visitors have merely been "casing the joint", then came back later to steal the birds. It has also happened that potential buyers were using false pretenses to then falsely report the bird

seller to animal regulators. Please do not subject your citizens to this. Meeting potential pet buyers in neutral locations or pet club meetings is an important safety precaution these days.

You may have heard that some supporters are using information about the long lives of parrots and various diseases supposedly linked to captivity as justification for this proposal. You may hear people say parrots live 100 years. They do not. My oldest to date may have been 52. Data compiled by the American Federation of Aviculture indicates larger parrots are lucky to make it to 50 or 60 years, medium parrots rarely exceed 50, and smaller ones may live as little as ten years. Research into wild populations, while limited, shows wild adults do not live as long as our pets. In addition, extensive studies of different wild birds reveals that as much as 90% of each year's hatchlings do not survive more than a few months. In captivity, breeders flip that percentage the other way, with 90% to even 100% survival to adulthood. It is also being said that many pet parrots with feather destruction issues would not have these problems if they were wild. While there are disease issues we have discovered over the last 30 years, thanks to our also-endangered avian veterinary specialists' work, we can now test for, and in some cases, treat these issues. It has also been said that these diseases do not exist in the wild, but, again thanks to data from AFA, these diseases have been documented in wild parrots. Guess what? They are hard to document in the wild because it is a dangerous place, and if you're weak, some predator comes along and eats you before your photo can be taken. These issues should not be used as justification for banning sales of parrots.

The writer is a wildlife biologist, professionally trained to review and consider animal population issues. Since it has been illegal to import wild-caught parrots into the United States since 1992 (I was part of the negotiations), American aviculture has had NO further impact on wild parrot populations. However, it is fair to say that aviculture owes it to the future of rare and endangered parrot populations to be allowed to continue ex-situ parrot conservation programs to provide potential reintroduction animals in case of extinction. This proposal would not only prevent qualified bird breeders from supporting their programs through sales of other more common parrots, but would also require surrender of birds to rescues or sanctuaries where they are cruelly held in non-breeding situations, forever unable to contribute to the world survival of their species. If on the one hand, you say you support endangered species survival, you can't, on the other hand, promote laws confining endangered species to non-breeding programs. Please vote no if you support endangered species survival. Extinct is forever.

One of the most egregious parts of this bill is the proposed ban on displays or educational programs. Why would you want to condemn your citizens to ignorance by denying them the opportunity to directly see and learn about parrots? What is shown on the media is a totally inadequate representation of the reality these creatures present. How else are people to learn what animals, if any, they have an affinity for? In addition, this ban could subject anyone whose pet parrot was simply admired during a visit to the outside world to a possible fine. This proposed ban is a direct violation of our civil right to freedom of speech and expression.

It is extremely distressing to me as an American citizen to have to read and oppose anti-pet bills like this one, while driving by liquor stores and pot shops in every town, and constantly having to mute gambling commercials on TV. Please do not support HB 7334, another disgraceful attack on Rhode Island residents' property rights, rights to free and fair trade and competitive commerce, rights to free speech and expression, and rights to liberty and the pursuit of our own individual happiness. This bad bill would further advance the radical animal rights extremist agenda to remove all pets from our lives.

Please vote no on HB 7334 or send it to a study committee for fair, even-handed public review.

Thank you for your time, and have a good day.

Sincerely,

Denise Cabral

Massachusetts Cage Bird Association
American Federation of Aviculture c/o
PO Box 595
Easton, MA
02375