



Memorandum in Support

COMMITTEE ON ANIMALS AND THE LAW

Animals #30

February 23, 2026

S. 3026

By: Senator Gianaris

A. 8551

By: M. of A. Dais

Senate Committee: Agriculture

Assembly Committee: Agriculture

Effective Date: 90th day after it shall have become a
law

AN ACT to amend the agriculture and markets law, in relation to restricting the performance of surgical devocalization procedures on dogs and cats

LAW & SECTIONS REFERRED TO: Sections 365-a and 374 of the Agriculture and Markets Law

THE COMMITTEE ON ANIMALS AND THE LAW SUPPORTS THIS LEGISLATION

Generations have learned the expression “the dog did not bark” since *The Strand Magazine* first published Sir Arthur Conan Doyle’s legendary Sherlock Holmes story “The Adventure of Silver Blaze” in December of 1892. In it, the great detective solved the death of a trainer in large part because the stable dog did not bark. The dog did not bark because it recognized the assassin who had entered the stable, intending to harm the horse kept there; the man was not a stranger to the dog.

It is in the nature of dogs to bark; for much of recorded history their barking – or choice not to – has been remarked upon, from the biblical Exodus to Holmes and beyond. And yet all too many dogs and cats continue to be subjected to unnecessary, inhumane and unconscionable surgeries in order to remove their ability to speak.

This bill amends the Agriculture and Markets Law by adding new Section 365-a to restrict the surgical devocalization procedures on dogs and cats. The term “devocalization,” as used in § 365-a, is defined as “a surgical procedure on the larynx or vocal cords of an animal intended to cause the reduction or elimination of vocal sounds produced by that animal and includes

Opinions expressed are those of the Section/Committee preparing this memorandum and do not represent those of the New York State Bar Association unless and until they have been adopted by its House of Delegates or Executive Committee.

procedures commonly referred to as ‘debarking,’ ‘silencing’ or ‘bark softening.’” Currently, owners of dogs and cats are free to proceed with the devocalization of their pets for any or no reason at all. If this bill becomes a law, it will change this reality in many ways, while still permitting the procedure to be performed when medically needed.

More specifically, the devocalization surgery would be legally permissible only if (i) performed by a licensed veterinarian, and (ii) to treat a dog or a cat for a physical condition that causes—or could cause—pain or harm, or to save its life. For dogs and cats under six months of age, the surgery would only be justified if it is both medically necessary *and* if the only alternative to the surgery would be death or euthanasia. In all cases, the particular medical necessity warranting the intervention is required to be documented by the veterinarian in the treatment record of the animal patient.

Anyone violating these prohibitions in S.3026 / A.8551 would face adverse consequences. A veterinarian who knowingly violates the prohibitions in the bill would be both subject to a civil penalty of up to \$1,000, and to the revocation or suspension of his or her license. Anyone else who either knowingly performs or causes a devocalization to be performed on a dog or cat in violation of the prohibitions in the bill could be charged with a class B misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment for no more than ninety days, by a fine up to \$500, or both.

The surgical devocalization of dogs and cats who do not medically need it serves a single purpose: making them quiet. In addition to causing pain, there are a plethora of serious adverse consequences for the animals that can result from these “convenience surgeries.”¹ Devocalizations present long-term physical risks, which include increased risks of aspiration pneumonia, breathing difficulties, exercise intolerance, as well as chronic coughing or gagging.² They also create increased risks to their physical safety due to the loss of their ability to ward off threats by vocalizing and alerting others to dangers.³ From a psychological and behavioral perspective, the procedure decreases the animals’ ability to communicate their intentions to other animals and to people, leading to possible misinterpretation of their actions and harm by others, or danger to themselves and/or others.⁴ Animals subjected to the procedure have also been reported to show an increased level of frustration, leading to possible destructive behaviors toward property or to aggression toward other animals or people.⁵ Accordingly, many credible organizations have taken

¹ Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association, Devocalization Fact Sheet, available at <https://www.humanevma.org/assets/pdfs/devocalization-facts.pdf> (last visited January 31, 2026).

² *Id.*

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Id.* See also Bain, Melissa, “Surgical and Behavioral Relationships With Welfare,” *Frontiers of Veterinary Science*, August 14, 2020, available at <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7456887/> (last visited January 31, 2026). Accord, Zach Eichten, state director for Minnesota’s Humane Society chapter, quoted in Pieper, Tessa, “Keep those claws — under bill, landlords couldn’t require declawing, devocalization of animals,” *Minnesota House of Representatives*, February 15, 2023, available at <https://www.house.mn.gov/sessiondaily/Story/17678> (last visited

Opinions expressed are those of the Section/Committee preparing this memorandum and do not represent those of the New York State Bar Association unless and until they have been adopted by its House of Delegates or Executive Committee.

a firm stance against the non-therapeutic devocalization of animals, including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the International Society for Animal Rights, PETA and the Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association.⁶

Numerous states have already limited or prohibited the devocalization of pets. Canine devocalization is restricted to medical necessity in Massachusetts, Maryland, and New Jersey. California and Rhode Island have adopted legislation making it unlawful to make devocalization an obligatory condition of real estate occupancy for tenants who own dogs,⁷ with Minnesota following suit in 2024.⁸

This is a longstanding bill, having been first introduced in 2010 as A.11684, the same year that the Massachusetts law was passed. The bill has been introduced in both houses every year since 2010, and has been passed in the Assembly in 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016. After substantial changes were made to the bill, it was passed by the Senate in 2024 and 2025, but no action was taken in the Assembly. It is now time for New York to definitively oppose devocalization and put an end to this cruel practice by passing S.3026 / A.8551 this year.

For the foregoing reasons, the Committee on Animals and the Law **SUPPORTS** the passage and enactment of this legislation.

January 31, 2026).

⁶ The American Veterinary Medical Association, Canine Devocalization, available at <https://www.avma.org/resources-tools/avma-policies/canine-devocalization> (last visited January 31, 2026); The International Society for Animal Rights, Stop Devocalization, available at <https://isaronline.org/nsite/stop-devocalization/> (last visited January 31, 2026); PETA, Debarking, available at <https://www.peta.org/issues/animal-companion-issues/cruel-practices/debarking> (last visited January 31, 2026); Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association, Devocalization Fact Sheet, *supra* at FN 1.

⁷ The American Veterinary Medical Association, Literature review on the welfare implications of Canine devocalization, March 7, 2023, available at [avma-lit-review-canine-devocalization-0323.pdf](https://www.avma.org/resources-tools/literature-review/canine-devocalization-0323.pdf) (last visited January 31, 2026).

⁸ Section 504B.114 MN Statutes, effective January 1, 2024, available at <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/2024/cite/504B.114/pdf> (last visited January 31, 2026).

Opinions expressed are those of the Section/Committee preparing this memorandum and do not represent those of the New York State Bar Association unless and until they have been adopted by its House of Delegates or Executive Committee.