

LINDA BEALL

2195 E. National Pike
Scenery Hill, Pa. 15360

1/6/2007

Bureau of Dog Law Enforcement
Attn: Ms. Mary Bender
Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture
2301 North Cameron Street
Harrisburg, PA 17110-9408

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
REVIEW COMMISSION

2007 JAN 18 AM 10:56

RECEIVED

Dear Ms. Bender:

I have lived with dogs all of my life. Approximately 30 years ago I started showing in obedience and also a limited amount of breed showing. I have bred one litter years ago. I groomed professionally for 13 years and now am no longer active in show and no longer groom other than my own dog. I am now just a dog owner and lover, living with my much loved companion dog.

I am deeply concerned with the proposed amendment to Pennsylvania Dog Law. While not likely to affect puppy mills to any great extent, it will cause undo problems for responsible breeders and dog owners, while not improve the quality of life for dogs from these breeders and dog owners. I am appalled at some of the inhuman things that happen to animals, but creating amendments like the proposed ones, will not greatly affect this inhuman treatment, but will end up punishing dedicated, caring, and knowledgeable dog breeders and owners.

The idea that dogs of different sizes cannot be housed together is far from true. Dogs of different sizes can live together in harmony if proper socialization is done. All of the dogs that I have had over the last 30 some years, from a 16lb. dog to a 90lb dog, have lived in the house with me, have been groomed regularly, had regular veterinary care, training, have learned to interact with other dogs and people, and have been much loved members of the family. Over the years, I have had dogs who have done pet therapy, have passed temperament tests, and passed good citizen test.

The thought that all of these strict unfair requirements could adversely affect the ability of my being able to find future pets from a reputable, caring breeder who has been put out of business by these unfair amendments.

Maybe the current regulations should be more adequately enforced. If for some reason these regulations aren't enough, then enact regulations that target specific deficiencies. The current proposal appears to be merely a list of requirements that have no connection to specific instances in which the welfare of dogs could not be secured, and no basis in science or accepted canine care.

I urge that this proposal be withdrawn.

Sincerely,
Linda Beall

Copies:
J. Barry Stout, Hon. Timothy J. Solobay, Hon. Peter J. Daley