

Kathy Cooper

RECEIVED

From: Avari28@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2007 10:12 AM
To: IRRC
Subject: The Proposed Dog Law Changes

2007 FEB -5 PM 5:00

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
REVIEW COMMISSION**2559**

Anne M. Grim
 1240 E. Schuylkill Rd.
 Pottstown, PA 19465

Dear IRRC,

I am against changing the current Dog Law, ID #2-152(#2559) because of media promoted hysteria. The current law, when enforced has closed the bad kennels and changed many others for the better without having the obvious agenda of closing Pennsylvania taxpaying businesses (or taxpayers hobbies). The people behind Governor Rendell have this agenda.

We currently require anyone transporting dogs into the state or out of (or gathering for pet stores) to be licensed to do so. Enforcing this on the larger rescues will regulate them. Many kennels however sell to individuals who drive in from out of state to meet the parents of their new puppy. To stop out of state sales is to cripple the market for many breeders and will severely limit many genetic pools. Breeders who ship individual puppies already obtain health certificates and are under airline scrutiny. To stop legal shipments because of groups doing illegal business under the guise of rescuing is not fair.

The current Dog Law is sufficient to close the bad kennels, that are what the public would call a puppy mill, and will shut illegal (unlicensed kennels with a turnover of more than 26 dogs/puppies a year) kennels down. They call for clean, safe quarters and healthy dogs and puppies. Anymore would be against the PA. Constitution's right to own property. Better enforcement when a violation is found is the key to eliminating any inferior kennels or better yet upgrading them into a thriving Pennsylvania business.

The proposed Dog Law changes are aimed at closing all kennels. Governor Rendell is so bold as to say in his speech that he is targeting the Amish who are the most fundamentally Christian people there are. I cannot believe these people have it in them to be cruel and education has again and again upgraded their facilities. Why not combat the propaganda billboards with some of the PETA billboards found on www.PETAkillsanimals.com ? I also think a billboard featuring a top champion produced in Pennsylvania and A catchy phrase would help the public know the truth. 95% of Pennsylvania's kennels are great and would be severely affected by this proposed change for no reason.

2/5/2007

Is it not strange that Michael Wolf, who had his kennel license taken away never had his dogs taken away nor was there follow up to see if he came down to a legal limit? Was this so he could be the current administration's rallying cry?

This at the same time that Governor Rendell stopped the Dog Law Advisory Board from meeting. No one can think this is a coincidence. I am sure the donations and adoptions have poured in from the media coverage to help support the humane societies..

Now the groups that generously gave to Governor Rendell's reelection campaign, want to have the lucrative job of getting paid to inspect kennels, getting to search for dogs to seize, getting to charge board to keep the dogs in crates under state law minimums until the hearing before their fellow swat team members, getting to release info and horrid, exaggerated stories to the media for public donations and then they get the funds from selling the confiscated animals since the accused kennel owner will surely be found guilty in a noncourt setting in front of this same group. Since many humane societies in this state are privately owned and all pay no license fees or taxes, this is the best money making plan that any person on the planet could conceive. Let someone else do the work, steal it and triple your profits.

What happened to due process of law in Pennsylvania? I am sure that this will end up costing the taxpayers money since it, also sounds very against the constitution and some group will eventually fight it. It already is costing us money since the Dog Law fund cannot cover all these new salaries and high priced prosecutors. \$15,000 to upgrade each dog warden just the first year alone. To quote A & N research "Taxpayer money will be used to purchase equipment necessary for measuring lighting and ventilation. It is estimated that \$15,000 per warden will be allotted the first year and \$5,000 for the next four years, or \$35,000 per each warden. The information I have has 79 dog wardens listed - there could be more. $79 \times \$35,000 = \$2,765,000$, nearly \$3 million dollars." Read their whole report at <http://giventhefacts.blogspot.com/> .

These hundreds of thousands of dollars should be used to shut down crack houses not Pennsylvania businesses. How ridiculous do we look when illegal activities are happening but we are going after licensed and inspected kennels?

How do we look when we close a business because it can't prove that it walked a dog for 20 minutes even though the dog is in a 20 foot indoor/outdoor pen? And speaking of that, they have 20 toy dogs in their house and a fenced in backyard to romp together in. IF the person has just 20 dogs with an occasional litter, you are talking almost seven hours a day that the owner, who probably works a fulltime job, must walk their dogs in order to meet the new law. This is on top of the regular cleaning and feeding chores that a kennel has on a daily basis. This basically is a rule meant to make it impossible to own a kennel.

Most small commercial kennels have no hired help and spend 8-10 hours in their kennels now. Show kennels are just the fancier working around soccer games, grooming and the family, basically taking care of their hobby. They can not afford to hire a dog walker and most will drop their license and go underground. Since it is illegal to limit the number of pets a person in Pennsylvania can have, as long as they

license the individual dogs and stay under 26 they will violate no law by doing so. Is this what we want to do? Drive small kennels underground.

In a letter from Jesse Smith he states this, "The 26-dog threshold for the regulations to apply is part of the existing Dog Law. No dog that does not stay overnight with you counts – be it a sighthound practice, dog show, dog park, grooming, training, play, agility, parades,

sire or dam's owner evaluating pups, whatever. This is true whether you have a kennel license or not – dogs "stopping by" don't count. A boarding kennel is defined by the existing Dog Law as "available to the general public" and "for compensation." So other situations, like friends staying over with their dogs for free, or caring for an offspring of your dog for free, won't require you to get a kennel license. The same dog is counted once, as one dog, even if it leaves and returns to you several times throughout the year. The definitions of kennels and the 26-dog threshold have been in the Dog Law since 1996, and are not affected by the draft regulations. " However, in the past the law was if a dog stays over night it is added to your count. This was because if a grooming shop or breeder allows 26 individual customers to stay overnight then they are crossing into a boarding kennel's territory. I doubt most individuals have 26 different dogs staying overnight cumulatively but if they are large enough to co-own, have in for stud service, and produce enough puppies to go over 26 they should be licensed or they are an unlicensed, illegal kennel. Many get away with it by not letting the public into the home or staying at less than 26 dogs at a given time but this does not make it right.

The changes are also written by someone who never did daily hands on chores. How many breeders were consulted? Filling out forms for two hours a day will not insure that the item checked was done -- looking in the water pans will tell the inspector that.

I know small show breeders and rescues that will not be able to keep their beloved dogs as well as many reputable commercial kennels with these regulations. Is this our goal? Do we eliminate all chicken farms and pig ranches next? It is obvious that stopping all breeding is the hidden agenda and then all animal usage.

Why is a 14 day quarantine mandatory for a kennel getting a litter in from the co-owner's house? In fourteen days a puppy not being handled by various people will get to be shy. Why can an individual not sell a litter to a kennel or pet store? Home raised pups are preferred over kennel raised ones and many individuals find themselves overwhelmed by the litter so they would all end up yet again at the same humane societies that seem to be the only ones profiting by the New Dog Law.

Do not think this is the puppy mill bill as it is not aimed at just commercial kennels but at our constitutional rights to own pets. It is aimed at all of us since co-owners, rescues and everyone will be under the new police state that Rendell recommends.

Yes some rescues should be monitored but an individual

housing two dogs at a time in their home for a rescue should not be required to meet kennel requirements, just like a show breeder raising pups in their bedroom could never pass the non porous surface or kennel requirements. More stringent laws are not the answer. Better enforcement of current laws is the answer. Stealing a breeders stock and pets is not the answer. Removing the license and setting them up with a timetable for reduction in the dogs while monitored is the answer.

The uproar being heard should be listened to and all of us must tell the governor that we will not support his changes.

Sincerely,
Anne M. Grim