HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

* * * * * * * * *

Ownership, Licensing & Liability Regarding Dogs

* * * * * * * * *

House Judiciary Subcommitte on Crimes and Corrections

Capitol Annex Room 22 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Thursday, October 3, 1996 - 10:00 a.m.

--000--

BEFORE:

Honorable Jerry Birmelin, Majority Chairman Honorable Thomas Caltagirone

KEY REPORTERS

1300 Garrison Drive, York, PA 17404
(717) 764-7801 Fax (717) 764-6367

		2
1	ALSO PRESENT:	
2	Dan Fellin, Esquire	
3	Majority Counsel to House Judiciary Committee	
4	Judy Sedesse	
5	Administrative Assistant	
6	William Andring, Esquire	
7	Minority Counsel for Committee	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

CONTENTS

2	WITNESSES	PAGE
3	Phonds Isnastor Concerned Citizen	5
4	Rhonda Lancaster, Concerned Citizen	
5	Dr. Billy Whittaker, Veterinarian	8
6	Sergeant Mike Henry, City of Harrisburg Police Department	16
7	Jonathan James, Concerned Citizen	29
8	Ron Tucker, Dog Breeder	48
9	Joseph Aquila, Concerned Citizen	53
10	Salvatore Aquila, Concerned Citizen	53
11	Officer Fred Lamke, City of Harrisburg	61
12	Police Department, Animal Control	
13	Dotsie Keith, Legislative Chairman PA Federation of Dog Clubs	71
14	Johanna Seeton, Chairperson PA Legislative Animal Network	83
15	Kathy Genuardi, Treasurer and Rescue	95
16	Coordinator, Independence Club	95
17		
18		
19		
20	_	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We are having a public hearing today. My name is Jerry Birmelin. The subject of the hearing is dangerous dogs. And along those lines we have had legislation that was introduced by the gentleman who sits to my right, Democratic Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Representative Caltagirone.

It was not assigned to this committee. However, the chairman, the Republican chairman of the committee, Representative Gannon, felt that it was a subject that could use some discussion and public hearing information on and so we have scheduled this today.

I am going to give you a few simple ground rules if you are testifying today. The first is that we do have an agenda, the copies of which are on the table listing the particulars of who is speaking when. I will not allow those who are testifying to go very far beyond their allotted time. We do have a full schedule and we also, I understand, have someone who is going to be added to the end of that schedule. So we will be here at least through 1:00, if not later. I don't want to delay the

meeting. If we speed it up, that will be great. 1 I will do my best to do that. Since there are 2 only two members here now, I don't think we have 3 to worry about a whole lot of questions being 4 5 asked. We can get underway. Our first 6 testifier is Rhonda Lancaster. Rhonda, are you 7 here? 8

> Would you come forward please and have a seat and share with us your testimony? your testimony in print, by the way?

MS. LANCASTER: Yes. It is on the back.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I have just a quick message to our stenographer. If we are going too fast for you, if someone is unclear, don't hesitate to stop and ask us for a clarification. You may begin.

MS. LANCASTER: I would like to start by saying that what I have is in here. I was told in the beginning it was 20 minutes I had to speak. It is kind of like a 20-minute deal and I will synopsize it and make it ten.

> CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Do your best.

MS. LANCASTER: Thank you. My name is

24

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Rhonda Lancaster. I am from Philadelphia and I am here because the peril that fell upon me started September 21st of 1993 when my cat disappeared. This was a cat that I had for many years and he never came back home. And then upon talking to the neighbors in the community, I was there led to the Women's Humane Society where I had to go to identify his body. It had been mauled to bits and shreds. This was in a sparring ground and this was my first contact or any knowledge of pit bull fighting.

2.2

So upon that I began to get my neighbors together in the community and we started watching the park where these fights were taking place and we began to find masses of body pieces of animals in the park and stenches and the whole nine yards, which you see is depicted in the report that I have submitted.

So one of my neighbors, Barry Burton, who is depicted in the article of the Philadelphia Inquirer, he and I kind of got together and led the investigation that eventually led to the, led to the hearing and the conviction of Alexander Thomas, who was also employed by the SPCA and upon his dismissal had

stolen property from the SPCA to be used for dogfighting and petnapping.

2.0

2.1

So when all of this came out of court, the Judge decided that because he violated the code of ethics of the SPCA that he would have to serve, I think it was six years' probation, until 2,001, community service and restitution of the euthanasia of the dogs that they found in his basement upon his arrest which had been used in the dogfighting and had been dehydrated and emaciated.

So we began to unravel that this
21-year old was in this very heavy. He was also
involved in narcotics, which is in the police
report submitted by the 14th Police District
which arrested him.

So I guess my synopsis at the end is that it is not so much the dog; it is the person that owns the dog. This man, he brought dogs home and he taught them to train, he baited them with cats and other animals. This is what he did for a living. We found out in the police report that his mother actually allowed him to have the fights in the house. She would clear the living room furniture out of the house and

allow him to have the fights in the home. It was just a real, real heavy thing.

So we eradicated most of the problem in my immediate area. However, it still goes on and I think that with education and letting people know the dangers of getting involved in dogfighting, we might be able to eradicate it, maybe not completely but eradicate a majority of it.

So that is my testimony.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: You did an excellent job of keeping it under 20 minutes; probably too good a job. As I said, we will give an opportunity for additional comments or questions by our many members, of which there is only one other one here today.

And Representative Caltagirone, do you have any questions?

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: No.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you.

Is Dr. William Whittaker here? I take it by that you are Dr. Whittaker?

DOCTOR WHITTAKER: Yes, sir. If it matters, my name is not William. It is Billy.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Billy.

1 DOCTOR WHITTAKER: Right. My name has 2 two T's. I don't know if that ever counts for 3 anything. CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Not a whole lot around here. Do you have any written testimony 5 with you today? 6 7 DOCTOR WHITTAKER: No, I don't. 8 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: It is pronounced Whittaker? 9 10 DOCTOR WHITTAKER: Right. 11 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: You may begin. DOCTOR WHITTAKER: I am a veterinarian 12 13 outside of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, in Lititz. 14 I see rots and pits on a weekly and lots of 15 times on a daily basis. We are a surgical 16 referral hospital, so we see a lot of rots and pits that come to us from outside the Lititz 17 area, too. 18 I would have to say that overall I 19 2.0 don't see any that concern me as being 21 dangerous, but the people who bring their 22 animals to me are conscientious pet owners. 23 will bet you that most of these people who are

fighting these animals don't even have

veterinarians or seek veterinary care. And I

24

25

would hate to see all those clients I have who have good pets and are good citizens be penalized by a breed specific dog law. The problem I feel is usually at the other end of the leash.

The other thing I am concerned with is, if you have a breed specific dog law, there is a number of people that have had a rot or a pit that is eight or nine years and has always been a good dog, the economic implications of these people. They may not be able to afford to keep this pet if there is an increase, a mandatory increase in insurance liability or a structure outside so when they are not immediately with the dog they would have to have a real aggressive structure outside the dog to prevent the dog from doing something that the dog has never done before.

The other thing I am concerned with is our police department situation. If suddenly we have new laws on Rottweilers that might indicate that we need an increase in insurance liability or the animal has to be on a muzzle when it is out in public, I think this is going to have a negative effect on the police department because

the police departments everywhere are strapped for cash. They are going to have to live up to the law, which means increased liability insurance, which may decrease the number of canine patrol animals we have out there. A lot of these dogs and all the ones I know personally that work with police departments go home with that family at night, in which case when they are off duty, they are just a pet. So somebody would have to pick up the increase in finances for the insurance and maybe a structure outside. Police departments can't afford to do it. patrolmen can't afford to do it. I think this would have negative implications on our police capability.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I don't know how this would affect the guard dogs at the prisons. Well, some are rots, some are shepherd types, so we have to think of that also.

Basically all I have to say is that I would hate to see breed specific legislation.

Most of the dogs that have taken shots at me have not been rots or pits; in fact, none of them.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Rots being

Rottweilers?

1

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DOCTOR WHITTAKER: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: I want to clear the air on this issue about breed specific.

We met with the kennel association people last night in Berks County and had a thorough, frank discussion about this particular issue. What we do need to define, we need a starting point. Let's be very honest about the timing of this legislation. We probably won't see anything really done with the legislation because there are so few days left in this session. That is not to say that the legislation will not be reissued and redrawn again in the next session. It probably will be. But what we need to get a handle on and be very specific about is that the dangerous or vicious type dog, be it Rottweiler, pit bull, German shepherds, Doberman or whatever, so that the local police departments, humane society and other officers, dog wardens can enforce the law on aggressive or overly aggressive type animals.

I think we are going to hear some testimony today and from hopefully the

Harrisburg Police Department as I have had with some of the other police departments about the number of incidences of attacks.

2.2

Let me give you some figures at

Reading. We had 180 pit bulls, or the Humane

Society's records told us, 180 put down from

January to June. Eighty were involved in some

type of attacks on people or other animals. We

have had a rash of incidents this past summer of

a number of a children that have been mauled or

severely bitten by these dogs; basically pit

bulls. That is not to say there weren't some

Rottweilers; there were, but basically the pit

bull.

And we have got to literally put some teeth in the law because the law enforcement people are telling us their hands are tied that until somebody is attacked or bitten, then they can respond. But until then, there is really nothing in the law that can force them to do anything. Sure you can say, well, when they are walking, they are supposed to be on a leash; granted. But what has been happening in some of the areas around the state, and it is not restricted to Reading — they have had serious

problems here in Harrisburg, York, Lancaster,

Philly, Pittsburgh, Erie -- I mean, we have seen

some incidences occurring outside in the rural

areas so they are not immune. They are not

immune.

I agree with you. It is the owner that really is the responsible party, should be the person that should be held accountable. And that is one of the other things that this legislation is aiming to do, is to make it a serious offense, maybe a year to five years in jail. I think that is pretty serious when these people get caught doing these kinds of things. That is the intent.

What we are looking to do is to define the verbiage for dangerous or vicious. And well, everybody is saying what does that mean.

Does that mean that a dog isn't penned up properly, starts to chew the wood away and can get out and runs over a 78-year old woman, corners her and scares the devil out of her; or kids playing on the playground where one of the dogs happens to run over and mauls a kid. These kinds of things have been happening.

DOCTOR WHITTAKER: I don't think there

is anybody here that is going to disagree that we need a real aggressive vicious dog law. I would like to see a law that really punishes these offenders that have these animals and encourage them to be dangerous and these people who breed dogs that are dangerous.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The biggest problem we have besides people encouraging these capable dogs of being so aggressive is people who, well, the Rottweiler or the pit bull have become popular so they see just a way of making money. So they breed without regard to temperament or even physical disability. They breed dogs with bad hips just because Rottweilers are popular. they are not going to take the least bit of care about what temperament they are breeding. would love to see a real good vicious dog law and I would love to see enough finances somehow that the police would be able to really enforce it aggressively, as was found that a lot of these people are involved in more than one thing besides dogfighting.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

DOCTOR WHITTAKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you.

I am going to add an additional speaker at this point. Sergeant Mike Henry, since we are running ahead of schedule at this point in time, if you want to give your testimony, please. Sergeant Mike Henry is with the Harrisburg City Police. He has asked for the opportunity to speak so he will not show up on the agenda that you have. We are running along here rapidly so we will give him the opportunity. I am sure he has the microphone in front of him.

SERGEANT HENRY: Let me just very briefly give you a little bit of background.

I have been employed as a police officer for the past 24, nearly 25 years. I have been a canine officer for the past 16 and have been in charge of the animal control section for the City of Harrisburg since its inception.

We view the pit bull problem as a serious one and, in fact, we are probably one of the only agencies that specifically track pit bull and pit bull problems. This, gentlemen, is a pit bull problem for a year and a half. We

know what it is. We are out there day in and day out taking on pit bull problems within the city. We feel that basically the bulk of the problem is an inner city problem, although there are occasions where the surrounding municipalities will get involved with pit bulls. But we see it day in and day out, several times a day.

2.2

My general impression of the pit bull is that not all pit bulls are bad. There are a lot of very good pit bulls out there. I would hate to see all the pit bulls sort of get lumped into one classification as a dangerous animal.

Now, we do look at the owners as being the responsible parties involved. Now, from a law enforcement standpoint, the difficulty in trying to enforce anything with the pit bulls is trying to establish the owner, a specific dog to the owner, an individual. What we encounter in the field is when we approach a group or several that have the pit bulls, they will simply just drop the leash and take off, leaving us with the dogs, knowing one of the dogs is probably stolen. He is not licensed. He is not rabid. They know automatically we will now have to stop

what we are doing, take charge of the dog that is out here running around in somebody's neighborhood. The difficulty for us, since they fail to comply even with the standard Dauphin County license or any of the licensing, they don't do any rabies. Then they take to the fighting.

And generally speaking, the pit bull again loses all the way around. The loser, it costs the guy money or drugs. If he is lucky, he will be destroyed or killed by the other dogs. If he is unlucky, he will be tied to some trailer or tree in some lot or in the basement of some vacant house where he is left to die with injuries. Even the ones that win may or may not receive veterinary care because they are afraid if they take the dog that has been damaged in a dogfight to a veterinarian, they are really not sure whether or not that veterinarian will call the police and notify us they have a dog and a client that has been involved in dogfighting.

So the biggest problem for law enforcement, as I see it, in the city is to be able to identify a dog with an owner that we can

bring to a successful prosecution. That is it in a nutshell. It is very difficult to do and these are all cases involving pit bulls and pit bull problems. I couldn't agree with you more. I am very afraid for a lot of the children in the inner city that have to deal with the dogs that are running around out here now.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Have you seen the legislation that Representative Caltagirone has introduced?

SERGEANT HENRY: I just picked up a copy this morning.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: So you haven't had time to review it?

SERGEANT HENRY: No, sir. Like I said, the only thing I am very concerned about is we don't want -- I am more in line with going along with what we are doing in Harrisburg now. We can take anybody's dog, it can be any breed of dog, and if that dog has, in fact, bitten someone, we then will go after the prosecution under 502-A, 1 through 4, if in fact, the circumstances of that bite -- and that here again, it is incumbent upon the police to do a good investigation because somebody is going to

pay a very high price if, in fact, that dog has been declared dangerous as a result of what happens there. So what we do is go in there, try to do a good investigation; why did that dog bite somebody. And if the bite was that severe, we automatically go with a letter determination to a district justice. We have got the due process already built into it. The district justice will have a hearing based on what happened with the particular incident. They then send a letter through the state and we have the dog declared a dangerous dog.

Again, we are going after, we are going after the individual. We are going after the irresponsible pet owner. It is not that sort of shotgun discipline that we have to go out here and create a problem that we are already struggling with. We need help.

I am a believer in microchipping these dogs where the microchip is inserted into the dog, which gives us a means of tracking a dog to an owner, regardless of whether the dog is wearing a tag. You can't avoid a microchip. We scan the dog. The chip is there. It comes back to an owner. Then we can do something. Right

now they don't comply with the standard licensing. They don't go after rabies. We are stuck with a big problem.

2.1

2.2

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Are you talking about implanting a chip in an already declared dangerous dog?

SERGEANT HENRY: No. No, in specific dogs, yes, I am. Pit bulls are a problem. I have the documentation here; but Rottweilers, pits, chows. Now, if a dog has been declared dangerous, yes, then he should be chipped. He should be chipped.

that Representative Caltagirone has introduced,
I would concur with his opinion that it is not
going to become law in 1996. It is an issue
that won't go away either, defines dangerous
dogs, per se, breed specific, if you will, and
you are telling us that you have documented
proof there are many, many problems with pit
bulls and similar breeds which would probably be
defined as dangerous per se under this
legislation.

Do you have any idea -- and this is probably not a fair question to ask you. But do

you have any idea of the percentage of these types of dogs that are problems that you run into as a law enforcement agent as a whole of the population? What percentage of pit bulls do you think are dangerous dogs and bite people or create problems that we are talking about today? SERGEANT HENRY: We look at our animal population in the city as being somewhere in the neighborhood of 10,000.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Let me back up; animal population?

SERGEANT HENRY: The entire animal population.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Not just dogs?

SERGEANT HENRY: Not just dogs, could possibly be cats and dogs. I will narrow it down to that. We have a very high percentage of pit bulls; very, very high. We just did a dog scan for license and rabies one month ago. We were reviewing the 170-some citations and probably three-quarters of those were for pit bulls and Rottweilers.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: As a percentage of the breed, you don't know how many are dangerous?

SERGEANT HENRY: It is very difficult because a lot of this is taking place in vacant They have their own breeding. not always told and we don't always see everything that is taking place in vacant houses. The inner breeding that goes on in the inner city, you have no idea for true numbers. Generally speaking, what we end up with out on the street is where something has gone wrong. They have trained the dog to the point where he has become so vicious they can't even control They kick him out the back gate and into him. the neighborhood where we are forced to deal with the dog.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

So numbers are difficult, although we are working on this. This is what we are doing here, tracking with our computers and getting the number of pit bulls and we are starting to get a better feel as the year goes on as to what we really are dealing with in terms of numbers.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Do you know anywhere where the insertion of microchips has been done on that basis with dangerous dogs?

SERGEANT HENRY: No, but it offers an interesting promise as far as what I can see.

The Doctor and I were talking just before you began here and he agrees that that is one possible way of being able to track a dog.

Otherwise again, if I were, as a policeman, if I were to stop a gentleman on the street, scan his dog with a chip scanner and he doesn't have his chip in, there would be a specific fine. Those that would steal a dog and get caught with it, the chip would solve a lot of problems as far as being able to establish the identity of the owner. The legislation could be directed at

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I have to confess that this is the first time I ever heard of this concept of microchipping a dog. I am not sure what to think about it, although in my earlier legislative years I was on the game and fish commission and spent some time chasing bears and putting collars on them and using that to track them for quite a bit different reason.

being able to tie down those loose ends where we

are able to better deal with these people.

SERGEANT HENRY: Like I said, interestingly we are getting into this over the last year. I only had 25 minutes to prepare to come up here to talk with you. I just found

this out.

2.0

We have a scanner. We have a chip.

We could have brought it up to show you how it

basically all works. It is maybe something you

want to look at.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: If we continue on this course that we are on, I think Representative Caltagirone is going to generate a lot more public debate. We may give you that opportunity to show us how it works.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Sure.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We are certainly interested in that.

Doctor Whittaker, you had your hand up. I assume you had something to add to this.

DOCTOR WHITTAKER: There is a number of veterinarians that are doing this now. It has been out on the market for a number of years. I am waiting to see which system is going to be used so it can be used universally, so I don't end up buying beta when I should have bought an eight track.

But it is not a big deal to implant.

I guess the biggest deal is to get somebody in there to have it done. But it is accepted by

the medical community as very easy and feasible.

2.0

2.2

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Who is it being done with now?

DOCTOR WHITTAKER: If you wanted to have your dog so you didn't have to worry about it getting lost or stolen, ends up down at the humane league, they have the scanner. They can scan it back to the animal hospital or to the owner.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: So it is primarily owners that want it for their own protection?

DOCTOR WHITTAKER: If we have someone that wants it, we have a Pet Friend down the street, he would do it for us. That way if the animal disappeared without a collar and it didn't have a tattoo -- that is another thing. You can have dogs tattooed. That is a lot more involved and requires anesthesia.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I think if you could include in that chip that the dog would be trained, it would be a really big seller.

SERGEANT HENRY: In closing here, the difficulty in the field with working with animals is even when they are wearing their license tag, we don't have a consistent policy

across the state where we computerize the licensing information. So I may end up in the field with a dog that has a license that was sold from one of the satellite places. If I have just the number alone, I am going to have to hand search 16,000 to 18,000 slips of paper at the Dauphin County Courthouse. It is a problem and this is something that maybe we need to look at.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Counsel for Representative Caltagirone, Mr. Andring, has a question.

MR. ANDRING: I have just one question, if you could. It seems to me that this problem could be a result of either irresponsible dog owners who buy a dog and simply don't train it, don't take care of it, don't handle it properly. But it seems like there is also a distinct outlaw or criminal element here. People are simply breeding dogs and fighting them.

Could you quantify this in terms of where the problem is really at? Is it criminal or irresponsibility?

SERGEANT HENRY: Well, I have to say

2.2

both. You have those out here who certainly don't care about their dogs, allow them to run at large. The dogs themselves become victims to cars and whatever. But we also know that we have a large percentage of the criminal element and we can directly associate a lot of the pit bull activity to those that are heavily involved in drugs and other criminal activity.

In fact, that is their sport of choice. And what they will do is they will wager money and drugs or sometimes other dogs on the outcome of these dogfights. Like I said, this is something that we run into. When you have heard one of these dogfights go down, it is something that you will never, ever forget what it is, because the dogs are literally being torn to pieces in these fights. They are spontaneous. They generally take place in about five to ten minutes. They could be on playgrounds, vacant lots, vacant structures.

But it is their preferred sport. We know that they are using them to protect the drug stashes and they are also using pit bulls as a preference to also enforce the drug trade. We know that a lot of times that drug dealers

will stash their drugs in the vicinity of a pit bull because they know when we come to the house, we are less likely to want to check a house or a room where we know there is a pit bull. And they say, well, we can confine the dog so you can go ahead and search. And we also have evidence that they are hiding drugs on the collars of pit bulls, so it is a problem.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you. We appreciate your coming and testifying and as I indicated, Representative Caltagirone, he ought to be in touch with you to get some more information in the future that we may need.

SERGEANT HENRY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We will get back to those scheduled on the agenda. The next scheduled witness I have is Mr. Jonathan James. Is he here? Would you come forward, please?

Mr. James, would you tell the committee who you are and give us your testimony?

MR. JAMES: Certainly. My name is

Jonathan James and I am a Harrisburg resident.

I own a house on Penn Street and I own a

two-year old male pit bull. I have owned him

for six months and I got him from the West Shore
Humane Society through their adoption program.

And I am here just to tell you about my
experience in owning the dog.

I have to say when I first adopted the dog, it was adopted with my fiance and myself.

I wanted something more along the lines of a golden retriever or a Labrador because I bought into the hype that pit bulls were inherently dangerous. So I was a little dismayed when she got, she decided she wanted to get this dog.

But in the last six months I have something to base my opinions on, having cared for this dog and run with him and played with him. It is a dog. I haven't found anything to distinguish my dog from other dogs. I don't see anything particularly inherently vicious about my dog. I have been with him for the last six months. And I am really dismayed that this legislature would seek to impose muzzle requirements on my dog if I want to walk him on the river front.

I am a responsible dog owner. I care for the dog. I clean up after the dog. My dog is registered, has his shots. It seems that

this particular law that is under consideration, the burden would fall mostly heavily on those people who are obeying the law. Apparently the last person who testified was speaking to a criminal element who are, by definition, outside the law. So when you argue that muzzle requirement, \$50,000 liability bond insurance, do you really believe that they are going to walk the street when the previous ends of the laws aren't being enforced or aren't vigorously enforced?

2.2

I can tell you that when I walk my dog on Front Street along the river front, once I get below Division, it is not uncommon for me to be approached by individuals seeking to use my dog as stud, inquiring either directly or obliquely whether I match or wager with my dog. And I can't believe I am the only one. Clearly I am not the only one who knows about this. The authorities do know about it. I just don't match my dog. I don't waste my time with these people. I just walk away and say no. I am not interested. But I know there is the element going on.

I just simply don't think that these

people will conform to the new set of laws. The people who will conform, who will be forced to adapt to this proposed legislation are your basic work-a-day folks like me; go home, go to work, care for my dog. I don't want to treat my dog in a cruel fashion putting a muzzle on him just to walk him in public. I don't think responsible dog owners are the problem. It is problem owners creating problem dogs.

б

2.2

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Have you had the opportunity to review the legislation?

MR. JAMES: I did. I read -- I didn't bring my copy with me. I read, I believe I read pertinent parts of it. As I understand that if the dog is declared per se that is by definition vicious, the muzzle requirement would be imposed on the dog. And that is, that really grates on me, not only the fact that it would be treating my dog cruelly, but if I may, I think there is a personal freedom issue here at stake.

I am an adult citizen, a taxpayer, a voter. I treat my dog in a responsible fashion. I don't wager against my dog. I don't deal drugs. I have demonstrated a capacity to own this dog, care for him in a responsible fashion.

I think the legislature by, they are not exactly taking the dog from me but they are making it so difficult for me to own my dog that I would be forced to get rid of my dog. It is a de facto method of precluding ownership on my part. I think that prevents me from exercising adult responsibilities in an adult fashion.

2.2

2.3

I have demonstrated no inability to be responsible with my dog and I think part and parcel of personal freedom is the ability to be an adult and exercise responsibilities. I am owning this animal, caring for him with no difficulty whatsoever. He is not vicious. No one has any reason to fear him. Why should the legislature see fit to interfere, really butting into my business when I am conducting myself in an entirely reasonable fashion?

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Well, I will ask Representative Caltagirone if he would like to respond.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: I would like to respond to the 80 people that have been mauled or bitten in the City of Reading or people that have been attacked by these dogs.

And let me just say another thing. It is not

just the drug dealers that have these dogs.

There are responsible people that have these dogs, supposedly responsible people that will walk down the street just to clear the sidewalk.

2.0

2.2

2.4

MR. JAMES: That is not responsible.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: It happens. It is not that they are just using these dogs for fights or transporting drugs. They are not involved in that activity. We have seen it in Reading. We have seen it in other areas around the state.

MR. JAMES: What is your source? What is your source of the 80 attacks?

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Denise

Golar, who has the identification of all the

cases that we have documentation. As a matter

of fact, we had a press conference. She brought

all of her stuff with her. We even had an

undercover informant who had filmed one of the

fights that had taken place. And she records

everything up there. She is the executive

director of the Berks County Humane Society.

She handles all these complaints. One of her

workers had a finger bitten off by one of these

dogs.

MR. JAMES: And your point?

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Pardon?

MR. JAMES: Your point?

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: My point is we have to protect society, too. It is just not everybody that abides by the laws. I mean, we make laws all the time up here on all kinds of issues, trying to protect society, many times from itself. It is not that we want to jump into these issues and say, well, you know, there is no problem here. There is a problem here and the problem has to be addressed.

MR. JAMES: And you think -- so I agree that you have identified the issue of problem dogs, dangerous dogs. I have absolutely no quarrel with the destruction of a demonstrably dangerous animal.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: You don't necessarily have to destroy a dangerous dog as long as that dangerous dog is controlled, because you have guard dogs. You have police dogs. You have home protection dogs. People have dogs for whatever reasons. I have had German sheps. I have had boxers. I have had poodles. I have had all sorts of dogs.

MR. JAMES: Do you want to muzzle your

German shepherd?

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: No,

absolutely not.

MR. JAMES: Well, German shepherds aren't the flavor of the month for drug dealers. But I remember when I was a kid and it was German shepherds and Dobermans that had the nasty reputation. This isn't the kind of law which is breed specific. There would be many dogs that are --

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: You weren't here when I opened up with my comment.

I said that what we are attempting to do is to define dangerous or vicious dogs. We had to start with the legislation at some point and what we do, as any of us in life realize, nobody is perfect and we don't make perfect law here.

Times change and we have to change the laws that reflect those times.

MR. JAMES: Would you consider not making it breed specific?

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Yes. I said that from the beginning. I said what we need to do is define the very nature of dogs,

period. If they are showing a propensity for either being vicious or dangerous, then we ought to be able to have the laws that protect society from those types of dogs, whether they are Rottweilers or pit bulls or German sheps.

2.2

MR. JAMES: Is it your contention that there is not already laws on the books to protect society from dangerous dogs?

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: The police that have come to us, not only in Reading but the police officer that was here earlier that left, the way the law reads now because of revision that was made in 1990, humane society people and we have a law enforcement officer here with us now, and the local police cannot respond until there is an attack. It is almost like you get the first bite and then we come in. I think that is just stupid.

WOMAN IN AUDIENCE: What about the children who trespass?

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Excuse me. You are not testifying at this point. You may be on the agenda. I am not sure, but you are not testifying now. If you would like to speak, you may have the opportunity. But right now Mr.

1 James and Representative Caltagirone have the 2 microphone. 3 MR. JAMES: Representative, I appreciate your efforts to identify a dangerous dog to the issue. My contention is that your 5 law does not adequately address the issue. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Then help 8 us with some verbiage. MR. JAMES: Pardon me? 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Help us with the verbiage that is going to be needed to 11 help protect society. You are trying to say 12 13 that we don't need a law? 14 MR. JAMES: I am trying to say you do not need a breed specific law. 15 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: I said 16 That is a given. 17 that. MR. JAMES: Well, I came here to say 18 my piece and I want you to know that -- and I am 19 I want you to know that I am against 20 not alone. breed specific legislation and arguing --21 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Would you 22 agree that dangerous dogs and vicious dogs 23 should be defined before somebody is bitten, 24

that enforcement authorities should have the

right to confiscate that dog before somebody is attacked?

MR. JAMES: Well, that is a compound question; maybe one at a time. Do I agree that dangerous dogs should be defined; if you could find a way to adequately define a dangerous dog before it has demonstrated a dangerous propensity, have at it.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Read the legislation. Some of the verbiage is in there.

MR. JAMES: I think it is very difficult to do that and the efforts would probably fall more heavily on those people who own pit bulls, like myself, precisely because there is the outlaw element that has taken this breed and given them a terrible reputation.

I work in a nursing home. I take my dog to work. He interacts with frail, elderly people. He is not a dangerous dog.

Anyway, the issue is dangerous dogs.

You are trying to address that issue. I

appreciate the effort. I think demonstrably

dangerous dogs should be curtailed or removed.

I do not think that laws that would fall heavily
on responsible dog owners are needed, if you put

the \$50,000 bond, the muzzle requirement.

I think the effort should be directed at curbing bad people. The dogs aren't organizing themselves. The dogs don't jump into dumpsters and fight one another. Someone puts them there. I know this happens because when I walk on Front Street, I am approached. This has happened on a dozen occasions over the last six months, approximately every other week, if you want to average it out, typically on the weekend when I have time to meander below Division Street.

I can't be the only person that knows this. The authorities must know. Yet I never read about this in the newspapers, about dogfights being broken up. I think there is inadequate enforcement of the present laws on the books. And I am skeptical that you can define ahead of time a dog that is dangerous without it being overbroad or vague.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Let me just read some things to you. Give me your instinctive, your reaction.

MR. JAMES: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: If there

is a strong fighting instinct and a low level of fighting which makes a certain type of dog propensity for wanting to fight, would you say that that would be a concern?

MR. JAMES: A concern?

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: That should be put into the law. We are saying let's define the breed. How about those that have a tendency who want to attack people when you are walking along a yard or along the sidewalk and the dog starts to be very aggressive, snarling and wanting to lunge at somebody? Would you say that that would be aggressive behavior on the part of the dog, any kind of dog?

MR. JAMES: That could be any dog. How could you --

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: That is what we are saying, any dog.

MR. JAMES: Then when I walk my dog on the river front, he is placid. But there are some dogs that come to the fence to bark at him. He is generally confident. Staffies and pit bulls are generally confident animals. He is not prone to barking. But they lunge at him. I seek to protect my dog and I am skeptical that

you can, by using those extremely broad phrases that are probably subject to multiple interpretations, clear up this issue.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: What you are saying is, let society continue to be mauled; do nothing, is what you are saying.

MR. JAMES: No. What I am saying is enforce your leash laws. Enforce your registration laws. Go to the river front, walk on the grass and you will see that there is another set of laws not being enforced. I would like people to enforce those laws. In fact, as long as you have taken a moment to read something to me, I would like to read something to you, if I could find it; should have marked it.

emphasis has been placed on the fighting abilities of these splendid dogs as there is so much favorable to be said of them and in so many other ways and as far back as pioneer days they were found to be trustworthy, reliable guardians of children, livestock and one's own home.

This is an AKC book on the American Staffordshire Terriers. They are loyal.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: I wish you would refrain from doing that because you are not going to change a single thing here. We are here to get testimony for the official record and that is all we are here for at this point.

Go ahead.

MR. JAMES: This is a book written by breeders who describe the dog as loyal, as friendly, as tenacious, as sturdy. And now I don't understand it. If you want to come up with a list of traits, you could shoehorn those traits into virtually any animal, any dog. But I am with you with the idea that people should be protected from dangerous dogs.

Typically the dangerous dog is owned by an irresponsible owner and you should perhaps see fit to allow people who have been mauled by dogs to get triple damages or have them held in strict liability standards or something along those lines. But this legislation is both overbroad and vague. It is hard to define, what is not dangerous.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Counsel Andring has some questions.

MR. ANDRING: Maybe not a question so much as a comment.

1.5

2.2

I can understand and sympathize with what you are saying, in particular because my wife and I own a Rottweiler. He is part of our family. He is tremendous with our granddaughter and he is just a super dog. But I think there is a certain amount of conscious denial of the situation here. The dog we own weighs 130 pounds. That dog is capable of severely injuring someone. A Yorkie or poodle is not capable of doing that. And I don't care how vicious that dog is.

MR. JAMES: Granted.

MR. ANDRING: It is the same with a pit bull. Part of the problem isn't so much temperament but pure size and power. There are dogs, there are breeds of dogs, breed specific that are capable of inflicting tremendous damage on a person, that are capable of injuring children; Rottweilers. The dog I own happens to be one of those breeds. A pit bull happens to be one of those breeds.

MR. JAMES: So how are you going to feel when they come for your dog, counsel?

1

2

3

5 6

7 8

9

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

19

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ANDRING: I don't expect anyone to come for my dog. I recognize that because I have chosen to own a dog with those kinds of capabilites that I may be required to either, through my own choice or through law to protect the public, to take measures to protect the public that somebody who owns a Yorkie or owns a poodle isn't required to take. That is the reality of the situation. I think that maybe the pit bull owners and the Rottie owners have to accept this reality, have to accept the fact that the dogs they have chosen to own have that potential, have that capability and that maybe there are going to have to be some requirements imposed on those owners that maybe other dog owners don't have.

MR. JAMES: Money and additional leash law, fine. Don't, please don't muzzle my dog before he has demonstrated. He has done nothing to deserve having that. That is cruel to him and I am just, I am very upset with that particular requirement, that you will put this on his face just to take him in public. I never run him off the leash. We have got a farm up in Bradford. He is off the leash there, acreage.

On Front Street he is on the leash all the time.

I don't take him off. That is a courtesy. That is just being polite to folks around me. Not everyone wants to be -- my dog is friendly. He likes attention. He is a baby at heart. He likes to walk up to people, say hi, get petted.

Not everyone is interested in his attention and many people have bought into the hype. They are frightened. He can feel it. He can't understand why they don't grab him around the neck and pet him. So I leash him.

But walk along the river. You will see that many people don't obey the elementary courtesy of leash laws and curbing your dog.

Counsel, if you can show me -- some dogs are dominant breed dogs, Rottie, chows, pits, German shepherds, and require a higher degree of responsible ownership. I agree with that. What I do think is that the way this law, the way I read the law, the copy of the legislation that was sent to me, its impact would impact me unfairly and not adequately address the issue of dangerous dogs.

MR. ANDRING: Well, I think the point and certainly what Chairman Caltagirone is

1 trying to accomplish is to find that solution 2 where we can protect the public and also 3 understand that there are many people who are responsible in the way they own and treat these animals. 5 Counsel, did you get MR. JAMES: 6 copies of the legislation from New Jersey, as I 7 understand which has a dangerous dog law but it 8 is not breed specific? Are you looking at 9 legislation from other states? 10 MR. ANDRING: We will be looking at 11 legislation from all over the country and as the 12 Chairman indicated, this is something that is 13 going to be evolved throughout the end of this 14 15 session and the next legislative session. MR. JAMES: If you would like to meet 16 my dog, Chairman, I only live seven blocks from 17 here. 18 The Chairman has met my 19 MR. ANDRING: 20 dog. 21 MR. JAMES: He is a big baby. CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Mr. James, we 2.2 thank you very much for your testimony. 23 Thank you. 24 MR. JAMES:

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Next on the agenda

is Ron Tucker, who is a dog breeder. Are you here?

2.2

Mr. Tucker, is your testimony in
writing?

MR. TUCKER: Yes, it is. It is on the table in the back.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: You may begin.

MR. TUCKER: My name is Ron Tucker. I am from Pennsburg, Pennsylvania. I raise one of the breeds specifically named in this bill as a dangerous dog per se, which is the American Staffordshire Terrier. And I have been raising these dogs, been petting the dogs, living with the dogs, loving with the American Staffordshire Terrier for over 15 years now.

And that is what I want to talk about.

I want to talk about a breed of which I have about as much knowledge as anybody else that is involved in this legislation, the legislation which I think is well intentioned but inappropriate as it stands now in naming the specific breeds.

I have read the bill quite thoroughly.

The foundation of this bill, this proposed bill lies in a page and a half of what is titled

Legislative Findings. They propose to list characteristics of certain breeds, certain dangerous breeds defined as being so. My personal favorite in reading that listing is the genetic predisposition to aggressiveness that makes them uniquely dangerous even to their owners. Well, I can tell you that fortunately my dogs can't read because they have, certainly the 30-some Staffs that we live with, would have done us in by now if they knew how bad they were.

If you are in my house, you know they are there, the dogs. I don't know what empirical data was used to get these legislative findings. I know my findings are based on 15 years of interacting with my dogs, other breeders' dogs, the public. I am deeply involved with the breed.

When someone calls me to inquire about a Staff because they like the dog's appearance but they no little or nothing about the dog, the first word I use is "affectionate." This is the most loving, kiss your face, do anything to please you 60-pound lap dog that I have ever run across. And I am involved with all breeds.

The people that know me have come to accept over the years that if there is a dog face in front of me, I am going to kiss it.

Fortunately those dogs don't read either because I haven't been bit in doing that. Over the years I have taken food, toys, shoes, anything out of my dogs' mouths. I have not been bit. I have two dogs that have a disagreement, I have broken them up by putting my arm between their mouths; not real intelligent, but I have never been bit.

I am also a professional groomer and I see all breeds. If you groom long enough, you will get bit. I have been bit in dog grooming. If I wanted to compile a list, there are certainly a few breeds that have done the major share of the biting. And I don't like getting bit and I get angry with the dogs that bite me. But never in all these years ever, has it ever entered my mind to label that entire breed as dangerous because of the ones that bit me. They are just the ones that bit me and there are many more that are just perfectly well-behaved dogs.

I would like to conclude by relating an incident that occurred about nine years ago,

to kind of show the temperament of a Staff, to show you the temperament of the Staff.

Dogfighting was on the rise in Pennsylvania back around that time, specifically in the urban areas. There were some municipalities that were introducing breed specific legislation at that time. Fortunately, back then our legislative

leaders enacted a dangerous dog law statewide as
well as making dogfighting a felony in this

10 state.

Concerning the issue of dangerous dogs, I was invited to appear on a morning television show in Philadelphia with one of my dogs. We were sitting back stage being prepped about the format of the show when the host, Wally Kennedy, walked over to see us, to say something to us. My dog, John Henry, who I can describe as 70 pounds of muscle, was lying on the floor by my feet and Wally inadvertently stepped on his tail when he came over to see me. John sprang up, got his paws on Wally, and you had to be there to see the expression on Wally's face at this point in time. And then John did the, what I will call the classic genetic predisposition of the American Staffordshire

1 Terrier; out came his tongue going a mile a 2 minute as if to say to Wally, I know you didn't 3 mean that; I am not going to hurt you. course, it was funny at the time. Wally didn't want his makeup smeared so there was no tongue 5 6 contact that day. 7 But that one spontaneous act, that 8 shows the temperament of this breed. A bad dog could have bit. He didn't. He knows the 9 difference. And from what I hear, and I know 10 what goes on with the dogs that are being talked 11 about, any dog can be trained to be dangerous. 12 13 They are not born that way. 14 That is my testimony. 15 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Mr. Tucker. 16 Do you have any questions? 17 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: 18 No. Thank you for testifying. 19 20 MR. TUCKER: Thank you. CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you very 21 2.2 much. 23 MR. TUCKER: Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Our next

testifiers are Joseph and Salvatore Aquila.

they here?

2.2

Would you come forward, please?

MR. J. AQUILA: My name is Joseph
Aquila.

MR. S. AQUILA: My name is Salvatore Aquila from Reading, Pennsylvania; actually Shillington. It is right outside of Reading.

On April 22nd, 1996 my granddaughter got bit by a dog; actually she was mauled by the dog, was a Rottweiler, which is the next door neighbor. And the person that takes care of this dog, according to some standards he was doing what he was supposed to do with the dog. He kept him clean. He had the shots, whatever. But to my opinion he was not a responsible person because he never kept the dog on a leash. He never kept the dog confined to where he wouldn't be able to harm anyone else.

In fact, one afternoon at 5:00 this dog jumped the fence and came into my yard. The fence is only about three feet tall and this is no problem for a Rottweiler to jump that fence. He got my little granddaughter, five years old by the head and drug her about 56 feet and ripped her skull apart. The scalp was torn

apart. She had to go under surgery for about three hours and she went up to get about 150 staples in her head. Three days later she still had to go under surgery again because the fever was high. And if that is what we have to state for the dogs, there is no such thing that a dog would have any more rights than a little girl or any human being.

I like animals. That is fine. I am not saying that all the animals should be dead or should be killed or should be whatever. But if you want an animal, you must be responsible for it and there should be a law to protect human beings and protect the neighbors and the people walking on the street. If you have been walking on the street, you have to be afraid to walk in my own house, around my own neighborhood because there is a dog that I am afraid might get loose and come after me, you know. I better move out of this country. There is no such a thing as should be.

This dog law is fine. Be responsible for your dog. I don't want to be moved where you got to walk around the dog because the dog is over there. Let the dog walk around me. I

am walking my street. That is fine. I don't have to step off the sidewalk because there is a dog coming toward me. They should step off the street because they have the dog and the muzzle. They should have a muzzle on the dog when they walk the street. Just because the dog has not bitten anybody at any time, nobody knows what the dog has in his mind. We don't know what it is. We don't know what snips they do; jump on anybody.

I am afraid of dogs, but I don't want to deprive anybody to have a dog as long as the dog won't harm me. So to do that we should have some kind of legislation, some kind of law, whatever to stop the dogs to harming people.

And this, as far as we have, like the man said he is a responsible person, fine. The man's dog who attacked my little granddaughter was a responsible people, too, according to his standards; not to mine.

I have pictures of her here that have been taken, not for this purpose. These pictures were taken by the kids playing in my yard, dancing. Somebody will pass these, please. This happened by accident that they --

this is my little granddaughter there. That was about three months after this Rottweiler attacked the little girl. For a while we didn't know whether the little girl was going to live And I got to listen to somebody say or die. that the dog is a good thing. No, I don't think that the dog is a good thing. The dog is a good thing if the owner is a good thing. If the owner doesn't have to get the dog, then let the owner go to jail instead of the dog. If that is the way they think the dog is supposed to be, They can have the dog they want, but be fine. responsible for what you have.

responsible for what I do with my car. You want a dog, you be responsible what the dog is going to do for you. That is all I am asking. Try to put some kind of law that protects all the people, especially the little kids. And you get these big dogs, you get a Rottweiler, 130, 140 pounds jump on me, I have had it. I don't care how strong I am. That dog is going to get me. That is it, period. It could be a pit bull. It could be a German shepherd. It could be anything that is heavy, heavy dog is only thing

that has the strength. If they want to attack you, you have had it, period.

2.0

2.1

That is all I have to say. I am sorry. I hope that the legislature is going to make some kind of changes or enforce some kind of law that we do have, but the muzzle is one thing they should have.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Joseph, did you have anything?

MR. J. AQUILA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Would you take the microphone?

MR. J. AQUILA: Yes. I have one thing to ask. The amount of time in between when my daughter was attacked and until the state actually contacted him to tell him his dog was dangerous was three months. Is there a reason why it takes so long for the laws to go through or is it just red tape, paper work that has to be filed?

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Who did you report the attack to?

MR. J. AQUILA: The attack was reported through the police officer and supposedly was trying to contact the dog warden

1 of the area and was nowhere to be found. 2 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: The police 3 officer? MR. J. AQUILA: So the dog was left in 5 the custody of the owner for the ten-day I was always under the impression guarantine. that the dog was taken away. 7 8 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Part of the problem that I uncovered here was that we g used to have about 65 dog law enforcement 10 officers statewide. We are now down to 42. 11 And you know, I agree with you. We need more dog 12 13 law enforcement officers if we are going to 14 enforce the law. Now, I do know we have somebody here 15 from the Harrisburg area. Hopefully at some 16 point we will be able to get him squeezed in to 17 offer some light on this problem. But I think, 18 as I understand, you work for the county, not 19 20 the state. Or do you work for the state? OFFICER LAMKE: City of Harrisburg. 2.1 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: You work 2.2 23 for the City of Harrisburg.

OFFICER LAMKE: I am the only warden for the entire City of Harrisburg, population of

24

50,000. I would like time today if possible.

2.2

2.3

MR. S. AQUILA: Also as this was happening, I couldn't get any response as far as the dog is being there, the dog was loose in the yard as was normal. He was taken on a leash in the yard but taken outside without the muzzle, that kind of stuff.

Then I had to go through myself as a victim. I saw my granddaughter in this dog's mouth, ripping the kid apart. There was nothing I could do. Finally I had to call around to see who I could speak to. Finally I got a hold of Mr. Rick Byrd. He is in charge of the dogs here in Harrisburg somewhere; anyways, in law enforcement here in Harrisburg. And he told me that he was going to take care of it himself personally. In about ten days to two weeks, the dog was destroyed.

If I have to do that as a victim, that is wrong. That is something I shouldn't be doing. There should be a law that somebody locally or whoever, even the police force themselves, they should have some kind of rights or some kind of power to act in certain things. But they have no power. They can't do anything

about it. So who are we going to go to? There should be some kind of law that provides the poor people that are the victim instead of becoming whatever you want to call it, and have somebody take care of this stuff, not wait until everything cools off and say, well, let's forget about this.

I can't forget. When I see my granddaughter in that dog's mouth, that I can never forget. Well, people say as time goes. No, I don't think so, not with me. I hope that is going to go by for my granddaughter. I don't know how she will react in a year or so. see the picture. You see the damage the dog did and this is three months after. If I could have, I would have got some pictures from the surgeon that took at the hospital. Then you would have seen what the damage that was done. Then you would see the stitches and you would see the damage. This is nothing compared to what it was. But you can tell by those scars. That is all I have to say. Okay.

MR. J. AQUILA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you.

Mr. Fred Lamke is unofficially

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

questioned here already and has asked for an opportunity to be recognized and testify. I will ask him to come forward. He is the animal control officer for the City of Harrisburg.

2.2

Mr. Lamke, would you care to give us some insight on the issue? Please put the microphone in front of you.

OFFICER LAMKE: Good morning. I thank the committee for allowing me a few moments.

My name is Fred Lamke. I am the animal control officer for the Harrisburg Police Department. I have been employed as the animal control officer for the Harrisburg Police Department since 1991. Once again, we are only, my sergeant and I only became aware of this meeting this morning about an hour and a half ago.

The animal control have a dog

population of roughly 10,000 of cats and dogs

within the City of Harrisburg. The population

of pits is astronomical, as Sergeant Henry

alluded to earlier. The week of August 19th I

transported 24 dogs to the Humane Society East

Shore for the city. Nineteen of the

twenty-three dogs were pit bulls, or mixed pit

bulls.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: For what purpose did you transport them?

OFFICER LAMKE: These were pit bulls that were either abandoned, strays or involved in dogfighting. It is an astronomic number. The percentage is very high in terms of what is normally taken by other dog wardens. I am probably an authority on the number of pit bulls that I have taken to the humane society in the last year; roughly over 200 pit bulls.

I attended a dogfighting seminar last summer. There was a, we had a man in Washington, D.C. who was raising pit bulls. He had a catalogue. You could buy a face biting pit bull, a thigh biting pit bull. There was over 90 pit bulls seized. All the dogs were eventually destroyed except for ten pit bull puppies, which were taken into custody by the American Humane Society. They were under the age of six months of age and they were raised in the homes by, quote, responsible pet owners and as the dogs matured, became adults, they started to find problems with the dogs. The dogs, of course, had genetically aggressive tendencies.

This was, of course, a result of many years of breeding by breeders, either responsible breeders or non-responsible breeders. So if you have a genetically aggressive pit bull, of course, you can have problems at a later date. Those were findings by the American Humane Society in the Washington, D.C. area. Those are not my findings.

Ine dog attack problem that took so long for your gentleman from Reading to respond, there is not enough dog wardens for the state. Attempts were made by the commonwealth now to even get rid of dog wardens. We are actually going in the wrong direction with the program rather than in the right direction. Mr. Byrd, the administrative assistant of the state dog law, he was so happy when Mayor Reed did hire an animal control officer because the work load was so tremendous.

I currently investigate 10 to 15

dogfights per month. I currently handle a case
load of 250 animal calls per month. Almost 40
percent of the calls are pit bull, Rottweiler
related. We have children that walk pit bulls
down the streets, turn the pit bulls loose on

other people. They don't have a gun, can't get a gun but they certainly can use a pit bull to intimidate a neighborhood. Neighborhoods are being victimized by the breed specifically. So it is not always just that it is a criminal element. We have a juvenile population that is doing the same thing.

Sergeant Henry and I also do seminars. We can take a pit bull into the seminar area and all the children in the room know what a pit bull is, which was quite alarming to me. Until 1991 I didn't know what a pit bull was. I knew what a German shepherd was. I wouldn't be carrying a nine-millimeter pistol on my belt today or mace or a stun gun if I hadn't come under attack on a number of occasions by multiple groups of pit bulls or Rottweilers within the City of Harrisburg. The case hasn't been so much against the Labs.

But the picture that I may be painting may be that I am breed specific and against a breed. We have in our custody currently a pit bull, an American Staffordshire Terrier, that was used in the City of Harrisburg for dogfighting over the course of four years, was

eventually seized, held for court and is now kept in our custody after the disposition of the case when the 180-day rule had expired. The name of the dog is Dobbs. He is an eight-year old pit bull. He is seen by Dr. Martin at the Capital Area Animal Clinic. He also sits on the board of the Humane Society. Dr. Martin's opinion is that Dobbs is not, quote, a genetically aggressive animal.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The problem we encounter is how do you determine if the dog is genetically aggressive, or somebody in the neighborhood buys a puppy from someone else. We have so many back yard breeders, not so much the breeders that are responsible. We have many breeders, pit bull breeders who won't even sell a dog within the city to anyone because they are afraid the dog might be used for dogfighting at a later date. Reports are that they are now breeding pit bulls or an American Bullshire Terrier to a bull terrier and they are calling them hogs. They have very massive heads, very massive jaws, the ability to generate a lot of stamina, can throw a tire up into the air 10, 12 feet up into the air. That is tremendous jaw pressure that has

developed, of course, by training techniques.

The pit bull terrier, of course, doesn't have a jaw any stronger than any other dog but because we have certain individuals that are using that

5 type of training method, they are able to

6 develop that strength.

2.0

I have an awful lot of pit bulls -- I investigate an awful lot of pit bull dog bites where children are playing on the floor in the kitchens with their mothers and what we have found is that the dog mistakes the child as another animal and they begin the playing technique and end up with many multiple face bites. These are not dogs that are being raised by quote, ill responsible pet owners but it is still a breed specific problem that we are encountering in the field.

With the dalmatians, the dalmatian is coming up on our list with the Rotties and the chows. Those four breeds are the bulk of our dog bites in the city. It is very disturbing that so many of these owners, so many of these children are bitten with face bites.

The microchipping that Sergeant Henry was alluding to is a very promising tool for us

to use in the war. Muzzling is something that has been mentioned here. The chipping would help an awful lot. If the dog is found to be unchipped, the dog could be seized right on the street. Due process, of course, we are all entitled to due process. Dogfighting cases present a tremendous amount of straining of the resources by the commonwealth in the prosecution of dogfighting. A dog held for dogfighting —first off, will we get back. Let me roll it back a little bit.

2.2

2.3

When we have a dog bite, like I get a call: Officer Lamke, this dog might jump the fence and bite my child. I have to tell the complainant well, until the dog jumps the fence and bites the child, we can't do anything at this point. I can go out and check for license, check for rabies. I can go out and check for cruelty in the back yard. That is about as far as I can go with my investigation until that child is actually bitten, until the child is bitten or until the dog jumps the fence. That is a hardship to us.

So that is the first start. That is the starting point for us. Then we go off to

the actual investigation, not the investigation but when we have the bite. First bite is free, of course, here in Pennsylvania. Then you must bring a dangerous dog complaint to a district justice. Meanwhile, the dog is being held for quarantine for ten days, either in house or at a humane society. That is if you have a place to take the dog to.

This is a problem that I encountered back on August 16th when I siezed nine pit bulls in a home in Harrisburg. It was a pit bull dogfighting camp. Those neighbors had called and said there is nine pit bulls in the house. Fortunately, the City of Harrisburg has an animal law whichs allows you to have only five animals. We found that out after the fact.

So dangerous dogs must first -- so you must declare a dog to be a dangerous dog. It may take months to get the state to come out and declare the dog a dangerous dog. Meantime the dog can still stay in the neighborhood. If you sieze an animal, you have to have a good reason to take the dog out of a setting. You have to house the animal. Someone has to pay for the housing of the animal. Most municipalities

don't have the financial resources. The state doesn't have any regional shelters to take these animals to. It is all called dollars and cents. It is very hard for us to deal with, some of these dangerous dogs, because we have nowhere to go with the dog. Meanwhile the dog may still be sitting in a neighborhood and it is a real challenge to us to finally get a case to the district justice.

We just had a case, took five months
to have a preliminary hearing on a dangerous dog
where we had some men fighting some pit bulls.
We had a videotape. I can't really say anything
more about that; five months to get a
preliminary hearing. Meantime these pit bulls
are being housed at the East Shore Humane
Society at a cost and a burden to the Humane
Society of Harrisburg.

So Dobbs is -- getting back to Dobbs and the pit bull at the Carriage House, he doesn't come in contact with other pit bulls or any other animals because of his past. He never will be. He is also in a very secluded environment and rightfully so.

The cruelty, the dogfights that I

finally respond to, the pit bulls' craniums are torn apart, ears are torn off, dog neck wounds, neck lacerations, dogs tied to telephone poles, dogs tied to die in the parks, Reservoir Park.

Of course, there is no collars on these dogs, no tags. So we need something else to try to get some inroad into this problem. Yes, and I have the sweet little old ladies that have a pit bull in their back yard and I never have a problem from them.

If this legislation passes, I will be happy to make a surety bond for Dobbs, the pit bull at the Carriage House and the requirements under the legislation that is proposed. It is necessary. I don't investigate too many Lassie dogs, collies with dog bites, or poodles, and I probably never will. My days are spent, unfortunately, with the pit bulls and the Rottweilers and the chows and it is an unfair amount of time for an animal control officer to be just dealing with these three specific breeds.

I am open for questions at this point and I wandered quite a bit and digressed.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Any questions?

1	REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: No.
2	CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you very
3	much. We appreciate your time.
4	Next testifier on the agenda is Dotsie
5	Keith, Pennsylvania Federation of Dog Clubs. Is
6	Dotsie a nickname?
7	MS. KEITH: It is a nickname but it
8	goes with my dogs. My mother didn't intend it.
9	It just happened that way. I do have testimony
10	with me.
11	I have put in front of you a chart
12	which is put out by the Heinz Corporation that
13	makes dog food. It represents the AKC
14	recognized breeds. It was done in 1991. More
15	breeds have been added. As you can see we
16	have
17	CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We can't see
18	actually.
19	MS. KEITH: Oh, I am sorry. I should
20	turn it around.
21	CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: If you do it sort
22	of halfway, Dan, so that members of the audience
23	could see it. Turn it a little more to the
24	audience. That is good. Thank you.

MS. KEITH: As you can see, we have

underlined in red the specific breeds that would in some way come under the descriptions of the legislation that you have before us, either by their phenotype, which is how they look, or the activity that that particular breed of dog does because it was bred for that, or because that is a natural instinct of most dogs. We eliminate approximately 80 percent of the dogs we have in our over 100 dog shows in the State of Pennsylvania. We would not be able to show them should this legislation take effect.

My name is Dotsie Keith. I am the legislative chairman of the Pennsylvania Federation of Dog Clubs representing 108 clubs across the state. I am also a member of the State Dog Law Advisory Board and the State Committee on Ethics in Animal Exhibitions.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you today about our mutual concern for the need to control dogs that are a danger to people and other animals.

In the late 1980's our federation and other animal groups began work with the legislature on revisions, both to the animal

cruelty laws and to Act 225, the dog law, to address the growing problem of dog attacks. The results of these efforts was a new law making training and fighting any animal a third degree felony and under the dog law, adding a new section, Article V-5, that deals specifically with dogs that cause injuries or death.

2.2

Both of these types of laws were designed to help remove these kinds of dogs from society by punishing the owners and restricting the dogs, regardless of the type of dog involved. They were done in this manner, unlike bills that have been recently introduced, to curtail offending dogs and irresponsible owners, while protecting well-mannered, innocent dogs owned by responsible citizens.

The law making dogfighting a felony offense was directed at both the old, organized, back woods, clandestine blood sport fighting and the new, macho street fighting which you heard about today, which posed more of a threat to the average person as it is usually done in urban areas. The old fighting dogs were people friendly due to the owners having to be in the pit with the dog during the fight. Unfriendly

ones were quickly disposed of. Since the purpose of the street dog is to prove that my dog is tougher and meaner than yours, being people friendly is considered a fault.

2.0

These street dogs are, in most instances, mixed breeds of any kind of dog that seems to have the qualities that they want. The young pups are then trained with exercise to build up their muscle strength, including treadmill work and holding on to tires with their teeth, and given small animals, again we have heard of kittens and small dogs, which they are encouraged to tear apart.

gentle, larger dogs that do not know how to fight this way. Often these dogs are pets that have been stolen for this part of their dog's education. Philadelphians had to cope with this several years ago when the bodies of missing pets were found in a nearby park. These dogs are abused and brutalized by their owners to the point that they will attack anything or anyone. They are often used as guard dogs by those persons who are also involved in other types of illegal activities, such as drugs and illegal

firearms. When one of these dogs get loose in the community, they truly are a danger.

The primary reason that we worked to have dogfighting made a felony offense was to give our police sufficient authority and reason to stop it. Prior to that it was only a summary offense, which meant that it was pretty far down on their priority list. This also brought the district attorneys into the cases, rather than having only nonprofit SPCA's prosecute them. We are dealing too often with people, as well as dogs, that are a threat to society. Unarmed state dog wardens and humane society personnel cannot be expected to cope with these situations without the assistance of our police force.

When this law is strictly enforced, the numbers of these dogs will undoubtedly diminish also. When it is not, we are teaching our young people that cruel behavior is perfectly acceptable. In Chester, and you have that article in your packet, juveniles hang their dogs that lose a fight, cut out their tongues and set them on fire. After these children become immune to the suffering of animals, it is easy to torture and kill fellow

humans, as has been proven in many studies.

This law must be taken seriously and enforced by government officials, if the proliferation of these dogs is to be stopped.

As for the dog law revisions and improvements to the dangerous dog section are being included in House Bill 2702, which has passed the House Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee. This amendment would make anyone guilty of a summary offense if a district justice declares that their dog is a dangerous dog under the law's provisions. The owner would have to keep the dog confined during the appeal process, which current law does not, and the owner could not dispose of the dog except by having it destroyed. Sometimes they give them away. Again, this law applies to any dog and is non-breed specific to protect the innocent.

The recently proposed bills try to describe certain types of dogs that would automatically be considered dangerous. They are based on phenotype, the way a dog looks, and activities that many dogs do. The American Kennel Club recognizes 141 breeds of dogs for registration and participation in its shows,

field trials and other events. Many of these breeds fit one or more of the descriptions in this bill. As I said, approximately 80 percent of the purebred dogs owned by Pennsylvanians would automatically be declared dangerous. It would include most of our working breeds, dogs that are used as seeing eye dogs, dogs that aid the handicapped, police dogs, military dogs, search and rescue dogs, many hunting dogs and sight hounds, many dogs used in herding and protecting livestock, a number of those in the non-sporting group, companion dog group and even some toy breeds. And who can tell by looking exactly what breeds make up a Heinz 57 variety?

2.2

Many owners of loving family pets
would either then hide their innocent pets,
meaning not licensing them or having them
inoculated against rabies or have to have them
killed or give them up or turn them loose on the
streets due to the cost. This would fill up our
shelters, which would then have to kill most of
them do to the lack of kennel space and because
no one would adopt them. Is this what the
legislators have in mind?

Representative Caltagirone has said

that he wants to stop a dog from biting before it bites. How can anyone know what a dog's intentions are? Children and adults need to be educated on the proper care, training and treatment of a dog. Each breed was created by man to serve a purpose in our lives. Buyers have to educate themselves as to which breed suits their own life style and family. In regard to bites, we need education on prevention. The solution is not arbitrary discrimination. Can the authorities come into this room today and arrest and sentence someone just because they think that their appearance or type causes them to look dangerous?

are national and international studies done on dog bites. The first study was published in the <u>Journal of Pediatrics</u> in June of 1996. Its conclusion states, quote, "The dog bite problem should be reconceptualized as a largely preventable epidemic. Breed specific approaches to the control of dog bites do not address the issue that many breeds are involved in the problem and that most of the factors contributing to dog bites are related to the

level of responsibility exercised by dog owners. To prevent dog bite related deaths and injuries, we recommend public education about responsible dog ownership and dog bite prevention, stronger animal control laws, better resources for enforcement of those laws and better reporting of bites."

The second article published in Great
Britain states, "In the United States at least
50,000 dogs are produced each year in puppy
mills for the mass pet trade. Usually the most
popular breeds are represented in these
intensive breeding operations and any animals of
the desired breeds capable of producing young
are likely to be bred and sold, regardless of
temperament," and gentlemen, temperament is
hereditary.

"The result has been the proliferation of physically and behaviorally unsound animals from among the most popular breeds, including those not traditionally associated with aggression to people, such as cocker spaniels, golden retrievers, malamutes and Siberian huskies. This problem has been widely documented in the American media." And I might

add that it is continuing as of last week. In other words, poorly bred dogs that have little early socialization, bred only for the money with no concern for quality, are contributing to our country's dog bite problem.

2.2

I heard, today was the first time I heard my breed mentioned. It is really sad for me. I have been breeding these dogs for 35 years. We see this in my breed made popular by Walt Disney, the dalmatian, with uncontrollable deaf ones and those with unstable temperaments coming from our puppy mills. The parents of these dalmatians probably had the same inherited traits but were bred anyway, with the puppies sold to the unsuspecting public.

We get two and three calls a day to our rescue people with dogs that have bitten somebody. We never had this before and 90 percent of those dogs have come from the puppy mills.

I hope that you will read the enclosed articles to gain a better understanding of the problems that we are trying to address. We definitely do need to enforce the laws that we already have, including the licensing law,

rabies law, the law requiring that dogs be kept under control and the fighting law and improve our non-breed specific law.

Please remember that 38 percent of your constituent families own a dog. That dog is a beloved member of their family. Most are responsible owners. To declare their pets dangerous would be a tragedy.

I have brought with me a chart. I will show you my next chart, showing most of the dogs that would be affected by the current bills and also pictures of dogs that I would like for you to identify as to their breed. Do not feel badly if you can't identify them. It takes a great deal of training and a written and a hands-on test to judge any one breed of dog according to the AKC standards.

This is the book of AKC standards.

There are only about two dozen people in this whole country that are considered qualified by the American Kennel Club to judge all breeds of dogs. We cannot and should not expect our state dog wardens to be able to have this kind of expertise.

I would like to show you my next

1 chart. That is my next chart. These are 2 informal type pictures taken of breeds of dogs 3 right out of the American Kennel Club Gazette. I would like for you all to be able to identify The names are tucked underneath from the 5 them. AKC Gazette and what activities these particular 6 7 breeds of dog were bred to do. This is what we will be asking our officials to do. 9

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Well, I can't see that far. I appreciate what you have done. We won't take the time to try to fail your quiz, although I am sure I would.

MS. KEITH: I would too, as a matter of fact.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: If you leave that there, I am sure not only us up here but people in the audience could take an opportunity to look at that.

Representative Caltagirone, any questions?

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: No.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you very much for your testimony. If you would leave that there, we will take a look at it later.

Our next testifier is Johanna Seeton

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

from the Pennsylvania Legislative Animal Network.

2.2

MS. SEETON: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Representative and Counsel.

My name is Johanna Seeton and I am the chairperson for the Pennsylvania Legislative Animal Network, a statewide volunteer lobbying group. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on the dangerous dog legislation. As you know, P.L.A.N. has been lobbying in Harrisburg for the past ten years and we appreciate your consideration of our views.

When a dog bites, everybody gets hurt.

And in your packet you will see and I would like to read some of the statistics. I think they are very important. They come from the U.S.

Postal Service. They come from the American Veterinary Association, State Farm Insurance, Centers for Disease Control, Humane Societies of the United States.

Number of letter carriers bitten in the past year, 2,851; number of dogs owned in the United States, 52 million; estimated amount paid out by the U.S. insurance companies in 1994 for dog bite claims, \$1 billion; average amount

of a dog bite insurance claim, 12,000; chances that a bodily injury homeowner's insurance claim will involve a dog bite, one in three; chances that an American will be bitten by a dog this year, 1 in 50; likelihood that the biting dog will be male, eight in ten; likelihood that the biting dog will not have been neutered, six in ten; chances that the bite will require medical attention, one in five; chances that the bite victim requiring medical attention will be a child, 3.2 to 1; average number of fatal dog bites every year, 9 to 12; ratio of households keeping a dog due to fear of crime 1981 compared to 1993, two to one; chances that the victim of a fatal dog attack will be a burglar, 1 in 177; chances that the victim of a fatal attack would be a child, seven in ten; the likelihood that a dog which has bitten will be destroyed, very high. Yes, when a dog bites, everyone gets hurt.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Everyone is trying to find a solution to the problem. In the legislative arena alone, many bills have been passed affecting dogs.

Pennsylvania has an excellent dogfighting law passed in 1986, making animal fighting a third

degree felony. How often is this law enforced? I don't know, but from what I am told, not often Dogfighting, is it on the rise in our state? You bet. How many busts have been made? Where do these fights take place? What animals are involved? Some of us have heard some testimony. Someone recently told me in this past week that people were gathered in a basement, apparently betting money on how many rats it would take to kill the dog; yes, rats. People kept throwing rats into the ring, and this is in Pennsylvania. It seems that the dog killed about 75 rats before -- he never did tell me the rest of the story, only that the dog involved was a pit bull. And I use that in quotes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Another important bill, the dangerous dog law, was amended to the dog law in 1990. This law, thought by many as the solution to the problem of horrific attacks by dogs, set stringent restrictions for dogs that were declared dangerous. According to a recent newspaper article, the state registry for dangerous dogs, for which the law provides, shows that since 1990 the state has declared

about 240 dogs as legally dangerous. Among them are: Akitas, ten; dalmatians, four; Dobermans three; German shepherds, 30; Great Danes, six; Malamutes, four; pit bulls, 30; Rottweilers, 48.

I just checked my spelling as I was doing this testimony on Rottweiler because my computer didn't recognize that name. And I was amused to find Webster's definition of the Rottweiler, a noun, and I quote, any of a breed of large, strong dogs with a short tail and short, black hair with tan markings, end quote; sounds like a lot of other dogs besides Rottweilers. I plan to find out more information concerning the state dog registry.

My point is this. The dangerous dog
law has been used a mere 240 times, give or take
a few, in the past six years for a total dog
population in Pennsylvania that is estimated to
be nearly three million. The total three
million is derived by extrapolating figures of
selling dog food within the state. Also there
are approximately 800,000 to one million
licensed dogs per year in the state. Where is
the enforcement? Do we have enough law
enforcement officers out there? Are complaints,

investigations and convictions proportionate to the tragedies that are occurring? Perhaps we should concentrate on enforcing the laws that are in existence.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

P.L.A.N. opposes the three new pieces of dangerous dog legislation recently introduced in the senate and the house. We recognize the tremendous problem. No one wants to see humans or animals injured. P.L.A.N. urges strict enforcement of the dog law and the animal cruelty statutes, not more laws. We support the Humane Society of the United States' new development of a task force to study and train police and humane society police officers within the State of Pennsylvania and other states for the specific crime of dogfighting. We would like to see Pennsylvania's puppy mills, which continue to engage in widespread breeding without concern for the dog's inborn temperament, cleaned up and out.

We agree with Dr. Randall Lockwood of the Humane Society of the United States when he says, "Perhaps the main reason why progress has been limited is that animal control agencies and local humane societies," and I might add dog

wardens, "with sparse and often diminishing resources, are attempting to deal with dangerous dog problems that have very deep human roots.

The underlying causes are the way people breed, raise, train, socialize and supervise their animals. It is time to look at what individuals rather than what governments can do to end the dog bite epidemic." And I end that quote.

2.2

The dangerous dog law incidents are not limited to cities. Here is an article that appeared in a rural newspaper last month. They say a picture is worth a thousand words. I am sorry I didn't have the time to have this blown up and distributed.

This is about a cow who was destroyed after a dog attack. Let me just read a little bit of it. This happened in Bradford County, Pennsylvania and I would like to, I know they are specific about their credits, so it comes from The Daily Review out of Towanda, PA.

Poor baby. Baby was a two-year old black and white Hereford cow that fought the battle over life and ended up losing the war. Baby is owned by Henry Campbell and his son, Andy. The Campbells own a farm about four miles

1 from New Albany. The battle Baby faced just a 2 week ago was with two vicious dogs, one a 3 Rottweiler. The Campbells didn't find out about the attack on Baby until neighbors called the family and told them, a couple of dogs are after 5 one of your cows. After is an understatement. 6 7 Father and son stopped transport of combine to respond to the scene. What Henry found was a 8 9 shock. I came over the rise and looked right 10 down on her and I couldn't believe what I saw. The cow was trying to protect her month-old 11 calf, according to Henry, and we were able to 12 The dogs were so intent on her walk right up. 13 they never knew we were there. She had one dog 14 15 latched right on her nose and the other one had a hold of her leg. The dog warden and the vet 16 were called. When asked where the dogs were, he 17 said, lying right there where Andy shot them. 18 The dog warden said to leave them there. 19 20 dog warden wanted to know who the dogs belonged They are local dogs but neither had a 21 collar on. I wouldn't tell him who owned them 22 because I wouldn't want to get my neighbors in 23 There is nothing they can do now. 24 take care of my neighbors. 25

And the story goes on but it is very prevalent in the rural areas that, I mean, this is a definite violation of the law right here, not reporting a dog bite. The picture, and I am sorry the audience can't see it, is of the bloodied cow without her ears, her nose, can't even breathe, standing protecting her calf.

1 1

P.L.A.N. will continue to be involved with animal legislation. We would be glad to listen to any additional concerns from anyone in this room.

Randall Lockwood, the Humane Society of the
United States. And the reason I use them and
there are additional, there is additional
information in the back of your packet from the
Humane Society of the United States, they have
what is called a legislative circle. I am lucky
enough to be the one chosen from Pennsylvania to
represent Pennsylvania in the legislative
circle. All 50 states are represented.

I quote from Randall Lockwood, "At a time when stories of dog attacks continue to fill the media, it is often easy to forget that most of our more than 50 million dogs never bite

anyone. However, the problems caused by the highly visible minority of animals and their owners have far-reaching consequences for all of us who care about the special relationships between people and dogs. Each of us must renew his or her commitment to seeing that safe and healthy animals share their lives with understanding and responsible owners."

And we are willing to work with the committee and with all the legislators to reach solutions. Yes, when a dog bites everybody gets hurt. We need everybody to work together to find solutions.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you for your testimony. I would point out to you, you earlier in your testimony, you read from the statistical charts.

MS. SEETON: Yes. That is from the Humane Society of the United States.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: You omitted the category, number of politicians that have been bitten by dogs.

MS. SEETON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I am speaking from

2 -

experience, by the way. I have done extensive door to door campaigning in a rural area and I got bit three times and all three times the owner said, oh, he won't bite.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SEETON: Interestingly enough, in the dog law with the dangerous dogs, and I know that you gentlemen are well aware of the dog law, the people that are exempt -- I shouldn't necessarily say exempt but they have different regulations -- are the rural people. people call them the farmers. They are not necessarily all farmers. But when you are out in a rural area, you don't have to have your muzzle on your dog. Your dog just cannot leave your property to attack and you must have your farm or your area well posted. Anyone going in or out can see dangerous dog signs. according to the testimony that is given, for a rural person to be able to control his or her dog without a leash on the property, not let them go off, is pretty hard.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Well, probably most people would say biting a politician is a good thing.

MS. SEETON: I have been bitten as

well, sir.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I do know in rural areas, and I represent a very rural area, it is not uncommon for dogs to just roam wherever. Occasionally they will have a dog collar or the license is a year or two outdated and the people don't get too excited about it. It is very difficult. We have one dog law enforcement officer for two counties. His job was in jeopardy earlier this year. Fortunately they kept him on, but he had been given furlough If we didn't have him, we have no notice. humane societies or SPCA or anything, and the people would be really on their own, I quess is the best way of saying it.

MS. SEETON: That is true. I lived 17 years in the district next to you, Bradford County. I know the same thing happens.
Unfortunately many of the dogs that are taken to the shelters have to be put down.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: As I read your testimony, Ms. Secton, I see that essentially you are opposed to the legislation of Representative Caltagirone and his counterpart in the senate but you are advocating, as I

understand it, some stiffer law enforcement penalties, et cetera. You obviously feel that is the direction that should be taken as opposed to the breed specific legislation.

MS. SEETON: Yes. We don't believe in any breed specific legislation. We think, too, that the laws that are on the books are quite good. I think it is interesting that this new development in the Humane Society of the United States, that they are, they have taken the initiative and from what I understand, the Federated Humane Societies of Pennsylvania is taking the lead in this to have them come to Pennsylvania to train, not only humane society police officers but also police officers. don't think I could -- well, I know they are trained and they are well trained, but I think it is a very specific crime. To go into a dogfighting ring with hundreds of people there, I think takes special training. The Humane Society of the United States has recognized the need for this and I look forward to working with all of them as well as they enter the state.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you.

Representative Caltagirone, any more

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

25

1 questions?

1.0

2 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: No.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you for your testimony.

MS. SEETON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: The last person on our agenda this afternoon is Kathy Genuardi.

She is from the Independence Club. I am not familiar with what that is. Is your testimony in writing today?

MS. GENUARDI: Yes. My testimony is in writing. It was put back on the table and you should have it.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We all have a copy of that now if you would like to make your statement.

MS. GENUARDI: Thank you. As you stated, my name is Kathy Genuardi. I have been involved with the American Pit Bull Terrier for 13 years as a pet owner, breeder, show enthusiast and a weight pull competitor. I am the co-owner of AlleyKat American Pit Bull Terriers based in Vally Forge in Philadelphia and I am also the treasurer and rescue coordinator of the Independence Allied

Performance Breeders and Training Club which is based in Bridgeport, PA and an American Dog Breeders Association sanctioned club.

2.2

As most of my experience involves the American Pit Bull Terrier, or bulldog as they are referred to, I speak on behalf of this breed and as a representative of the Independence Club. However, you can feel free to substitute the name of any of the listed breeds; American Staffordshire Terrier, Staffordshire Bull Terrier, etc.

The first bulldog I ever owned was
Belle, the greatest dog that anyone could ever
hope to have. She was a veritable Lassie, or I
should say Petie of "Our Gang" as he was also a
bulldog. She would allow children to crawl over
her, climb on her back and ride her, dress her
up, pull her ears or her tail, and would only
respond with a lick on their face and a wag of
her tail. She lived agreeably in my home for 13
years with an assortment of dogs, cats, birds
and small animals and she was a friend to every
human she met. I could talk for hours on the
dogs I have owned and that I have known but I
know that you would rather hear facts.

Fact: The American Temperament

Testing Society based in St. Louis has stated

that as of December '95 with 2700 total dogs

participating in their certification process,

and this is a ten-part test, the overall passing

rate for all breeds is 78 percent. The American

Pit Bull Terrier has an 81 percent success rate.

The American Staffordshire Terrier has an 80

percent success, and the Rottweiler stands at 79

percent.

Fact: The first three breeds that you wish to target in your legislation fall slightly higher than the average. The ATTS has stated that they are adamantly opposed to any breed specific legislation, instead favoring a, quote, punish the deed not the breed type of law.

Fact: The American Kennel Club's

Canine Good Citizen program, developed in

response to growing anti-dog sentiment, does not

currently keep breed numbers. They will as of

1997. However, in the CGC tests that

Independence has handled, the American Pit Bull

has a 100 percent passing rate with an average

for all breeds at 83 percent.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Excuse me for a

1 second.

MS. GENUARDI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: You are using language you are very familiar with. I am not sure if other people are. What does it mean to be certified in this? What do these percents mean?

MS. GENUARDI: Well, all of the
American Pit Bull Terriers that have
participated in the Canine Good Citizenship
testing, the testing involves meeting a
stranger, meeting a stranger with a dog, being
able to sit or lie down upon command, being able
to be left alone without their owner quietly;
all things that the average dog living in a
human environment as a companion animal would
come across.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you.

MS. GENUARDI: Fact: The Delta
Society, which handles Pet Therapy programs,
Assistance Dogs programs and educational
programs nationwide has two American
Staffordshire Terriers and one American Pit Bull
Terrier and one, quote, pit bull, actively
participating in their programs.

Fact: Therapy Dogs International,
which sends animals and their owners to
hospitals, nursing homes and rehabiliation
facilities, lists seven American Staffordshire
Terriers, two Staffordshire Bull Terriers and
two American Pit Bull Terriers in their current
active files.

2.0

Now, understand that there are already many local chapters and organizations nationwide that are doing the same thing and they have bulldogs listed but they are just too numerous to mention. These are the national organizations.

Fact: In December of '95 an American Pit Bull Terrier was out walking with his owner, who was an off-duty Philadelphia police officer. This particular dog was given up by his owner and was due to be put to sleep as the shelters in Philadelphia do not adopt out pit bull types. While he was walking he found an abandoned baby in the garbage with just enough time to save the baby's life according to the Philadelphia Daily News.

Fact: In 1994 an American Pit Bull
Terrier located an autistic boy lost in Ridley

Park, Delaware County. That was a <u>Philadelphia</u>
Inquirer article.

2.0

Fact: In 1994, Wela, an American Pit
Bull Terrier was named Ken-L Ration's Dog Hero
of the Year, for helping to locate and
subsequently bring food and water to 42 domestic
animals stranded by flooding.

Fact: Could any of these dogs accomplish these tasks while muzzled?

Of course not, and we are all intelligent enough to realize that these are not the dogs and the owners that are causing the problems. However, it is a very good overview of the breed's personality and capabilities when in a particular responsible owner's hands.

It has been stated by the legislators drafting these restrictions that the bulldog breeds are bred for dogfighting and therefore are a danger to the general public. The history of the breed does include ratting, dogfighting and bull and bear baiting. But gentlemen, this is the history. It is past. This is not the present. These are companion animals. The American Pit Bull Terrier is registered with the United Kennel Club and the American Dog Breeders

Association and the American Staffordshire and the Staffordshire Bull Terrier are registered with the American Kennel Club. These are internationally recognized registries and authorities that do not promote or condone fighting and cruelty to animals. The ADBA, or the American Dog Breeders Association, and the United Kennel Club have definite policies against dogfighting.

As an ADBA sanctioned club, the Independence Club has a section in its bylaws which states, Section 12, if a club member is charged with dogfighting, that member will be suspended pending the outcome of the charges. The club officers will decide the degree of suspension. If a conviction of dogfighting occurs, unquestionably said club member will experience immediate expulsion from the club.

The United Kennel Club's policy which is routinely published in the <u>Bloodlines</u> magazine, regarding the fighting of dogs states in part: "The UKC and <u>Bloodlines</u> magazine are against the pitting of one dog against another," and 2, "will not knowingly accept an advertisement or article pertaining to the

fighting ability of a dog."

Regarding the persons associated with dogfighting, the club says, "All dog registration privileges will be revoked for life," and, 2, "The person or persons will be barred for life from participating in or entering any UKC licensed events."

Again, we see the owner being made responsible for the dog's actions, as it should be. These figures and policies are stated so that you have a general idea of what the breeds are that you are talking about.

In fact, the American Pit Bull Terrier and the related breeds are first and foremost companion animals which also compete in conformation shows or weight pull events. They may be obedience titleists, agility competitors or tracking dogs. Their capabilities and accomplishments are limited only by the time and energy constraints of their owners.

In a September 25th edition of the Philadelphia Northeast Times a senator's aide was quoted. In this article he discounts the figures that show of the 240 dogs that have been declared dangerous since the 1990 law went into

effect, 48 are Rottweilers and just 30 are pit bulls. He says that the figures are misleading because according to the AKC's registration numbers, there are more Rottweilers than, quote, unquote, pit bulls; therefore, the pit bull has a higher percentage of bites because there are less dogs as a whole.

First, the American Kennel Club does not register pit bulls. They register two breeds with the uninformed label of the generic name of pit bull. Second, he is not including the American Pit Bull Terriers registered with the American Dog Breeders Association and the United Kennel Club across the country. The ADBA alone currently registers over 330,000 American Pit Bull Terriers. This figure along with the UKC registration figure, which was not available at the time that I had to get this together, will greatly reduce the percentage of the bite statistics, thereby diluting the bite ratio even further.

Third, we have to ask, who is identifying these animals; the owners, the humane societies or the distraught victims? And as Dotsie attempted to show you and you will

look at later and this has been done at various places, even those persons knowledgeable in the various dog breeds cannot always pinpoint a pit bull. Actually, there is no such breed as a pit bull. This is a generic name for a type of dog, similar to the nouns shepherd, collie or terrier.

б

2.2

In Philadelphia County where I currently reside, the number of bites attributed to the generic name pit bull account for only six percent of the total number of bites. In Montgomery County where I grew up and where the county seat of Norristown has claimed in the past few years to have a problem with the breed, as Reading and Harrisburg have, the pit bulls are attributed with only three percent of the bites for 1995.

Again, the problem with these figures is the identification of the animals. Are these animals registered with a nationally recognized authority? Or most likely, are they mostly mixed breeds whose owners want to hang a macho name tag on their dogs because the papers and television tell them what a tough dog the pit bull is? It is a status symbol to own one. So

therefore, any short-haired, muscular dog is referred to as a pit bull by their owner.

In my travels with my dogs I talk to owners of many kinds of dogs, but more times than I would like the conversation goes something like this: The person will walk towards me and say, "Hey, I have a pit bull, too." When I ask them who is it registered with or do they show it, their response is, "No, I bought it from a guy," or "I bought it from my cousin; its dad was a pit but its mom was a boxer." When I explain that it is a mixed dog, they say, "No. No; it is a pit bull because the guy that sold it to me, he said it is a pit; besides, I paid \$150 for it." Well, that is no guarantee.

Let's face facts. Who owns the dogs that we see in the headlines? Are they responsible pet owners that obey the leash laws and socialize their animals? My opinion is no, because if you look further into these bite cases, it is my opinion that these people and animals have been a nuisance in the past but either have not been reported until a serious attack occurs or it is not followed through by

the authorities because of the time and budget restrictions so often cited as the reason for the low numbers of available dog wardens.

б

Let's talk about dangerous dogs. What exactly is a dangerous dog? Is it a dog that has inflicted serious injury on a human, or is it a dog that has been given the one free bite advantage, then goes back for a second or third? One of the state representatives has complained to the press of this, the dog gets one free bite advantage.

According to the current Pennsylvania

Dog Law Article V-A, Section 502-A and it has

been quoted in the past, but the determination

of a dangerous dog, one of the ways we determine

that is either through infliction of severe

injury on a human or a domestic animal, or part

3, attacked a human without provocation.

Section 501-A of the current law defines an

attack as "The deliberate action of a dog,

whether or not in response to a command from its

owner, to bite, to sieze with its teeth or,"

this is important, "to pursue any human, animate

or inanimate objet, with the obvious intent to

destroy, kill, wound, injure or otherwise harm

the object of its action." Therefore, in the short form, a dog does not have to bite to be determined dangerous in our system. They just have to attack, by your definition, but they are not followed through. If a dog doesn't bite, people think it is not serious. Through public education you have to let people know a bite is not the only serious thing.

One of your senator's proposals is to have the owners of these unfairly labeled dangerous dogs carry a mandatory liability insurance in the amount of \$50,000. As a responsible dog owner, will I be able to comply with this requirement? Will I be able to find an insurance carrier that will cover my dogs? It is a well-known fact that major insurance carriers across the country are canceling or imposing riders on those homeowners that own so-called dangerous breeds and it has been reported that some will cancel if you ever admit you have any dogs.

How can you pass a law I cannot comply with? Can you guarantee me the availability of insurance? And if it is not readily available through the normal channels, will you establish

a state high risk program as you did for mandatory auto insurance laws? If the state and counties do not have the funds to adequately enforce the dog law as it currently stands, how will you fund such a program?

Я

And in a telephone call with a state representative I commented that as representives of our state government I believe the legislators involved in drafting these restrictions are promoting racism and discrimination in our commonwealth. He answered by stating that I was being ridiculous and taking this to the extreme, as they are talking about animals. Am I being ridiculous or are you? Webster's Ninth Edition New Collegiate Dictionary defines race as a class or kind of people unified by habits, community interests or characteristics.

As fanciers of the American Pit Bull
Terrier, the American Staffordshire Terrier and
the Staffordshire Bull Terrier we fit the
definition of a race. According to Webster's,
discrimination is defined, part 2, as the act,
practice or instance of discriminating
categorically rather than individually. As the

owner of an American Pit Bull Terrier I am being told I should muzzle my dog, thereby identifying me to the public as a pariah, because as I was told on the telephone by this state representative, "...if you want to own that kind of dog, you can expect to be thought of as a dogfighter." Is this an example of the equality on which our Bill of Rights was founded?

Each day as I play with my dogs and work with them, I am reminded of what it means to make the most of each moment. Of all the breeds, the bulldog takes hold of life and lives each minute to the fullest, whether chasing a ball or playing with the neighbor's kids. They are perpetually happy. Even when reprimanded, they will come to you, lay their head in your lap and say they are sorry and then give that bulldog grin that says, all is forgiven; let's play.

Thank you for allowing me to appear here today.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Ms. Genuardi.

What I would suggest to you is if you have any concerns on this issue, either the

legislation specific in front of you, or if you 1 have any input or suggestions, you may want to contact Representative Caltagirone. Don't contact me, please. I am not going to get real involved in this issue. I am just chairing this meeting. 7

But Representative Caltagirone has the real interest in it. I am sure in the next session he will be working again towards some legislative proposals. I know he has to leave quickly. He has another meeting to go to. Representative Caltagirone's counsel, Mr. Andring, would be available to give you his phone number and address. So if you wish to contact Representative Caltagirone, you may do that in the future.

With that, we stand adjourned. (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 12:10 p.m.)

20

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1

I, Marsha Hunter-Breen, Reporter, Notary Public, duly commissioned and qualified in and for the County of Montgomery, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my stenotype notes taken by me and subsequently reduced to computer printout under my supervision, and that this copy is a correct record of the same.

This certification does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under my direct control and/or supervision.

Dated this 29th day of October, 1996.

16

-Marsha Hunter - Breen

18

17

Marsha Hunter-Breen, Reporter Notary Public

19 20

My Commission Expires: May 17, 1999

21

22

23

24

25