***SAMPLE* Letter # 2**

Docket No. APHIS-2011-0009

Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS

Station 3-A-03.8

4700 River Road Unit 118

Riverdale, MD 20737-1238

RE: Docket No. APHIS-2011-0009: Horse Protection; Licensing of Designated Qualified Persons (DQP) and Other Amendments

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important subject concerning the proposed amendment to the Horse Protection Act regulations that govern the inspection of horses at horse shows, exhibitions, sales and auctions. I care deeply about my livestock, and work hard to provide the proper care and treatment for animals on my farm. Soring of horses is not a practice I condone.

But, this proposed rule is badly flawed. The proposal could result in inspectors, who have knowledge of horses, being replaced with someone who possibly has only worked with small animals simple because they have a veterinary degree and receive some training on the soring issue. The rule is also unclear on exactly what animals would be subject to the rule. All horses have a gait, and for that matter some other species of animals have gaits and utilize training devices during the training process. Also, what are the foreign substances mentioned in the rule? They are not defined, and essentially could be anything.

This rule is suspicious in its intent. Is the intent of the rule to truly address the soring of horses? If so, let’s look at more objective means to address the issue that are based on truly identifying soring cases. Or, is the intent to limit, or eliminate animal agriculture as some activist groups would prefer? This rule, because of its vagueness and potential broad implications, could easily result in the destruction of an entire industry. I would recommend APHIS completely withdraw this rule, and instead implement a more objective, science-based inspection process for the inspection of horses to accurately address the soring issue.

Sincerely,