

I urge members of DCA to vote yes on the current ballot.

The science behind the backcross breeding strategy is on firm ground. It was established in the early part of the 20th century that excess urinary uric acid output is controlled by a single gene and the gene has now been isolated on chromosome 3. Breeders who wish to introduce this gene into their lines can follow it easily with genetic testing.

There is no evidence to suggest that LUA Dals will from other types of stones if the primary risk factor of high concentration of urinary uric acid is removed. There is no evidence that any of the backcross dogs have inherited health problems from the Pointer and, after 10-13 generations, very little of the Pointer DNA remains except that which has been explicitly carried on through testing and selection - and that is the gene for normal canine urinary uric acid output.

Many people are afraid to fly and yet, if you look at the numbers, the 30 minute car ride to the airport is more likely to result in injury or death than a flight across the Atlantic. Sometimes our fears are based not on a rational analysis of relative risk, but upon an impression that what we do all the time must be safer than something we have never done.

There is no greater risk in breeding an AKC Dalmatian to a dog descended from the Pointer outcross than there is in breeding 2 AKC Dalmatians together. Additionally, anyone who does not want to introduce these dogs into their lines need not do so; they can continue their breeding programs as is.

Most of today's Dal breeders are not landed gentry with the resources to manage kennels full of dogs and the hired help to care for the kennels of dogs. I do not believe it is reasonable to ask a small group of breeders to effectively maintain 2 breeding programs for 10-20 more years. Additionally, these breeders will be asked to do much above and beyond the norm with regard to backcross litters.

And, unless something changes, IMHO, the breeders will be expected not only to carry out whatever protocol is agreed upon, but to respond to questions and suggestions in a climate that can border on adversarial. I do not own a descendant of the backcross project, so I do not have a horse in this race. This does not affect me personally.

If the majority of the members of DCA does not wish to lift the hold on the registration of the descendants of 2 5th generation AKC registered backcross dogs within the next 5 years (which is all it would take to make the current

backcross Dals AKC-register-able) , then I suggest that the membership direct the club to seek some sort of compromise or interim AKC registration. Personally, I would support full registration and trust the breeders involved to make the right decisions. Breeders have been faced with 'popular stud dogs' in the past and are trusted to make the decisions as to when, where and how often he should be used. Why not trust breeders in this case, particularly since the breeders involved have studied breeding practices and formulated a plan for proceeding?

I also trust that should health problems arise, the breeders involved will face the problems and do what they think is best for the breed. Some of these breeders have already set their own successful AKC breeding programs on the back burner to further the backcross project. To me, this is evidence that they are willing to look at the big picture and deserving of that trust.

We have already seen what happened with the backcross program after the first go-round . I feel the Dalmatian breed stands to lose if the membership of DCA does fully not support the current effort.

Corinne James (Biederman), PhD