After attending a recent workshop on Stop Puppy Farming I would just like to make a few comments.

- The success of the legislation appears to be relying heavily on people actually registering their animals with local councils. This assumes that the majority of people actually register their dogs but what if they do not? What statistics are available to confirm that most people register their dogs? If they do not, you will have no way to track their actions and the council will be unaware of whether they are breeding or not. It seems to me that people will simply not register their animals in order to avoid having to comply with the new legislation. How would this be enforced and monitored? As usual, the people trying to do the right thing are most likely to be affected by more regulations and increasing costs while those contributing to the problem will continue to go unmanaged.
- Statistics raised at the workshop indicated that DOGSWEST registered breeders make up approximately 15% of puppy sales etc. This means that the vast majority (85%) are backyard breeders (BYB) or puppy farms. It stands to reason that the majority of the problem of unwanted dogs is also due to BYBs and puppy farms. Further, Dogswest breeders were acknowledged by your own panel as representing the 'gold standard' when it comes to responsible dog ownership and breeding, and it was acknowledged that our member breeders are highly regulated and have high standards for care, breeding and sale of our dogs. Therefore, why are Dogswest breeders <u>not being supported and</u> <u>encouraged</u> to continue the good work – rather we seem to be targeted under the legislation as we are currently being told we will not be exempt from the mandatory desexing rule. Please support the responsible breeders by providing Dogswest members with an exemption from mandatory desexing. This legislation could unintentionally end purebred dogs, especially as a sport and hobby.
- Years ago I was encouraged by a vet who specialised in breeding dogs to engage in early sterilisation of puppies. Wanting to prevent my dogs being bred irresponsibly, I decided to have all of my puppies that were sold as 'pets' sterilised by the age of 3 months, and before they went into new homes. Over the years I tracked their progress (not expecting any issues related to sterilisation but out of a belief in monitoring my breeding). I noticed physical differences in the pups who were neutered/spayed early. They grew faster and were bigger than all their intact litter mates. Many of them also ended up with issues of incontinence and there were some other health issues (not significant but interesting to note) that the littermates I was able to keep in contact with did not have. The only two dogs I ever bred who reportedly ended up with Hip Dysplasia (this was 15 years ago BTW and all my breeding dogs were x-rayed ad certified by the AVA as suitable) were both sterilised young. I have never had a report of one of the intact dogs developing HD. I speculated that this might be related to the speed with which they grew which left them vulnerable because it added stress to immature joints and muscle structures before they might have been ready. I realise this is just anecdotal information for you, but I believe these findings have also been repeated in scientific studies so it does not appear to be unique. However, I will leave it for your consideration. After a break from

breeding for several years, when I finally started again and approached the same vet who had recommended early sterilisation previously, he told me that he NO LONGER RECOMMENDED IT – to my surprise. Therefore, I think this part of your legislation is dangerous. <u>I believe in having pets sterilised but</u> <u>please give them to 12 months of age</u>. And, perhaps consider significant rebates for sterilisation via vets so people are not put off at the cost and are more likely to sterilise. Maybe offer to pay for sterilisation for a period of time for any person who would like to have their pet sterilised?? I wonder how many people would voluntarily take up that option if it was free and then you might not even need to make it mandatory as compliance might be significantly higher???

Regards,



Disclaimer: The information contained in this e-mail may be private and personal or otherwise confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of any part of the information is unauthorised. If you have received this e-mail in error, please inform the sender and delete the document.