



Dogs West Member Submission on
STOP PUPPY FARMING



Name	Claire Jensen
Email address	[REDACTED]
Prefix or Member #	[REDACTED]
Breed(s)	Border Collie, Brittany, Whippet, Papillon, French Bulldog
Phone Number	[REDACTED]
Years involved	27
Family involved?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p><i>My thoughts on:</i> Transition pet shops to adoption centres (can only sell dogs sourced from rescues).</p>	<p>I don't believe that pets should be sold from pet shops/ stores full stop. The existing rescue organisations carry out background checks on new owners, and do pre-adoption property checks. In the case of the Animal Protection Society of WA, they do this and combine it with vaccinations, sterilisation and vet checks to then "sell" the dog for under \$500. They do all of this to reduce the likelihood of these animals re-entering the rescue process in the future. What pet shop is going to be so thorough? They currently charge \$Thousands to anyone prepared to stump up the funds, and are one of the major sources of dogs who will be abandoned – yet you think they are a solution? This approach you are suggesting has failed EVERYWHERE it has been tried before. The issue is not with the type of pets available through pet shops - it is the fact that as it stands, and as it's proposed, people will still be able to walk into a pet shop and walk out with a pet, having given little thought or consideration to the responsibility involved. The only way I see this working is if the pet shops become a reference centre of sorts without physically having dogs on the premises available to instantly purchase – any enquiries for a dog that get made at a pet shop store front can be then directed to a reputable ANKC registered breeder, or to a registered accredited rescue, with the pet shop receiving a small commission on sales made perhaps? Or some kind of reciprocal referral service from breeders/rescues to send their new owners to said pet shop for food/supplies etc.</p>
<p><i>My thoughts on:</i> Introduce mandatory dog de-sexing.</p>	<p>To an extent I am generally in favour of de-sexing for most companion animals in pet homes - but most definitely NOT in favour of the blanket nature of the regulation proposed, particularly in regard to the recommended age stated in the proposal. At the DogsWest presentation we attended you conceded that this was a bad idea at the young age proposed. It was claimed that this was "the best information available in 2013". This is clearly a cop-out – all current research, and indeed research from several years ago, supports the benefits of desexing when necessary after maturity. This does vary between breeds but in general I would suggest most dogs should not be desexed prior to approx.. 9 – 12 months of age, older for larger breeds. I also believe the proposal should be amended to include ovary sparing spay & vasectomised dogs as being correctly sterilised – this is a much better option, especially in the case of larger breeds who require their hormones to develop normally. I have seen so many dogs over the 20+ years I have been working in and around the pet care/boarding industry that suffer from incontinence & hypoplastic (recessed/undeveloped) vulvas due to being desexed too young – which then cause life long maintenance & medication issues.</p> <p>Many breeds can be sensitive to anaesthesia and giving a GA too early is very dangerous. I am opposed to such strict rules in relation to the age of de-sexing, and I also believe that it needs to be assessed on a case by case basis in consultation with the veterinarian and the owner.</p>



Dogs West Member Submission on
STOP PUPPY FARMING



<p><i>My thoughts on:</i></p> <p>Introduce a centralised registration system and Council registration to be a Breeder.</p>	<p>This will only keep tabs on honest people, who are NOT the target of this legislation. Anyone who wishes to operate outside of your scrutiny merely needs to continue a practice of not microchipping/registering as they currently are, and your dream falls on its face. So you will make it more difficult/costly for people who are currently doing the right thing, and have no effect on the people you are trying to target. An expensive waste of time and resources.</p> <p>I am a registered breeder with Dogs West and would ask you grant us the exemption you mentioned at the consultation nights with members. You have said Dogs West is the standard you want people to meet. I do not want to have to register with you as a breeder in addition to my Dogs West membership which is already highly regulated and monitored. I do not want to be scrutinized, I have a clean record and I feel like I am being punished when I am not the problem.</p> <p>This is very disappointing and while I support the cause ‘to stop puppy farming’ in its most literal & widely known form, I do not support this proposal. I think you have created a document that preys on people’s good will and is misleading. It will not deliver what you promise.</p>
<p><i>My thoughts on:</i></p> <p>Introduce mandatory standards for dog breeding, housing, husbandry, transport and sale.</p>	<p>I agree that there should be mandatory standards but you have not provided us with a paper/proposal to comment on. We already have standards. Why do you see the need to re-invent the wheel? In fact on the night I attended the Dogswest talk the opening paragraph of your presentation stated that WA has some of the toughest laws for animal welfare in the world and certainly within the country. It seems that you merely need to investigate and enforce the legislation that is already in place – because with all the proposed changes you have still overlooked investigation and enforcement.</p> <p>One of my common concerns regarding every facet of this proposed legislation, as stated above, is that this will only be targeting those currently doing the right thing. We have legislation in place currently that is not enforced when people choose to blatantly flout the rules – how do you propose that this new legislation will be any more successful? Those who have always chosen to break the laws by not microchipping/not vaccinating/not registering/not providing suitable standards of care will continue to do so regardless of any new legislation. This will mean that once again the people who are transparent and follow the rules and do the right thing and are happy to be held accountable will be penalised by the very nature of their transparency – they will be on the radar, and will then have to pay significant extra costs to continue being able to do the right thing while the people who don’t comply will continue on their way doing whatever they like – dogs will continue to be unmicrochipped/unvaccinated/unsterilized. A better use of time and money would be to work within the existing framework we already have in place and enforce the current regulations.</p>