



Proposed Amendments to Animal Trader Regulations (Cap 139B)

Emmie, Osawa

to:

07/11/2012 12:20

Hide Details

From: "Emmie, Osawa" <>

To:

Miss Liza LAM,

As a rescue dog owner, I very much welcome the proposed amendments to Cap 139B and would like to offer these comments and observations:

The current laws are not effective in deterring breeders, and seem to provide little to no protection against the abuse of animals, or to the people buying dogs in good faith. The penalties for offenders should they be caught breaking the law are too small, and not comparable to the crime.

The amendments include a proposal for Animal Breeder License A to permit no more than four females breeding on a premise. If each female had 4-10 puppies, this could mean up to 40 puppies an unregulated "hobby" breeder could have on the premise at any one time. To me this does not qualify as a hobby, and these actions should be regulated. The maximum should be set at 1-2 females. Furthermore, the females should not have more than one litter every year, and no more than 3 litters in their lifetime. It would be extremely hard for AFCD to monitor breeding in private homes, therefore these dogs can be kept in terrible conditions. Considering the number of unwanted dogs in shelters, is there really any need for more than 2 dogs per breeder?

Breeding facilities must be properly regulated, and should be routinely checked for abuse. Welfare standards should be set and enforced, with a minimum standard of care clearly set out to ensure that no animal is suffering, diseased, or forced to lead a life of misery. Anyone who cannot or will not take proper care of their animals should be fined and their licenses revoked, with a lifetime ban on keeping animals again.

Lastly, no person or company should be allowed to advertise or sell puppies without the dogs having been seen by a vet, fully vaccinated and microchipped. My 3 year old rescue dog was abandoned with a pet shop microchip that was never registered, and he had never been rabies vaccinated (at 5 months, as is the law). AFCD should have had the power to fine the owner of the microchip. His eye was damaged and untreated, and he was underweight and most likely kept in a cage most of his life. I believe Pet shops should be made to keep full and proper records of all puppies sold and available to be sold, which should be made accessible to AFCD at any time. Pet buyers should also be required to have full documentation, and any pet owner who owns a dog without full license should also be fined and/or made to comply.

In conclusion, I am in support of increased regulation and penalties. While I think they need to be much stricter, I welcome any change in the right direction.

Thank you,

Emmie

The information contained in this e-mail, and any attachment, is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. Access, copying or re-use of the e-mail or any attachment, or any information contained therein, by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient please return the e-mail to the sender and delete it from your computer. Although we attempt to sweep e-mail and attachments for viruses, we do not guarantee that either are virus-free and accept no liability for any damage sustained as a result of viruses.

Please refer to <http://disclaimer.bnymellon.com/eu.htm> for certain disclosures relating to European legal entities.