



Animal Care Australia

# The Animal Care Expert

“Animal welfare by the experts—those who keep, care  
for and breed animals”

## In This Issue:

- 3 President’s Report
- 4 Submissions, news & correspondence
- 7 NSW Animal Welfare Discussion Paper
- 9 What an indoor cat misses out on
- 10 Do large numbers equal a puppy farm?
- 12 Greater oversight & accountability needed in NSW
- 14 Bird update
- 16 Media release: Forgetting to include puppy farms
- 18 Cocoa’s story
- 20 He wasn’t born dangerous ... he was trained to be!



December 2021. Volume 3.

Issue 4. ISSN 2625-0818



Animal Care Australia

“Animal Care Australia acknowledge the Traditional Custodians of the land on which we reside, and pay our respects to their Elders past and present.”

**Executive**



**Michael Donnelly**  
President



**Sam Davis**  
Vice-President



**Michelle Grayson**  
Secretary



**Sue Kowalczyk**  
Public Officer/Treasurer

**Species Representatives**



**Sam Davis**  
Birds



**Michelle Grayson**  
Cats



**Kylie Gilbert**  
Dogs



**Exhibited**



**Fish & Aquatic**



**Karri Nadazdy**  
Horses & Livestock



**Michael Donnelly**  
Native Mammals



**Joanne Payne**  
Reptiles & Amphibians



**Rachel Sydenham**  
Small Mammals

## President's Report

By Michael Donnelly

### Another year gone!

This past three months has been the busiest for ACA.

Victoria, Western Australia and NSW have all had ongoing dog and cat related issues that just won't stop.

Local Councils in Victoria have continued to make their own rules up as they go along — further limiting owners on how they can keep their dogs.

Western Australia is about to pass their so-called puppy farm legislation, and despite our ongoing communications with the Shadow Ministry and some minor parties, the sad reality is the MGowan Government holds the majority in both Houses, making it extremely difficult to stop the legislation or achieve amendments to it.

NSW has seen the AJP finally release it's puppy farm Bill and as expected it is the most restrictive of the three States. Also as expected the Bill and it's introductory speech is full of more lies and exaggerations than the four years of the Trump administration!

While it is not expected to pass in the NSW Lower House, ACA is aware that the NSW Labor Party is already drafting it's own puppy farm policy and 2022 will see 4 or 5 Bi-elections that have some potential to reduce the current majority in the Lower House—and that could spell troubled times ahead for the Liberal/National majority and therefore raises the potential that a puppy farm Bill could make its way through with the right behind the scenes negotiation/deals.

There is more about the NSW Companion Animal Amendment (Puppy Farm) Bill 2021 in this newsletter.

A number of Local Councils, in NSW,

Victoria and Qld have highlighted the influence of animal rights ideologies as well as a lack of expert consultation as they have about their merry way of reviewing their Animal Management Plans. ACA has responded to as many reviews as we can pushing back against restrictions and we hope that at least some of our recommendations are adopted.

The AGM is to be held on 13th December via zoom, and as part of that we will be looking to adopt a fully reviewed constitution.

All member Associations should by now have received notification of the AGM, and the Special Resolution.

The yearly reports from the AGM will be provided to all members and supporters in our Bi-annual Report.

This report will cover the two years since our last AGM. During Covid, the ACA Committee followed the NSW Dept of Fair Trading advice and held over the 2020 AGM until 2021.

The NSW Animal Welfare Review has already seen some major changes suggested in the latest draft and this holds major concerns for moving into the next phase during 2022.

One of the recommendations is to include cephalopods and crustaceans into the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act and as regulations and codes of practice begin to be reviewed ACA will need ensure we have the necessary knowledge to respond. If you or someone you know would like to join ACA as our Fish & Aquatic Representative, please contact us: [aca@animalcareaustralia.org.au](mailto:aca@animalcareaustralia.org.au)

Send us a quick resume or outline of your experience in keeping aquatic animals.

Finally, due to the AGM being held in December and some of us needing a well-deserved break, there will be no General Meeting in January, so we will see you all in March.

On behalf of the ACA Committee I would like to extend best wishes for the new year and hope everyone has a happy Christmas holiday.



## ACA Submissions, Correspondence & Meeting Reports.



### ACA works with Shooters, Fishers & Farmers Party Victoria, to support pet grooming

#### e-petition

**10th September 2021** — ACA is calling on all Victorian dog and cat owners to sign the ePetition that will make grooming services essential during any lock down.

ACA would like to thank Jeff Bourman MP - Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party — Victoria for sponsoring the ePetition.



### Authorised dog/cat grooming expanded in Victoria.

**14th September 2021** — additions have been made to the Authorised Providers list in Victoria: “pet grooming mobile services that can be undertaken in a contactless manner (businesses with an ABN) and operate solely outdoors where physical distancing can be maintained at all times“.

This back-flip comes just days after an ePetition sponsored by Jeff Bourman MP - Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party, was made public.



### ACA responds to NSW Animal Welfare Review — Discussion Paper

**17th September 2021** — ACA’s response to

the paper is critical of the obvious animal rights & compliance influences, while lacking aspiration to improve animal welfare. Some of ACA’s findings include:

- An opportunity missed to educate the public and improve animal welfare.
- The objects of the Act should centre on improving animal welfare across NSW and they do not.
- The Regulations MUST be formulated prior to the new Act being presented to or passed through parliament.
- Entry powers for inspectors still do not protect the hobbyist or pet owner from over zealous inspectors.
- ACA requests justification as to why options to review who enforces the Act were not proposed?
- ACA recommends a model where all inspectors are directly answerable to and accountable to the DPI.
- State to be responsible for holding costs of animals whilst court proceedings are finalized.
- Aligned statute of limitations is partly supported
- Application of replacement, reduction and refinement is not applicable to education, exhibiting or private keeping.
- ACA opposes the proposal to reduce holding times of animals in shelters. This only benefits the shelters.
- ACA opposes the alternative pathways to prosecution – circumnavigating the mental health processes by the Courts is not in any one’s best interest – other than the prosecuting authority.



To read our submission click on the pdf icon:

Cont’d next page...



## ACA responds to proposal for a National

### Registration Scheme for the Export of Live Exotic & Native Birds

**17th September 2021** — The Federal Government is proposing (again) to introduce a national registration scheme for recording all birds kept by Australian residents.

Ignoring a recommendation to introduce a registration process for birds that are being exported by recording those birds and their DNA, a survey & proposal has now expanded to include all birds kept or bred — all 6 million plus birds!

Our recommendations included:

#### Recommendation 1:

ACA DOES NOT support the introduction of a National Registration Scheme for ALL exotic & native birds

#### Recommendation 2:

ACA will support a requirement for birds intended for export or import to have DNA parentage testing and the registration of ONLY those birds intended to be exported

#### Recommendation 3:

ACA supports the CCBFA's DNA parentage testing protocols for birds intended for export.

To read our submission click on the pdf icon:



## ACA responds to Golden Plains Shire Council's

### updated draft of Local Law -

## Keeping animals.

**12th October 2021** — Following a request by Golden Shire Council to present at their Council meeting, ACA has responded to their amended Animal Management Plans.

ACA Vice President, Sam Davis presented ACA's recommendations to the Councillors via a zoom meeting.

ACA maintains welfare is not about number restrictions or limiting species allowed to be kept.

ACA responded with examples of how restricting animal numbers will affect animal welfare .

ACA called for the removal of restrictions and Council to adopt more favourable support for keeping pets.

ACA highlighted how impractical restrictions are for the keeping of most pets.

To read our submission click on the pdf icon:



## ACA responds to Macedon Ranges Shire Council's Domestic Animal Management Plan 2021-2025

**20th October 2021** — ACA responded to Councils consultation.

ACA welcomed Councils willingness to educate it's residents.

ACA responded on behalf of reports from our own Macedon Ranges members on Councils unwillingness to follow the provisions provided by the Domestic Animals Act relating to the provisions of 'Applicable Organisations' as well as 'Domestic Animal Businesses'.

ACA called for the Council to improve it's interactions with its residents and support the keeping of pets rather than hindering.

Cont'd next page...

To read our submission to  
Macedon Ranges Shire Council  
click on the pdf icon:



## ACA responds to Townsville City Council's Animal Management Plan 2021

**29th October 2021**— ACA responded to Council's draft plan.

ACA has opposed the majority of Council's restrictions on species numbers.

It is clear that Council have never undertaken to consult with experts.

ACA is appalled that Council would implement a policy of euthanising an animal that has escaped 3 times, rather than offer support, training or rehoming where the owner is deemed irresponsible.

ACA opposed restrictions on bird numbers permitted to be kept.

ACA opposed the restriction of more than 3 dogs requiring owners to register/apply as a kennel.

To read our submission click on the pdf icon:



## ACA responds to Companion Animals Amendment Bill 2021

**3rd November 2021** — ACA continues to lobby against the AJP's proposed Puppy Farm Bill.

All NSW Parliamentary Members have been provided with a written response

to Ms Emma Hurst's speech introducing her Bill — calling out false and misleading statements.

ACA has also provided a clause by clause breakdown highlighting the flaws and consequences of the Bill.

ACA defends the rights of everyone to keep & breed dogs & cats.

ACA is concerned with the inclusion of this Bill in the Companion Animals Act as this will allow for the restriction of other pets in the future.

ACA sees no justification in the inclusion of Boarding and Animal Training Facilities or Shelters in this Bill

ACA has major concerns this Bill will contribute to the continued eradication of some dog & cat breeds

To read our submission click on the pdf icon:



## Have a plan and a 'grab & go' kit in case of an emergency

### 1. Pack Supplies & your 'Grab & Go' kit

Use easy to carry & stackable containers

### 2. Plan ahead

Plan where the animals can stay during the evacuation and the cleanup/rebuilding. Make sure your pets and neighbours know each other. They may be needed urgently if you are away

### 3. Identification

Animals might run or hide — so you need ways to identify them. Have collars, tags, microchips, write your phone number on larger animals, and have photos of them for easy

### 'Grab & Go' kit

Pack enough for 3-7 days for all of your animals.

Include transport, restraint, food, water, medications, bedding, toileting & first aid:

- cages/carriers for each animal
- muzzle, leash, lead rope, head collar.
- food, water & bowls/dishes, feed bucket — can opener, spoon, scoop.
- blankets, towels, bedding, coats/rugs.
- medications & first aid items
- litter, litter trays & poo bags
- favourite toy or any other essential items to last them 3-7 days.
- vets contact info incl: photos of vaccination certificates and other important medical info

"Animal welfare by the experts— those who keep, care for and breed animals"

[www.animalcareaustralia.org.au](http://www.animalcareaustralia.org.au)

To Join ACA: <https://www.animalcareaustralia.org.au/join/>



By Michael Donnelly — ACA President

## NSW Animal Welfare Discussion Paper

### Missing a strong welfare focus

ACA has expressed our disappointment in the lack of inspiration to improve animal welfare.

Drafting a new Act should be the time to throw out what isn't working and introduce new initiatives.

ACA calls on the Dept of Primary Industries & Minister for Agriculture to:

- ◆ Focus on educating the public to improve compliance and require less enforcement.
- ◆ Re-draft the Objects of the Act to centre on improving animal welfare across NSW.
- ◆ Include provisions measuring animal welfare state-wide so that improvement can be monitored and responded to.
- ◆ Enshrine the funding of education in the Act
- ◆ Develop education programs for children in Primary & Secondary schools to teach about the caring for and the responsibilities of keeping animals.
- ◆ Develop Standards & Guidelines for the keeping of all species by consulting animal-keeping organisations & key stakeholders.
- ◆ Make the Animal Welfare Act aspirational.

**Make it about animal welfare.**

### ACA supports minimum care requirements in animal welfare Acts.

ACA has continually supported having minimum standards for the keeping and breeding of animals. We support standards that reflect the intent of the 5 freedoms:

- provide appropriate food and water
- provide appropriate shelter
- provide treatment of disease or injury
- provide appropriate surroundings to meet the animal's behavioural needs
- appropriately handle and transport animals

These standards **MUST** be supported by species specific Standards & Guidelines as to avoid any opportunity of over—enforcement from misinterpretation.

ACA will remain cautious as to how much influence animal rights ideologies have on setting minimum care standards.



Cont'd next page...



### **Added 3R's requirement NOT supported by ACA.**

Applying the 3R's - replacement, reduction and refinement - used in scientific research is not applicable to education, exhibiting or private keeping.

Animals in education are well established and maintained under strict standards within codes of practice.

The idea that any organisation could reduce the availability of animals for education and teaching simply by raising a concern of replacement, or the reduction in the numbers held by any one educator, or the refinement of the need for said animals, is totally succumbing to the animal rights movement and has no logical or welfare-based grounds

ACA will continue to advocate for animals in education, exhibition & private keeping.

### **ACA does not support 'psychological suffering' being included in the definition of cruelty.**

Psychological pain is the result of the infliction of other forms of cruelty and is specific to each individual species and therefore very difficult to measure within most animals.

While ACA does not question the existence of psychological suffering, we maintain this suffering is the result of the impact of the neglect of an animal and accordingly, the requirement of a compliance organisation must be on proving the level of neglect or cruelty committed to that animal.

Standards & Guidelines documents may be the appropriate strategy for addressing methods to reduce psychological pain. If minimum standards are being encouraged and complied with, this will go a long way in preventing pain.

ACA will continue to advocate for fair and non-ambiguous standards to protect the animals and their owners.

### **ACA supports the offence of leaving animals in hot vehicles as an act of cruelty.**

NSW Animal Welfare Discussion Paper has proposed new guidance for the leaving of dogs in vehicles, as well as transporting dogs.

ACA has called for the offence to cover ALL animals, while at the same time ensuring there are exemptions and guidance for working dogs and dogs travelling on vehicle trays when being used to work livestock.

ACA will continue to advocate for working dogs while protecting all animals from the cruelty of being left in hot vehicles.

Cont'd next page...





## ACA supports criminalising the production or distribution of animal cruelty material, such as crush or bestiality material.

ACA was shocked to learn this was not already an offence in NSW.

1. ACA supports the intent of the inclusion of exemptions to ensure that this new offence does not have any unintended consequences. These exemptions must include: educational material relating to humane euthanasia methods in professional animal related settings, such as reptile, native mammal and avian food production that involves euthanasia techniques and methods to small domesticated prey animals.
2. It would be more appropriate for this offence to be included in the Crimes Act given its similarity to offences like possession of child abuse material.

The new law must include the possession of these materials which is currently missing from the proposal.

ACA's response to the Animal Welfare Discussion Paper can be downloaded by clicking the pdf icon:



## What an indoor cat misses out on!

Many local councils are now introducing restrictions & curfews

on roaming cats.

What an indoor cat misses out on:

- ◆ Being hit by a car
- ◆ Being trapped or poisoned
- ◆ Becoming the victim of another animal (eg: dogs)
- ◆ Complaints & threats from neighbours
- ◆ Being stolen
- ◆ Being injured
- ◆ Killing native wildlife
- ◆ Other territorial cats
- ◆ Catching transmissible diseases
- ◆ Infestations of fleas/ticks/parasites

These are just some of the benefits of keeping a cat indoors. As a responsible cat owner you should be considering the benefits of keeping your cat indoors, and invest in a catio or cat enclosure.

You can also take your cat for a walk by using a cat harness and lead.

**Be a responsible pet owner and protect your cat's future.**





By Kylie Gilbert — Dog Representative

## Do large numbers of dogs equal a puppy farm?

*Recent legislative changes have been written based on a numbers model not welfare and at not one point has any government party, or Animal Rights organisation defined the meaning of 'puppy farm'.*

*Reading recent suggested changes to the NSW legislation which is full of contradictions, in one part they want to see a stop to breeders who own large amounts of dogs where in the same piece of legislation they talk about staffing numbers sufficient to ensure the care of the dogs and puppies on site. So, which is it? No large breeders, or large breeders with staffing?*

*From a breeding point of view what is the magic number? In Vic they have seen a change to the domestic animal act to suggest that 10 fertile females is the number that defines a recreational breeder while above this is a commercial business. While this may seem simple in theory, is this approach the best from a welfare point of view? What about the breeder that has multiple breeds and wants to ensure genetic diversity how do they do this with 2-3 bitches, especially if this breeder keeps their dogs until they die? These models do nothing more than force breeders to re-home their dogs instead of being forever homes regardless of breeding ability, and for small gene pools and vulnerable breeds, this will reduce the genetic diversity causing possible issues in the future.*

*We also have the point that if you own an animal business such as a boarding kennel you cannot be a dog breeder? Traditionally breeders brought kennels to ensure adequate housing for their dogs, to have an income via boarding and to live where they work so that they could spend time with their dogs and puppies. How is this an evil thing? There is more danger in the person that owns 2 dogs that they continue to breed until they can no longer produce puppies.*

*Every day new Facebook pages are popping up with people advertising their dogs online for stud services! Does this sound like the page that a reputable breeder would visit to find the sire of their next litter? But these are the people that are breeding dogs simply for profit, the ones that don't study pedigrees or lineage, who don't health tests, who cross their fingers and hope that the bitch copes with the pregnancy and then the birth and that she raises her litter right. I am positive these people would not be up doing 2 hourly feeds for struggling puppies or sleeping next to a whelping box.*

*Legislation needs to be written based on the conditions that dogs are kept in, the care that they receive, and it should be up to the local laws to police these conditions. Every year the RSPCA get millions of dollars in grants and donations, yet why can't some of this money make its way to the Animal Management units of councils to ensure inspections are done for dog owners, or bigger government funding for something they see as a big concern?*



Cont'd next page...

In Victoria, DogsVic and the MDBA are expected to undertake inspections of their members which means there are a fair few already being monitored, but it is the average person who are usually going undetected? These are the people that could be deemed as a 'puppy farm'. The real puppy farms have nothing to do with numbers and everything to do with the welfare of animals and the conditions in which they are kept.

New legislation isn't needed. Maybe some tweaking to make it a more sensible approach to welfare. Instead of the government spending all the money on re-writing legislation it should go to inspections and by those that can interpret the legislation as it is intended, and not the RSPCA which has proven to this point that they are not capable of a commonsense approach.

But the first thing we need is the definition..... **WHAT IS A PUPPY FARM? And how are numbers the answer to the problem?**



**BAN PUPPY FACTORIES  
NOT PUPPY BREEDING!  
REMOVE UNETHICAL OPERATORS and  
PROTECT RESPONSIBLE BREEDERS!**

October 2021



"Animal welfare by the experts—those who  
keep, care for and breed animals"

**ACA**  
Animal Care Australia

In response to the ongoing legislation reviews and 'Puppy Farm Bill' amendments, ACA has produced a document highlighting:

- ⇒ the flaws of the proposed amendments,
- ⇒ how they affect dog and cat breeders,
- ⇒ what the government & local councils can do instead of adopting the amendments, as well as,
- ⇒ why it is important for us to remember 'It is not about numbers - it's about welfare!'

You can download or read the document [here](#)



By Michael Donnelly — ACA President

## Greater Oversight & Accountability needed in NSW.

ACA has expressed our disappointment in the NSW Animal Welfare Discussion Paper's proposal for improving oversight of the compliance organisations. It just doesn't go far enough. There is nothing new proposed!

- ◇ Entry powers still do not protect the hobbyist or pet owner from over-zealous inspectors. ACA strongly recommends replacing "Dwelling/residence" in the proposal with "Land that is used for residential purposes".
- ◇ With no justification, it is clear RSPCA/AWL inspectorates are to remain. Why is this not being reviewed? Why are stakeholders not being provided an opportunity to provide alternative options?
- ◇ Authorised compliance organisations MUST be specified within the Act — not the regulations.
- ◇ ACA recommends a model where all inspectors are directly answerable to and accountable to the DPI.

ACA will vigorously advocate for further oversight.

### ACA does not support reducing holding times for rehoming in NSW.

ACA does not support the amendment for the holding time of animals from 21 days to 14 days

ACA questions how the charitable organisations can reasonably identify the owner of an animal that is not microchipped such as birds, reptiles, or other small mammals?

How is this justifiable to sell or euthanise without allowing a reasonable time for an owner to seek their lost animal?

ACA supports there being no minimum holding period applied where an animal has been surrendered by its owner.

ACA does not support there being no minimum holding period applied where the animal is a feral animal or an infant companion animal.

ACA has no opposition to animals being fostered after shorter holding periods but is categorically opposed to no minimum holding periods.

ACA does not see this proposal as being in the best interests of the animals, and it is only in the best interests of the shelters. The reduction of holding times is contradictory to the purpose of the shelter or rescue services.

Cont'd next page...

## **State to be responsible for holding costs of seized animals whilst court proceedings are finalised.**

ACA believes holding charges to be a significant reason for many guilty pleas. The holding charges routinely far exceed the penalty.

In meetings with RSPCA, we are aware holding fees are often never paid. Either not awarded by the court or the person convicted does not have the means to pay.

Currently it is the charitable organisations absorbing this debt. Clearly this is not fair on the charitable organisations and would no doubt shock many of their donors - such losses are a direct result of state legislation.

In all other matters those convicted are not required to compensate the state for gaol costs, looking after children or even holding items in evidence, the same should apply here.

In the pursuit of natural justice, ACA is recommending the state pays for holding animals regardless of the outcome of court action.

## **ACA DOES NOT support the broadening or enhancement of powers of entry to allow proactive compliance.**

ACA has highlighted concerns with the inclusion of the breeding of dogs and cats as being a commercial entity as described within the Prevention Of Cruelty To Animals Regulation 2012 - schedule 1.

Being able to declare any person breeding dogs (or cats) to be a business allows the Inspectorate the capacity to circumnavigate the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act Section 24E – Power to enter Land.

This is not acceptable and certainly does

not appropriately balance the privacy concerns loudly expressed to the Minister.

The un-fettered power provided by this loop-hole is NOT afforded to the NSW Police and most certainly should not be afforded to charitable organisations.

ACA supports investigating compliance through proper investigative methods, including the use of warrants.

## **ACA DOES NOT support the proposed definition of “reasonable suspicion of commerciality”.**

“Reasonable suspicion of commerciality could be based on factors like the size or complexity of facilities, evidence of animals being sold or transported from the premises, or other relevant considerations.”

This definition WOULD and DOES include ANY person who keeps, breeds and sells/trades/swaps/exchanges ANY animal.

It is inappropriate, and is strongly reminiscent of previous attempts to include all animal breeders within the definition of a pet shop.

It cannot be supported and must be re-defined!

ACA has continually been assured by the DPI, the Minister and his staff that welfare is not about numbers of animals kept or the numbers of animals bred.

Therefore, the size or complexity of a facility or evidence of sales SHOULD NOT be a contributing factor to allowing authorised officers carte blanche access to any property or premises.

## **Animal welfare is not about numbers!**

ACA's response to the Animal Welfare Discussion Paper can be downloaded by clicking the pdf icon:





By Sam Davis—Bird Representative

## BIRD UPDATE

### Golden Plain Shire Council's bird and other animal

#### numbers issue

CCBFA lodged a submission to Golden Plains Shire Council's review of their Local Laws back in September 2020. The full submission is on our CCBFA website.

I spoke at the Council meeting on 12/10/21 representing CCBFA and ACA interests.

We have been successful in having all restrictions on Domestic Birds removed completely. There may be mention of "Noisy birds", likely roosters on residential blocks.

Several other compensations for other animal species are also likely.

#### Parrot Exports

CCBFA's opposition to the reintroduction of a NEBRS style scheme has certainly not gone unnoticed. Many thanks to all the people who have contributed to our program of opposition, in particular to those who assisted in the development of our "Proposal for a DNA Parentage-based Export Protocol" and those who agreed to attend various meetings with CCBFA and the ThinkPlace consultants and government.

The President went through the CCBFA "Proposal for a DNA Parentage-based Export Protocol" in some detail. No delegate expressed opposition to the proposal.

All documents critical to this matter are publicly available on our CCBFA website. It is perhaps inevitable with matters such as this that misinformation and misrepresentations will occur. I can assure all clubs that CCBFA officers and those who have kindly volunteered their time to assist are dedicated to ensuring aviculturists are not burdened with unnecessary redtape and that loopholes



enabling smuggling, poaching and laundering are shut.

A summary of significant meetings since the 1/9/21 CCBFA meeting is as follows...

10/9/21 – Major meeting with ThinkPlace to discuss general issues regarding the proposed registration of all native and exotic birds project, our opposition and to present CCBFA's "Proposal for a DNA Parentage-based Export Protocol".

Those present representing aviculture: Sam Davis (CCBFA President), Ron Robertson (CCBFA Secretary), Simon Griffith (Macquarie University, Dept of Biology), Gary Fitt (Queensland), Murray MacPherson (NSW), David Pace (South Australia), Mark Reynolds (Victoria).

21/10/21 – Meeting to discuss species level numbers. Included reference to the old NEBRS system, including many species where number were limit but are now in the hundreds. Also the lack of compliance generally with only some 500 birdkeepers nationally enrolled despite a significant blitz.

22/10/21 – Meeting to discuss the total number of birds in aviculture nationally,

Cont'd next page...

then drill down to CITES species numbers. Consideration of the number of aviculturists in total and in terms of CITES species.

Thanks again to all involved in the above meetings.

I personally have been in regular contact with the ThinkPlace team and have also communicated via email and phone with senior Wildlife Trade officers and Federal politicians including Warren Entsch MP.

We expect ThinkPlace to release their recommendations in coming weeks, certainly prior to Christmas.

The President asked delegates a number of times “Does anyone have issues with CCBFA opposing a national registration scheme, or with CCBFA’s DNA Parentage-based proposal?” No delegate expressed support for a national registration scheme and no delegate expressed opposition to the CCBFA DNA parentage-based proposal.

### **Townsville City Council’s bird and other animal numbers issue**

CCBFA recently 29/10/21 submitted to Townsville Council’s review of their Local Laws. The full submission is on our CCBFA website, however the following summarises the recommendations.

1. Council should encourage and promote animal keeping – important for the wellbeing of residents.
2. Exclude all restrictions on birds and instead require compliance with the DAS Code of Practice – Aviculture.
3. If 2 is not implemented then numbers should only be specified for blocks under 1000 square metres, and numbers to be raised not lowered.

ACA all made a submission and will draft model local law tables and to lobby Qld state government to have these included in

the model local law documents. The aim is to correct the issue for all Qld councils. Currently many councils have local laws restricting keeping of a range of species (not just birds) to ridiculously low numbers and then a permit for higher numbers - in some cases the permit fees are exorbitant.

### **NSW Bird Sale CoP**

The final code is now on our website under the documents tab.

1. Clubs have all been contacted to determine the number of copies each requires.
2. A QR code for easy access to the complete code via smart phones is on the front cover of the code and will be included on all posters.
3. In the new year we will do a bit of a media blitz including media release and distribution of an advert for inclusion in club newsletters.

To confirm, only species smaller than a rainbow lorikeet CANNOT be in all wire cages. The precise species are listed as Appendix C of the code. In practice Stewards need to simply question any birds in all wire cages that look to be smaller than a rainbow lorikeet. If there is any disagreement then Appendix C resolves the matter.

To confirm, the aim is to NOT have this code become law, rather this code proves we are self-regulating and therefore, somewhat like Victoria, if we agree to abide by our own code then there is no need for government regulation.



Wednesday, 20<sup>th</sup> October, 2021

## **FORGETTING TO INCLUDE PUPPY FARMS?**

### ***AJP's proposed anti puppy farm bill doesn't mention puppy farms, nor does it stop them.***

**Sydney, NEW SOUTH WALES, (20th October 2021)** For months the Animal Justice Party's Emma Hurst has been making announcements stating NSW welcomes puppy farmers and their keeping of dogs and cats in deplorable conditions. Ms Hurst frequently states that substandard breeding establishments are legal in NSW, are inundating Councils with DA applications and overtaking small towns of terrified residents. Pictures of dirty, matted, sad eyed dogs usually accompany these announcements.

It's not true, of course. NSW has laws to protect animals from cruelty.

Now that we have finally seen the overly-touted ***NSW Companion Animal Amendment (Puppy Farms) Bill 2021***, we find a glaring omission. No mention of puppy farms. Why is that?

Normally, in a legislative amendment, one would expect to find a list of critical definitions, followed by a list of itemised amendments to the current legislation. So while the amendment is called ***NSW Companion Animal Amendment (Puppy Farms) Bill 2021*** and Ms Hurst claims to be ending puppy farming and backyard breeding in NSW, her amendment includes no definitions of a puppy farm or backyard breeder, nor any kind of definition matching the description of the filthy, heartless puppy farm establishments that Ms Hurst has been vividly painting to gain our tearful support.

"There is no puppy farm definition because the truth is the AJP believe anyone who breeds and sells puppies or kittens is a puppy farm, and that won't sit well with voters," says Michael Donnelly, President of Animal Care Australia (ACA). "ACA has consistently defined a puppy factory or more accurately an unethical breeder as any person who is breeding an animal with poor welfare outcomes in defiance of the animal welfare standards. Unlike the AJP – ACA puts animal welfare first over ideologies and rhetoric designed to garner votes and supporters," Mr Donnelly continued.

The amendment instead describes 'companion animal businesses', and 'animal breeding businesses' and, that's it. Within the 21 pages of the Bill there is nothing about raising standards from the 3rd world conditions NSW supposedly allows. Vet certification is mentioned, not to check that an animal is healthy and fit and free of genetic flaws, but just to ensure it is of age to breed. There are limits on how many fertile females a person can own, regardless of whether they are actually used for breeding or not. There is mandatory desexing or else mandatory surrender of any female who has had two litters.

Despite the blind support given to the AJP by shelters and rescues, they are not spared, being lumbered into the same Animal Business category as pet shops, boarding facilities and dog trainers. Ms Hurst knows that most of her 'following' will never actually READ the document they are supporting. She doesn't even need to be subtle.

In fact she doesn't even need to hide her own contradictions within her Introductory speech for this Bill, in one bold statement Ms Hurst declares "At the end of the day, adopting from rescues, shelters and pounds is the truly safe and ethical option when it comes to finding a companion animal," while in the very next mouth full she declares "... puppy farm industry contributes to the oversupply of companion animals, many of whom end up in our already overcrowded pounds.

-more-





So which is it Ms Hurst? Are the animals in our shelters and pounds the ethical option or are they the deplorable, gaunt, unhealthy, unethically bred problem of NSW? Are you stating it is ethical to obtain an unethically bred animal – simply because it's not from a breeder or a pet shop?" Mr Donnelly questions.

"This Bill is counter-productive because it requires the removal of all breeding females after two litters. Public demand requires a constant supply of puppies or kittens," Mr Donnelly warns. "If breeding females are retired or surrendered or worse still dumped, then MORE females will be needed to maintain a level of breeding that keeps up with demand, that protects genetics and that continues to allow for breeders to responsibly breed any health issues out of a breeding line. This will not decrease the numbers of animals in shelters - or being bred – it will increase both. People will get desperate and underground breeding will flourish – just as it has in Victoria. Ethical breeding and welfare standards will not be the norm."

For all of Ms Hurst's promises to end backyard breeding, unregulated, unethical breeding is exactly what this amendment supports. By making it impossible to breed dogs and cats to healthy breed standards with genetic diversity, the amendment makes it easier for inexperienced people to breed random, unsuitable animals in their home without regulation, standards or registrations.

This is exactly what the Animal Justice Party want! This will justify further restrictions in the future to eradicate those remaining breeders because their animals are unhealthy and have been flooding the market unregulated.

This is what PeTA and animal rights activists advocate - to stop all use of animals. Humans should not OWN animals they say. Selling animals is never ok - unless you call your animal business a "sanctuary" and then suddenly it's ok to keep animals in captivity.

Emma Hurst is a former PeTA employee, she really believes this.

This Bill is not about Puppy Farms. You just need to read beyond the title to see it. "This bill is about regulating puppy breeding so restrictively to ensure honest people with high welfare standards will stop breeding. The AJP's approach simply incentivises a black market puppy trade at the expense of animal welfare standards, as is occurring now in Victoria due to similar legislation."

-ends-

For further information contact Animal Care Australia Inc

[www.animalcareaustralia.org.au](http://www.animalcareaustralia.org.au)

[president@animalcareaustralia.org.au](mailto:president@animalcareaustralia.org.au)

Phone: 0400 323 843



*President: Michael Donnelly*

## Cocoa's Story.

Our story won't be possible for the people of NSW in the future if Puppy Farm Bills such as the one proposed by the Animal Justice Party are introduced.



A knock at the front door, exactly two hours later and on time from when he said he would arrive. Our beloved Boof looks up from his snuggled position in his blanket on his bed as the man's shoes draw closer.

"So little mate it's time! It's been a great run."

The man prepares Boof's little leg and tells us this is it. Getting down on the floor, we lay looking straight into Boof's eyes. It is our faces that he sees, as the small pin prick is felt he yelps and then snarls, and we caress his face and tell him it will be okay.

Tears stream down our cheeks as Boof's eyes close for the very last time in the 14 years he had been a part of our family. For the very last time we said goodnight to our beloved little mate.

Placing him in our backyard with the memorial of his life was the culmination of an extremely difficult day.

For the next few weeks nothing was the same. My little mate didn't greet me anymore when I opened my bedroom door of a morning. We didn't play catch after dinner at night. I didn't have my little shadow. Shattered!

There were three adults in the house and yet it felt so empty and so quiet. He was gone.

A couple of weeks passed before we started to consider what we would do next. Sentimentality kicked in and it was decided, we needed a new little mate. He needed to be the same breed as Boof, as that suited us and our environment and for true sentiment he would be born on the day of Boof's passing.

Our search began, we found advertisements, we called the breeders. We asked questions. How old was the mum? How many were in the litter? Will they all be vet-checked and have the necessary shots by the time we can take one home? Can we come and see them now and place a deposit?

Liking the answers we received we had two possible breeders to visit. Of course once we arrived at the first house there would be no reason to look further! The elderly couple who answered the door were delightful. The dad of the pups also greeted us and seemed to proudly lead us through to where mum and the pups were located. A small bed with five pups all snuggled up. The couple removed mum & dad from the room so that we could look the pups over without interruption. They were healthy looking and all seeking our attention. All except one. That one at the other end. A different colour, lighter fur and seemingly not interested in the commotion. We had been told that two were already on hold for other people which left us a choice of two boys or a girl. We wanted another boy so it was the dark or the light fur. Picking the lighter fur up was all that it took. A quick cuddle, and he immediately snuggled in tight. That did it. Love a first sight.

Cont'd next page...

Deposit left and we would return when he was old enough to come home with us.

Weeks later, with two grandkids in tow, it was the big day. Our new family member was going to come home. Back to the elderly couple. Lots of oohs and ahh's and oh how cute. Just like before he was on his own – the last one to be picked up. Collecting the paperwork, and thanking the wonderful couple we headed home with a new fluffball. A fluffball with a coffee-coloured coat and little face that just melted you. Those eyes, that little whimper, that need to be snuggled and to feel safe in your arms. The car ride home was a debate – what should he be called? “You can't call him Boof,” says one of the grandkids, “Boof was Boof. He needs a different name”. “He is a coffee colour call him coffee”. “No!” And so it continued, until... “he is also the colour of cocoa when I have it. Can we call him Cocoa?” There it was! The grandkids had decided on the name.

Cocoa quickly discovered that his new home meant lots of cuddles, lots of play followed by lots of naps, more cuddles, more play, more naps. Growing quickly Cocoa made himself a home, and soon there I was opening my bedroom door and the new little mate was sitting patiently waiting for me, and for a quick good morning pat and cuddle before becoming my shadow for the day.

That was seven years ago. Cocoa is still my shadow. He is my friend. He is my guardian. I am his friend. I am his guardian. I am his play mate, his carer, his companion. I am his world.



Cocoa didn't come from a puppy farm. Cocoa didn't come from a commercial animal business. Cocoa came from a loving couple who were responsible breeders. That couple who lovingly cared for, and provided social interaction teachings to Cocoa and his siblings will soon be declared as commercial animal business owners. They have done everything right. Wonderful clean environment, microchipped their puppies and ensured they were seen by a vet for their checkups. They don't make a profit. They don't have woeful conditions. Their adults dogs are not unkempt. Their adult dogs are family to them. They are a part of the majority of dog breeders, and yet the Animal Justice Party insist on bagging them up in the same blame game as unethical breeders – puppy farms! For the Animal Justice Party it's not a case of singling out the bad apples it's a case of labelling the entire barrel as corrupt, money hungry profiteering animal cruelty perpetrators who must be stopped at all costs!

True puppy farm prevention legislation would not include layers of regulations and restrictions. True puppy farm legislation would include welfare-enhancing requirements, public education funding, encouraging and supporting responsible breeders not condemning them.

ACA promotes high welfare over all else - looking after the needs of our animals is what matters. Numbers, government forms, policies and red tape, as the AJP recommends, have never improved welfare. Such things simply inconvenience those doing the right thing and drive those with poor welfare underground.



Insert your dogs photo here to remember what we are fighting for!



Member contribution

## “He wasn’t born dangerous — he was trained to be!”

On September 7th 2021, the Animal Justice Party’s Emma Hurst released the following meme via social media:

*“He wasn’t born dangerous - he was trained to be. It’s legal in NSW for anyone to train a dog to be dangerous. In the end, there will be two victims - the person or other animal attacked, and the dog who was trained to do so (who will likely be killed). There is one person at fault - the person who trained the dog to be dangerous.”*



Soon after Animal Care Australia received a response, written by one of our highly respected members within the Dog Training Industry.

I am the head trainer of a company that specialises in rehabilitating aggressive dogs. I see dogs every day that display aggressive behaviours towards other people, their owners, children, other animals etc.

What is missing from 99% of these dogs is effective training, management, rules and boundaries.

“He wasn’t born dangerous”. Well Emma, dogs are opportunistic predators. They are genetically imprinted to hunt, chase, and kill their food.

Like most politicians, you go ahead and make bold statements that have little to do with any truth, facts or usefulness, but are simply produced to draw attention to yourself through the heart strings of others.

You have loosely spoken about it being illegal to train a dog to be dangerous.

Good, I agree 100% if you mean that a dog is encouraged to attack anything or anyone indiscriminately.

There have been 8 people killed by dogs in Australia since 2018. That’s around 2 per year on average.

None of these dogs were “trained to be dangerous”, in fact I will guarantee you that all of these dogs had little to no effective training at all.

If they are not trained on “how to” behave, there is a high likeliness that they will display predation (predatory driven aggressive behaviours) towards live beings they identify as prey. Such as people, livestock, other domestic animals, native wildlife and children.

Many dog sports that include bite work are aimed at satisfying the dogs genetic desires in a structured, controlled, and effective manner.

Dogs trained well in these sports are LESS likely to engage humans or other animals aggressively.

It may surprise you to know, because clearly you have not completed any research, that many dogs trained in bite sports will NOT bite unless the person of interest (helper or decoy) is wearing the specific equipment.

Cont’d next page...



You go on to say “There are sometimes other factors at play, I get that – but legally allowing animals to be trained to attack people creates a huge risk to the entire community, and may even contribute to illegal underground dog fighting rings.”

What are you saying here Emma? That people who train their dogs in bite work will also start teaching them to fight other dogs in dog fighting rings?

This is one of the most uneducated statements you could make.

Each time a person is killed by a dog, I make the offer publicly that I will assess the dogs temperament, complete a detailed report of why I feel the attack occurred. This is all at my own expense, I am fully insured etc. and for the benefit of the dog owning community so we can learn and prevent these events from occurring again.

Never is that offer taken up, and if it was, I do not expect to hear that the dog that killed a person was trained to attack indiscriminately.

Those that would participate in dog fighting sports are the lowest creatures that scourge the earth. Certainly, target those, but casting a wide net to include people who train their dogs in bite sports, is simply clickbait and as a person who portrays themselves as being passionate about animal welfare, you can do better, you should do better and need to do better.

Banning a person from doing something simply means that the professionals stop, but people go underground and this removes professional input and education.

Here is some free advice for you!

You would do much more good to promote the need and requirement to TRAIN OUR DOGS.

You would do much better to promote the need and requirement to TRAIN YOUR DOG.

Speak with professional, experienced people within the field that you’re looking into before diving headlong emotionally into it.

Research why dogs attack and look at solutions.



**Animal Care Australia Inc.**  
 PO Box 314 Macarthur  
 Square Post Office NSW  
 2560

Website: [animalcareaustralia.org.au](http://animalcareaustralia.org.au)

Email: [aca@animalcareaustralia.org.au](mailto:aca@animalcareaustralia.org.au)

ABN 36 438 686 995

Tax File No 508 268 553

CFN: 25599



## MISSION STATEMENT

**“Animal Care Australia (ACA) is the Peak Animal Welfare Body representing the keepers and breeders of pet and companion animals in Australia”.**

ACA encourages continued development of animal welfare standards and Codes of Practice for animal husbandry, breeding, training, sale and sporting exhibitions for a wide range of animal species. Our goal is to promote and encourage high standards in all interactions with the animals in our care. To encourage responsible pet ownership, and the respectful treatment of all animals in our community ACA continues to promote welfare education over regulation

## OBJECTIVES

- To represent Animal Care Groups as the peak animal welfare body
- To engage and advise Government and legislators on welfare issues relating to pets and companion animals.
- To protect the rights of ethical hobbyists & animal keepers to breed and keep pets and companion animals.
- To clarify the difference between animal rights and animal welfare
- To promote higher animal welfare outcomes



## ACA GENERAL MEETINGS IN 2022

**7.30 to 8.30pm**

**MARCH 14th**

**MAY 9th**

**JULY 11th**

**SEPTEMBER 12th**

**NOVEMBER 14th — AGM**

**Meetings in 2022 will continue via Zoom to ensure members nationwide can attend..**

Any member wishing to join a meeting will need to RSVP by no later than 5pm on that Monday via email:

[aca@animalcareaustralia.org.au](mailto:aca@animalcareaustralia.org.au) with your details. A link for the meeting will be emailed to you.



Watch out for our next issue in March 2022.

Click to read our [previous issues](#)



Animal Care Australia

happy  
holidays!

