

Submission
No 189

**INQUIRY INTO PUPPY FARMING IN NEW SOUTH
WALES**

Name: Name suppressed

Date Received: 5 March 2022

Partially
Confidential

Regarding the "Companion Animals Amendment (Puppy Farm Bill) 2021 Submissions.

I feel that the DPI has taken the easy road by targeting ANKC members who are already following ethics and standards that are designed to protect the animals owned by their members. Puppy farmers don't follow those ethics or standards and are a law unto themselves, but they are not documented in ANKC members lists so not so easy to find. I feel that more effort needs to be directed against the puppy farmers that are only out for financial gratification and not interested in the real care of the animals in their care.

Puppy farmers aren't identifiable through council records, or vet records or anywhere that responsible pet owners are known because the puppy farmer animals are denied all cares that ANKC members give their pets as a normal occurrence.

Every point on your argument will have the consequences that the animals will not be sustainable or happy, as they are now. I realise that there are some people that might not be acting in the best interest of their animals but they should be held accountable and not ALL animal owners targeted like your submission is pushing for. If a Dogs NSW member contravenes any of the rules they are held to account and are liable to have their membership terminated. ANKC are policing their own members. Those that aren't members are hopefully policed by the RSPCA and Council Rangers so I feel that they should have more powers when an abuser or puppy farmer is identified.