Name	
Email address	
Dogs owned:	1
Phone Number	
My thoughts on: Transition pet shops to adoption centres (can only sell dogs sourced from rescues).	I disagree with pet shops being labelled as adoption centres. For many dogs who end up in a shelter a pet shop environment is not appropriate – they require special care by trained staff.  This also leaves a market open for disguised puppy farming. If there is still a means by which puppies can be sold for profit (other than through a registered breeder), people will exploit that. It would likely lead to puppy farms disguising themselves as "shelters", such that they can continue to supply puppies to pet shops that are disguised as "adoption centres".  Why is this transition needed? Why not make it illegal to sell puppies through any means other than via a registered breeder, and for legitimate shelters to be able to sell the puppies on for cost recovery only.  Also how do you plan to monitor and enforce this strategy exactly? How much will that cost, and why not redirect that investment into compensating pet shops to adjust for a change in revenue source, and to invest in existing shelters to help them manage the temporary increase in puppies requiring homes while this legislation is in its infancy?
	If the legislation works, there should be no need for pet shops to transition to adoption centres from an ethical perspective (because there will be fewer dogs needing adoption, and thus less demand for adoption centres), and pet shops will still need to diversify their income (given that there should be fewer dogs needing adoption over time, and thus less stock to sell anyway).
My thoughts on: Introduce mandatory dog desexing.	De-sexing should continue to be recommended, and current registration fee incentives should continue to be offered. However, for a number of reasons I'm not sure that making this mandatory is the right move.
	It seems to me that the biggest issue is to close off the market through which irresponsible breeding is allowed to profit.
	Enforcing responsible dog owners to place their dog in surgery (potentially against their will) seems unnecessary – these are not the people who are breeding illegally/unethically anyway, and enforcing this aspect of the policy is a waste of money in my view. There will be so few accidental puppies from responsible owners with dogs who are not desexed that it will not justify the investment in this aspect.
	There are many and varied medical reasons for not desexing a dog. For example, there is evidence to wait until large breeds reach

	sexual maturity before desexing to reduce risk of bone cancer. For older dogs or dogs with other medical conditions, this is a form of major surgery that could result in complications or death. At the least there needs to be a simple and reasonable way to process exemption claims (not something that involves overly tedious and confusing paperwork), and this policy should not be enforced on all dogs, but only on new puppies and dogs under a particular age.
My thoughts on: Introduce a centralised registration system and Council registration to be Breeder.	I do not have a problem with a central registration system. However, I see no reason why this system should cost any more for registering my dog than the existing local government system. There may be some small cost involved in transitioning software and records, which should be included in the State budget for implementing this legislation. Subsequently, whatever funds LGAs were receiving within their budgets to manage dog registrations should be redirected to maintain the central management system. If anything, this system should be cheaper to maintain than having individual systems in each LGA.
My thoughts on: Introduce mandatory standards for dog breeding, housing, husbandry, transport and sale.	I am not an expert on these aspects and believe this should be left for comment by those who are involved in these activities.