

S00175 – Neil Wilkinson

I would like to make a comment regarding the Draft Code of Practice for Keeping Native Birds and apologise for the late submission of my comments and hope they can still be considered.

Whilst I appreciate the sentiment of many that reducing the number of birds required to be licensed might be desirable, I believe the current system is better, particularly with regard to record keeping. The Guidelines outlined in section 4.2 of the subject draft are far too excessive. The proposal in section 4.2.2 that all birds except “juveniles and very small species” should be micro chipped is prohibitively expensive and frankly ludicrous for such semi-domesticated and/or very common species as cockatiels, budgerigars, red-rump parrots and galahs. Additionally, even in the expert care of a good avian veterinarian, submitting birds for micro chipping also has inherent health risks for them. Further, micro chipping will significantly increase the cost of the birds and inherently discriminate against those on lower incomes.

In addition, keeping health records for all birds as proposed in section 4.2.1 is excessive. Surely this should only apply to birds that have had health problems.

I believe that micro chipping of birds in general is not in the best interest of the birds and would certainly prefer that any birds kept in aviaries are not subjected to this procedure. I would rather risk birds being stolen or not returned than to subject them to micro chipping. However, if it is to be insisted upon, it should be restricted only to species subject to licensing conditions, certainly not those on the proposed schedule.

Additionally, with regard to Standards as outlined in section 4.1.1, it is both excessive and unnecessary to have to keep records of every acquisition and disposal of many of the birds detailed in the schedule. Again, species such as cockatiels, budgerigars, red-rump parrots, galahs and zebra finches should not be subject to such draconian regulation. Most, if not all of the species detailed on the list are not in need of the sort of over-restrictive regulation and monitoring outlined in the subject draft. Placing such restrictions on common species, often held by hobby or pet owners is unnecessarily restrictive and bureaucratic and appears to be designed to discourage bird ownership.

Similarly, with regard to section 3.1.5, I can see no reason to restrict the advertising for sale of birds to specialist publications etc.

I believe that changing the current system with regard to those items I have criticised in my email above will be a backwards move and I hope that you find my comments to be beneficial, constructive and helpful. Accordingly, I submit my comments for your consideration.

Please note that I do not consent to the publication of my comments as detailed in the email above.