

Laws discriminatory to dog owners

MORE and more town councils are enacting more restrictive by-laws on dogs and their owners. In one place, you will have to get the permission of 10 of your neighbours before you can apply for a dog licence. This is highly discriminatory as dogs are kept as pets only by certain racial groups.

We welcome laws for the protection and welfare of dogs and that of our neighbours, but not those which are or which can be misinterpreted as discriminatory.

If dogs are a nuisance, so are other pets, especially cats. My neighbour's cats used to consider my garden their toilet, and let's not forget that cat's stools carry the dangerous disease toxoplasmosis which can cause brain damage and blindness especially in children, and in some cases even kill.

In the US, toxoplasmosis, transmitted mainly by cats, causes about 750 deaths each year whereas dog attacks caused 31 deaths in 2011.

And there are more than 72,000,000 dogs in the US. So the "harmless" cat is far more dangerous

than the dog.

Moreover, all dog related fatalities are caused by two breeds - the pitbull and the rottweiler. If these two breeds are banned, there would be practically no fatalities.

I feel strongly that if restrictive laws were to be enacted, they should apply to all types of pets, not just dogs.

Because these laws will inevitably reduce the number of people keeping dogs, the only people who will benefit would be the burglars, robbers and rapists!

Many of my friends and patients who are dog owners are passionate about their dogs and consider them to be not only protectors but also part of the family.

And when a member of the family is victimised, even the most staunch supporter of the policy maker of the day, will switch allegiances.

Datuk Dr Looi Hoong Wah
Kuantan

**SINGAPORE
ECONOMY GREW 4.9%
IN 2011 - PAGE 15**