

Exploring Canadian Pet Positive Lists: A Comparative Analysis and Key Learnings of Wild Animal Pet Ownership Regulations



Date:

November 20, 2025

Prepared for:

Zoocheck Inc.

Written by:

Michèle Hamers

MSc, RSci, MRSB, EurProBiol

Introduction

The trade and keeping of wild animals for private ownership (hereinafter called exotic pets) poses risks to animal welfare, public health and safety, environments and biodiversity. Historically, regulatory measures impacting exotic pets were limited to banning the keeping of those animals that posed a physical danger to the public (known as Negative List regulation). However, there is a growing acknowledgement that the exotic pet trade must be further regulated to protect animals, people and the environment.

A regulatory tool that has gained popularity among policymakers is the Positive List – a list of animals that may be kept as petsⁱ. This tool is precautionary in nature, and if developed with care, prevents the keeping of species that are not suitable as pets by individuals without specialized knowledge. Additionally, this tool can help reduce the risks of zoonotic disease transmissions, the establishment of invasive alien species, and the pressure on wild populations. It can also help address enforcement challenges, shelter capacity issues and animal health challenges due to the lack of specialized veterinarians.

In Canada, municipalities and provinces have the competency to develop and implement Positive Lists in their jurisdiction. This has resulted in a variety of Positive Lists throughout the country.

This document is a comparative analysis of Positive Lists in selected provinces and municipalities. By discussing common pitfalls, gaps and challenges, the goal is to support those jurisdictions that are considering implementing Positive Lists in the future and to support harmonization of the development and implementation of Positive Lists throughout Canada moving forward.

Positive List Fundamentals

For Positive List regulations to be impactful, more is required than merely establishing a list of animals that may be kept by members of the public. Fundamental considerations for Positive Lists include:

- Compiling a list of definitions to establish the scope of the Positive List.

- Understanding the interplay with existing Acts, Regulations, and/or By-laws and provide clarity on supersession.
- Developing a robust set of clearly defined criteria which the list of species is based on.
- Establishing transitional provisions (e.g., grandfathering, specific conditions) for owners who have non-listed animals when the Positive List comes into force.
- Formulating exemptions that allow the keeping of non-listed animal species by professionals in the field (e.g., animal control facilities, veterinary offices, municipal zoos) or in other situations when all clearly defined requirements are met.
- Ensuring enforceability of the regulation by competent authorities.

According to the European Court of Justiceⁱⁱ, the following criteria should also be met when developing and implementing a Positive List regulation:

- Lists should be based on objective and non-discriminatory criteria.
- A publicly accessible procedure should be established to allow interested parties to request the inclusion or removal of a species from the list. In addition, requests must be completed in reasonable time, and rejections of requests should be substantiated and communicated.

Comparative Analysis Provincial Positive Lists

This analysis includes the Positive Lists of New Brunswick and Saskatchewan, with New Brunswick having the oldest provincial Positive List in Canada and Saskatchewan one of the most recent ones. There is often a dual responsibility in the protection of “exotic pets”. Exotic pets are wild animals and considered as such in Canadian provincial regulations, which means that Positive Lists are often situated under provincial wildlife laws. However, legal provisions on *how* these animals should be kept as pets can typically be found in animal protection laws and regulationsⁱⁱⁱ. This dual approach results in shared enforcement responsibilities for *exotic wildlife* in most provinces.

New Brunswick

In New Brunswick, the Positive List regulation is part of the Wildlife Act^{iv}. The Act makes a distinction between *wildlife* and *exotic wildlife*, with the former being mostly indigenous to the province^v and the latter applying to all other species. The release of any *exotic wildlife* into the wild is prohibited.

A general prohibition also exists for the import, keeping, and export of species not listed as *allowed*, except by authorization (e.g., permit). Other than the authority of the minister to issue import, export, and keeping permits for non-listed species, no mechanism appears to exist for the public to request for the inclusion or removal of species on the Positive List. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may include any species or subspecies to the existing list^{vi}, however the criteria to determine whether a species should be added to or removed from the list are seemingly not defined.

New Brunswick has one single Positive List for mammals, amphibians, birds, and reptiles that may be kept as pets without restrictions^{vii}. No legacy provisions appeared to have been used, effectively requiring import and keeping permits for non-listed species at the time of the enactment of the list.

The New Brunswick list contains 904 taxa, including 19 amphibian, 447 bird, 15 mammal, and 423 reptile taxa. Strikingly, most of the species that are impacted by the list are not actually listed. The list includes 12 genera (e.g., *Boa* spp.) and 1 family (e.g., *Psittaciformes* spp.), representing 723, or 80% of species.

Saskatchewan

In Saskatchewan, the Positive List regulation is also part of the Wildlife Act^{viii}. Similar to other wildlife Acts, native and non-native wildlife are defined differently. Interestingly, Saskatchewan defined *wild species* that include **any** animal that is wild by nature, broadening considerations and protection for species not native to the province. As in New Brunswick, the release into the wild of any *exotic wildlife* is prohibited.

A general prohibition also exists for the import, keeping, and export of species not listed as allowed except by authorization (e.g., permit). Other than the authority of the minister to issue import, export, and keeping permits for non-listed species, no mechanism appears to exist in the regulations for the public to request

for the inclusion or removal of species on the Positive List. The minister *may* designate any species as allowed or restricted and *may* consider risks to public health and safety, animal welfare, environment and biodiversity, and the history of the species in captivity during that decision-making process^{ix}.

Saskatchewan uses an *allowed list* and *restricted list*. The *restricted list* has two divisions, which seems to help facilitate the transition from the old to the new regulations. All animals belonging to a species on the *restricted list* must be reported to the minister^x. All *Division 1* listed species on the *restricted list* must be disposed of *within the period that is determined by the minister*. *Division 2* listed species on the *restricted list* may be continued to be kept after it has been demonstrated to the minister that the animals were kept by the person prior to *the date on which these regulations came into force*.

The permitted list in Saskatchewan includes 312 species, of which 10 species were listed as part of a family (Psittacidae spp.). There are 43 amphibian, 412 bird, 9 mammal, and 197 reptile species which can be kept without restrictions. The *restricted, division 2* list, includes 195 species covering 20 amphibian, 66 bird, 35 mammal, and 74 reptile species.

According to a Saskatchewan representative^{xi}, the Positive List was identified as a better tool for risk management than other alternatives because, as threatening situations arise in the future, such as the emergence of new diseases or new invasive species, a Positive List would provide more flexibility. Other advantages that were identified include removing permitting requirements for low-risk species and having a robust, defensible and transparent decision-making process.

While not defined as such in the Regulations, according to the government representative the criteria used for the development of the list included possible risks to public health and safety, establishment of invasive species, risks to transmitting diseases to domestic animals and wildlife, conservation concerns in the range country of the species and risks to animal welfare. A panel was created, made up of a wildlife health specialist, exotic pet veterinarian, ecologist, pet industry representative, conservation officer, and an animal protection officer, to establish the list. It is unclear whether this expert panel is still in existence and whether they continue to advise the minister regarding possible listing changes.

Comparative Analysis Municipal Positive Lists

Almost all provinces and territories have regulated, to some extent, the keeping of exotic animals as pets, with the most notable exception being Ontario. The lack of regulations in Ontario has resulted in numerous municipalities taking it upon themselves to establish their own regulatory By-Laws, many including Positive Lists. This section discusses the Positive List By-Laws of the Town of Newmarket, Town of Aurora, City of Richmond Hill in Ontario and, because it is the largest city currently with a Positive List, the City of Montréal in Quebec.

Positive Lists are typically incorporated in pet keeping or animal control By-Laws^{xii}. Noticeably, all By-Laws reviewed, refer to *domestic* animals, rather than *domesticated* animals. As Décory (2019) explains, "'Domestic' should not be confused with 'domesticated'". *Domestic* is something belong to or in relation with a home, hour or family^{xiii}, while *domesticated* species are groups of animals that have undergone a process of genetic change resulting in changes in both appearance and behaviour, which differentiates them from their wild counterparts^{xiv}.

Municipalities classify *domestic* and *non-domestic animals* but definitions vary. In Newmarket and Aurora, a domestic animal is *a dog or cat kept by a person*, while in Richmond Hill *any* animal kept by a person except for livestock and wildlife is considered a domestic animal. The definition of domestic animal in Montréal is the City's Positive List^{xv}.

The Positive List operates similar in municipalities as in prohibiting the keeping of animals, except for those listed. Interestingly, Aurora is the only municipality that also addresses cross species breeding and the production of hybridized individuals by prohibiting any hybrid species bred from one or both animal species not listed on the Positive List.

All three municipalities in Ontario have defined transitional provisions, with Newmarket and Richmond Hill requiring registration of non-listed animals within 90 days of the By-Law coming into force. The latter also defined criteria that *will* be considered when determining a person may continue to keep their non-listed animal(s). Criteria include animal welfare, public safety and nuisance risks^{xvi}. In Newmarket, the Town *may*

impose conditions and terms for the continuation of keeping not-listed animals. This seems to be the same in Montréal. Clear exemptions to Positive Lists are described in the Richmond Hill and Montréal By-Laws^{xvii} and include local authorities, veterinarians, academics and research institutions, shelters, and zoos.

As with the provincial laws, no mechanisms seem to exist for the public to request the inclusion or removal of species on the Positive List. Defining the criteria on which Positive Lists are based is also lacking.

Unlike provincial laws, and except for Aurora, animal welfare provisions that apply to listed animals are incorporated into the By-Laws, including humane and appropriate care and hygiene requirements. A limit on the number of animals a person is allowed to keep is also specified in Richmond Hill and Montréal^{xviii}.

The listing of broad taxonomic categories is not uncommon in By-Laws, in fact, all reviewed municipalities, except for Richmond Hill, use broad listing categories such as *amphibians*, *arachnids*, *birds*, *reptiles* of a certain length, and species that are non-venomous. While the list for these municipalities is short on paper, in reality it allows for the keeping of thousands of different species. Additionally, in Aurora and Montréal, the scientific name is not stated for the species on the Positive List. Presumably, when referring to cats, dogs and certain rodents, the intention was to only allow for the domesticated varieties of these species.

Richmond Hill, similar to the provinces, drafted a list of specific species allowed to be kept, which includes 0 amphibian, 291 bird, 13 mammal, and 74 reptile species. For the birds, identifying which *Psittacidae spp.* are allowed is challenging because the animals were listed at different taxonomic levels. Interestingly Richmond Hill also used a Negative Listing within their Positive List, allowing *all* species of fishes *except* for saltwater fishes^{xix}. Additionally *all* insects are allowed *except* for those that are venomous and poisonous. Significant knowledge would be required to identify those insects that are allowed versus those that are banned, given that there over 1 million described insect species.

A representative in Richmond Hill explained that the Positive List was drafted after their old By-law was reviewed. While a Negative List was first considered, the understanding that a Positive List was simpler, less risky, reduced the chances of “missing a species”, and was precautionary in nature eventually resulted in the Positive List. During the development of the By-Law the City consulted with the local animal enforcement authorities, animal welfare organizations, pet industry members, veterinarians, and neighbouring

municipalities. The representative mentioned that the greatest challenge was balancing the needs of the industry while at the same time addressing the risks to exotic pet keeping. Also listing animals with the lowest taxonomic rank (i.e., species) was experienced as a daunting task due to the high number of species that exist, the lack of expertise and the short timeline. In the representative's opinion, these types of lists should be developed and implemented by the Province rather than by individual municipalities, due to the required resources, expertise and to ensure jurisdictional harmonization across the province.

Identified Gaps and Areas of Concern

Technically, all Positive Lists work in the same way, they list species or taxonomic groupings that may be kept as pets. Unfortunately, that is where most of the comparisons stop. While the Ontario By-Laws have similarities due to the tendency of municipalities to copy By-Laws from each other, the six reviewed lists and the framework on which the lists are constructed significantly differ. Below is an overview of key gaps and areas of concern that were identified during this analysis.

- Allowed species vary from one jurisdiction to another: This creates a patchwork of different animal species lists that may be confusing to pet owners, residents, businesses and others, that may encourage illegal trade and that may make consistent enforcement exceptionally difficult.
- Lists contain taxonomic groupings rather than species: Identifying which species belongs to a taxonomic grouping requires significant expertise, and can unintentionally result in allowing a large number of individual species to be kept, even if they are unsuitable for pet keeping.
- Clear consistent definitions and criteria are lacking in regulations: While some jurisdictions have indicated they considered animal welfare, public health and safety, and trade impacts on biodiversity loss during the establishment of their lists, none were defined in the Acts, Regulations, or By-Laws. For Positive Lists to hold up to public and judicial scrutiny a robust, unambiguous, and transparent

process must take place, which should ensure that interested actors understand why this policy tool is used and have access to a clear rationale for the (non)listed species.

- Mechanisms for review of the list to add or remove species: The list of animal species that may be kept as pets should reflect our ever expanding understanding of animal welfare, zoonotic disease risks, and biodiversity loss. A pathway must exist for relevant stakeholders to petition the government with new evidence for them to consider and to make an informed decision to add or remove a species from the list. However, review mechanisms can only exist when clear criteria for the listing of species is defined.
- Ensure that exemptions are provided to competent parties: A pathway must be created for non-listed animal species to be taken in and cared for when they are detected in the community.
- Questionable role of the pet industry in the development of Positive List regulations: During interviews with jurisdictional representatives it became apparent that either the pet industry had undue influence on the development of Positive List regulations (i.e., Saskatchewan omitting animal welfare experts and/or NGOs from their expert panel), or were perceived as unnecessarily antagonistic during the consultation process. With one representative stating: “while the minority of people keep these animals, during the process they started to look like a majority (...) which may result in Council saying it’s not worth it anymore because of all the complaints”. Positive List regulations should be based on scientific evidence and are put in place to ensure the order, safety, and well-being of animals and residents in a jurisdiction.

Recommendations

Positive List regulations are gaining local, national, and international traction because of their simple, clear, and precautionary approach and because this one tool can address multiple policy concerns such as animal welfare, public health and safety and threats to biodiversity. Nevertheless, to ensure Positive Lists achieve what they are set out to do, a more coherent approach is needed for the development, implementation and enforcement of these lists. Below a set of recommendations that will lead to a more coherent approach:

Scope

As stated in the analysis Positive List regulatory frameworks can be developed in several ways. Saskatchewan for example established an expert group to provide recommendations when formulating their lists. In an ideal world independent experts would come together to establish an assessment process framework and subsequently use that framework to assess which species should be listed. This process however takes time and resources which jurisdictions may not have. Instead what jurisdictions could opt for is to define a clear but limited scope, and create a list accordingly. For example, development of a Positive List may primarily focus on public safety, or perhaps on specific characteristics of animal species that make them clearly unsuitable for pet keeping (e.g., very long lifespan, wide-ranging, nocturnal lifestyle). An important starting place is to identify those animals that are currently bred, traded and kept in the community. This can be done by surveying pet stores, searching for local breeders online, and surveying pet owners in the community to inquire about the species they keep. It is recommended that species which are not present in the jurisdiction at the time are omitted from the analysis and the list, this is to prevent welcoming new or unknown risk that are inherent to the trade of exotic pets. Instead, when there is a desire of actors in the pet trade to introduce a new species in the jurisdiction, they can provide evidence to show why the species meets the conditions/scope of the Positive List.

Clear criteria

The Positive List regulatory approach is an exceptional simplification tool, because it lists animal species that may be kept as pets. However, throughout this analysis, it became clear that the simplification and

clarity is often lost due to the lack of defined detailed criteria and the listing of lower taxonomic groups (comprising large numbers of species) rather than at species-level. Defining clear criteria is the foundation to ensure that a Positive List regulation is unambiguous, can be applied consistently, is transparent and enforceable, and allows for adjustments in the future. This doesn't mean that criteria have to be complicated or numerous but they do need to be defined. As well, explanation and clarifications should be provided to make sure definitions are understandable and not subject to interpretation. For example, instead of merely stating that a criterion is "public safety", it could be further defined, indicating that it applies to any animal species able to kill or severely maim/injure a person due to their physical characteristics (e.g., big claws, teeth, weight, speed) and/or behavioural tendencies (e.g., predator, territorial). Clear criteria will address problematic ambiguities which will also help support jurisdictions who defend their laws against possible legal challenges from stakeholders.

Harmonization and collaboration

For Positive Lists to be successful, fair and enforceable it will be essential to have similar lists across jurisdictions where these are implemented. Provinces and Territories should be working together to ensure that Positive Lists and accompanying regulations are coordinated. If this responsibility is downloaded to municipalities, existing collaborative municipal platforms should be utilized to work on Positive List By-Laws template that can be circulated and adopted by individual jurisdictions. At the same time a depository should be created where relevant documentation can be stored, consulted and shared. For example, Saskatchewan had the most elaborative decision-making process of the 6 jurisdictions that were analyzed in this review, it's a missed opportunity that their analysis hasn't been made publicly available.

Complimentary measures to strengthen Positive Lists

Positive List regulations are an important tool to address the risks of exotic pet ownership, however a lack of awareness or enforcement capacity can endanger the effectiveness of the regulation. Therefore it is

recommended that in addition to a transparent development process, there must also be clear communication once the tool is in place (see e.g., Saskatchewan website^{xx}). An additional complimentary measure could be providing husbandry guidelines for those species on the Positive List and ensuring that enforcement officials are properly trained and resourced to address any pet keeping that is no longer legal.

Summary

The keeping of exotic pets is widespread in Canada and the potential and realized issues related to those exotic pets brings with them animal welfare and public health and safety issues and negative impacts on biodiversity. That why workable, comprehensive regulatory measures, such as Positive List regulatory regimes, are needed to mitigate these risks. This analysis provides a preliminary overview of the complexities of Positive List regulations that determine which animal species may be kept as pets. A review of two provincial and four municipal Positive Lists regulations highlights the need for establishing a clear scope and criteria prior to deciding which animals may be listed. It also demonstrates that while transitional provisions should be defined, to provide clarity regarding what will happen with animal species that are no longer allowed but are already in possession, this doesn't always occur. Similarly, these lists should be subject to change as science evolves, nevertheless none of the Regulations or By-Laws establishes a clear mechanism how interested actors can request a change for the up-listing or removal of a species from the list.

This analysis also finds little consistency among Positive Lists and the frameworks on which they are developed. The listing of higher taxonomic groups is problematic and likely results in the unintended

inclusion of many species. Recognizing the challenges in resourcing relevant, credible information and independent expertise five recommendations are made below. They are:

1. Set a clear scope based on the animal species bred, traded and kept in the jurisdiction. The scope can be as small or as wide as appropriate depending on the expertise, capacity and resources available in the jurisdiction.
2. Define criteria as clearly and narrowly as possible, and ensure they are communicated publicly.
3. Base lists as much as possible on the lowest taxonomic grouping (preferably at the species level)
4. Establish transitional provisions for owners who have non-listed animals when the Positive List comes into force.
5. Establish a fair process that allows interested stakeholders to request animal species' list additions or deletions but that requires applicants to provide meaningful, comprehensive evidence in support of their recommendations.

Finally, Positive List regulations can most effectively and efficiently be enforced when adjacent municipalities, regions, provinces and territories implement similar lists. It is therefore recommended that any jurisdiction considering Positive Lists attempt to harmonize their lists with other jurisdictions, wherever possible.

Positive List regulatory frameworks are growing in number and are here to stay. This review of several existing Positive Lists and their development processes should provide jurisdictions considering Positive Lists with useful insights and lessons regarding the formulation and implementation of Positive List regulation in their own jurisdictions. Positive Lists are an efficient and effective way of protecting vulnerable animals from neglect and abuse, of safeguarding public health and safety and play a role in stemming the tide of biodiversity loss.

ⁱ Toland E, Bando M, Hamers M, Cadenas V, Laidlaw R, Martínez-Silvestre A, van der Wielen P. Turning negatives into positives for pet trading and keeping: A review of positive lists. *Animals*. 2020 Dec 10;10(12):2371.

ⁱⁱ EUR-LEX - 62007CJ0219 - EN - EUR-LEX [Internet]. Available from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:62007CJ0219>.

ⁱⁱⁱ New Brunswick Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, [RSNB 2014, c 132](#) and General Regulation, [NB Reg 2000-4](#); Saskatchewan The Animal Protection Act, 2018, [SS 2018, c A-21.2](#) and The Animal Protection Regulations, 2018, [RRS c A-21.2 Reg 1](#)

^{iv} New Brunswick Fish and Wildlife Act (Fish and Wildlife Act, SNB 1980, [c F-14.1](#)), and Saskatchewan Wildlife Act (The Wildlife Act, 1998, [SS 1998, c W-13.12](#)).

^v In New Brunswick the definition of *wildlife* also includes species that have been introduced into the wild in the province. In Saskatchewan *wildlife* includes also *exotic wildlife* found in Saskatchewan (it is left unspecified how *found* is defined).

^{vi} Exact wording is (k.1) *excluding from the operation of paragraph 38.1(1)(a) or (b) species or subspecies of exotic wildlife*;

^{vii} New Brunswick [Regulation 92-74](#) under the Fish and Wildlife Act (O.C. 92-416)

^{viii} New Brunswick Fish and Wildlife Act (Fish and Wildlife Act, SNB 1980, [c F-14.1](#)).

^{ix} The list of factors the minister may consider is: (a) whether holding the wildlife in captivity poses a risk to public health or safety; (b) whether holding the wildlife in captivity requires special care and management; (c) whether there is a significant risk that the wildlife being held in captivity could establish in the wild in Saskatchewan; (d) whether the conservation status of the wildlife species is a concern; (e) whether the history of the wildlife species being held in captivity is short; (f) whether holding the wildlife species in captivity poses disease risk to domestic animals or native wildlife; (g) whether the wildlife species is well established in the pet industry; (h) whether there is sufficient information to evaluate the wildlife species; (i) whether the wildlife is native to Saskatchewan; (j) any other criteria the minister considers appropriate to further the purposes of the Act and these regulations. (3) If the minister designates any wildlife as a restricted species or an allowed

^x The reporting deadline was on November 30th, 2021.

^{xi} Email communication with government representative October 2nd, 2025.

^{xii} By-Law 2020-30, A By-law to regulate, licence, and control Animals in the Town of Newmarket; By-Law 6197-19, Being a By-law to regulate various matters relating to the keeping, licensing and controlling of animals in the Town of Aurora; By-Law 22-25, A By-Law to promote responsible pet ownership and regulate animal control within the City of Richmond Hill; By-Law 21-012, By-Law concerning domestic animals.

^{xiii} See Cambridge Dictionary: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/domestic>.

^{xiv} Décor, M. S. M. (2019, March). A universal definition of 'domestication' to unleash global animal welfare progress. In *Derecho Animal. Forum of Animal Law Studies* (Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 39-55).

^{xv} The definition of domestic animals in Montréal is: (1) dogs (except hybrids); (2) cats; (3) rabbits; (4) ferrets; (5) domestic rodent weighing less than 1.5 kg; (6) sugar gliders; (7) hedgehogs (except *Erinaceus*); (8) birds, except galliformes (e.g. chickens, quails, turkeys, grouse, peacocks, pheasants), anseriformes (e.g. screamers, geese, swans, ducks, teals), struthioniformes (e.g.: ostriches, emus, kiwis), reptiles, except snakes whose length in adulthood reaches more than 3 m, venomous snakes, lizards whose length in adulthood reaches more than 2 m, venomous lizards, sea turtles, turtles from Tryonichidae family and alligators, crocodiles, caimans and other crocodilians; (10) the American toad, the wood frog, the mink frog, the leopard frog, the green frog, the mudpuppy, the bullfrog, the newt and all the exotic amphibians, except poisonous amphibians; (11) fish authorized to be kept in captivity in accordance with the Act respecting the conservation and development of wildlife (CQLR, chapter C-61.1) and the regulations thereunder.

^{xvi} The criteria are: a) the animal's welfare is not compromised when kept; b) the animal does not cause a nuisance such as but not limited to noise, smell, and potential for property damage; c) the animal is not a threat to public safety or the natural environment; d) the animal's specific physiological and behavioral needs can be met; and e) any other relevant criteria identified by the director.

^{xvii} Richmond Hill exemptions are: any Property owned or occupied by York Regional Police; the employees of a municipal or other government authority lawfully operating a public park, exhibition or zoological garden; the premises or an affiliate branch of a lawfully operated Municipal Animal Shelter or the Provincial Animal Welfare Services; an animal hospital or clinic which is lawfully operated and supervised by a veterinarian licensed by the Ontario Veterinary Association; premises registered as research facilities under the Animals for Research Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. A.22, as amended, or the employees of such facility, during the course of their duties; any person licensed or exempted as an operator of an animal supply facility in accordance with the Animals for Research Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. A.22, as amended, or the employees of such facility, during the course of their duties; h) native Wildlife species licensed in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997, S.O. 1997, c. 41 and exempts only those Animals described and listed on individual licenses.

^{xviii} A maximum of seven (7) individual animals can be kept at a dwelling in Richmond Hill, and eight (8) in Montréal (except for fishes).

^{xix} Except for saltwater fishes, freshwater fishes that are not from self-sustaining captive populations, freshwater fishes that are sourced from the wild, either directly or through intermediaries, fishes that reach an adult length of 1 meter or more, fishes identified by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency.

^{xx} <https://www.saskatchewan.ca/business/environmental-protection-and-sustainability/wildlife-and-conservation/captive-wildlife>.