


## Inquiry into the Animal Care and Protection Amendment Bill 2022

**Submission No:** 5  
**Submitted by:** Shelley Stefiuk  
**Publication:** Making the submission and your name public  
**Attachments:**   
**Submitter Comments:**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [State Development and Regional Industries Committee](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed amendments to the Animal Care and Protection Act  
**Date:** Sunday, 15 May 2022 8:52:11 PM

---

For the attention of: Committee Secretariat  
Parliament House George Street Brisbane Qld 4000  
Phone: (07) 3553 6662  
Email: [SDRIC@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:SDRIC@parliament.qld.gov.au)

15 May 2022

Submission with regards to the proposed amendments to the Animal Care and protection Act (2001)

Submitted by;

Shelley Stefiuk  
[REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to submit feedback on the proposed amendments to the Animal Care and Protection Act (2001). My position is such that I believe certain particulars of the proposed changes (detailed below) should be disregarded and not passed into law, as it is my understanding (detailed below) that due parliamentary process has not been followed in the lodgement of all tabled amendments.

Evidence of Due parliamentary Process Not Being Followed

I refer to the 'REVIEW OF THE ANIMAL CARE AND PROTECTION ACT 2001 CONSULTATION OUTCOMES REPORT', prepared by the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries and published in October 2021.

In relation to page 37 of the report, section titled "Relevant E-Petitions", it is acknowledged that "there were six animal welfare related e-partitions that were tabled in the Legislative Assembly during the consultation period. Issues raised in these e-partitions (listed below) are also being considered as part of the ACPA review process".

Of these six petitions, the relevant subject matter of three of these petitions was also included as part of the initial discussion paper; as such, stakeholders and the community were provided the opportunity to give feedback on these matters. The three petitions are:

- Make suitable shelter mandatory for all farmed animals (Petition no. 3499-21)
- Tethering of dogs must be prohibited (Petition no. 3501-21)
- Continue the use of all methods, including dogs, to control feral pigs (Petition no. 3515-21)

There remains three relevant e-petitions, for which there a-was no correlating subject matter in the initial discussion paper:

- Ban the use of shock collars on dogs (Petition no. 3526-21)
- Illegal to import – Prohibit the use of prong collars in Queensland (Petition no. 3530-21)
- Prohibit the use of choke collars in Queensland (Petition no. 3531-21)

These three petitions were made to the Hon. Mark Furner, with closing dates in May 2021 and a response due date in June 2021. I wish to note that, since the closing of these petitions, there has been no opportunity provided to relevant stakeholders or the community to be surveyed on these matters. All three petitions listed above closed on 23rd May 2021. The closing date for feedback on the review of the Animal Protection and Care Act, as detailed in the Outcomes Report, was 21st May 2021.

I would consider here that key stakeholders would include, but are not limited to:

- Members of the Queensland Government currently utilising these training tools, including Police and Military unit
- Certified Animal Training Professionals, working to improve standards of pet ownership and care, community safety and education around responsible pet training and ownership
- Animal Welfare Organisations
- Members of the public who own pets or have pet dogs living in their community

I am of the position that changes to the Animal Care and Protection Act (2001) are serious in nature and have far-reaching implications for the wider community. I am in agreement with the closing remarks made in the Outcomes Report:

“The Queensland Government is committed to maintaining strong and effective animal welfare laws. It is important that the community and stakeholders have an opportunity to comment on animal welfare laws”.

As there has been no opportunity for the community and stakeholders to make comment on the proposed banning of the training tools listed in the above petitions, I do not consider due parliamentary process to have been followed. As such I petition the committee that changes pertaining to the legality of these tools not be considered as part of the proposed amendments.

Thank you for your consideration of this submission.

Kind regards,  
Shelley Stefiuk