Inquiry into the Animal Care and Protection Amendment Bill 2022

Submission No: 13

Submitted by: [redacted]

Publication: Make my submission public but keep my name confidential

Attachments: No attachment

Submitter Comments:

Dear Parliamentary Committee,I 'm writing in submission on the proposed amendments to the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001I have for many years been a keen dog training enthusiast & community member, engaging in various sports and advanced dog activities, in addition to being a life long dog owner of various breeds.I find the proposed amendments repugnant, and reject the premise they have been brought forth under as it lacks in substantiated research, sufficient understanding of the practical application of training tools and dog behaviour, and has failed to consult either the wider community or suitably experienced professionals & stakeholders within it.The government has not followed its own best practice guide for the amendment of legislation.

The Queensland Government Guide to Better Regulation May 2019 states that: The COAG Best Practice Principles For Regulation Making include: a) Consulting effectively with affected stakeholders at all stages of the regulatory cycle b) Ensuring that government action is effective and proportional to the issue being addressed c) Considering a range of feasible policy options including self-regulatory, co-regulatory and nonregulatory approach d) Adopting the option that generations the greatest net benefit for the community Evidence that the government has not followed it's own best practice guidelines: 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.I refer to page 37 of the report, section titled "Relevant E-Petitions", it is acknowledged that "there were six animal welfare related e-petitions that were tabled in the Legislative Assembly during the consultation period. Issues raised in these e-petitions (listed below) are also being considered as part of the ACPA review process". Of these six petitions, the relevant subject matter of the 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. I have included the 3 relevant petitions below: - 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. 3 515-21)There remains three relevant e-petitions, for which there 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. No such e-petitions have been made or reviewed regarding the currently proposed amendments, nor has the community been effectively consulted. The proposed amendments may lead to disastrous consequences for both individual animals wellbeing and indirectly, the relationship humans have with them. As a member of the community, I would ask for substantiated research and advice on the practical application and outcomes of the correct use of prong collars and restraint tools made by qualified and experienced professionals. Additionally, I would ask that "restraint" be fully defined for further discussion. Reducing effective methods of solving behavioural problems may lead to: - Greater risk of animals being euthanized due to unresolved behavioural problems. - Deterioration of Dog / Owner relationship as unresolved behavioural problems subsist. - Increase cost of dog training as the market compensates for the inefficiency in using other methods where possible. - Reduced quality of training services, as many issues require a scientific application of operant conditioning; safest and most efficient with correct tools.I ask the Parliamentary Committee reject the proposed amendments until substantiated

research can be obtained and the community along with qualified, experienced professionals and stakeholders can be consulted on the subject.Kind Regards