

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

**Submission No:** 28  
**Submitted by:** [REDACTED]  
**Publication:** Make my submission public but keep my name confidential  
**Attachments:** No attachment  
**Submitter Comments:**

Dear Sir Madam, In reference to the Animal Care and Protection Amendment Bill presented by the Hon. ML FURNER (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries and Minister for Rural Communities) on 12 MAY 22 Parliament Sitting, I would like to bring to the committee's attention that due process/ proper consultation has not been followed in regards to the legislative process of the making of an ACT making this bill unlawful and unjust. The specific part of the bill I am referring to is referenced below; "The bill prohibits the possession and use of prong collars without a reasonable excuse. Prong collars are considered to be inappropriate as a training aid because they cause pain and fear in dogs and are used as a punishment. Research has shown that using aversive training methods, including the use of prong collars, can cause pain and distress and can compromise the dog's welfare. Prong collars can also cause physical injuries such as bruising, scratching and puncturing the skin of the dog, Over time, this may lead to scar tissue developing on the dog. In extreme but rare cases, prong collars can be associated with spinal cord injuries and other severe injuries. I know that there have been views expressed on those provisions by certain animal trainers" "The public was also consulted through a discussion paper that was released for public and stakeholder comment between April and May 2021." "In December 2021, a consultation outcomes paper was released to provide a summary of all the responses to the discussion paper." The Hon ML Furner refers to a discussion paper that was released for public and stakeholder comment between April and May 2021, yet dog collars of any type were not mentioned at all so the opportunity to provide a submission was not given as it was not raised as an issue in the paper in the first place. Had the issue been correctly raised through the discussion paper, the appropriate Industry professionals who are to be directly affected by this bill would have had the opportunity to respond to the banning of prong collars. Not including it in the discussion paper but taking e petitions without further consultation on the matter is unjust and not following procedural fairness.