


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

**Submission No:** 57  
**Submitted by:**   
**Publication:** Make my submission public but keep my name confidential  
**Attachments:** See attachment  
**Submitter Comments:**

17 May 2022



State Development and Regional Industries Committee

Dear Parliamentary Committee,

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

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on the proposed amendments.

My name is [REDACTED], I participate in Tracking, Track & Search & Scentwork competition with my dog, am a former pet dog instructor with the Canine Obedience Club of Townsville Inc (1998-2015) & a former volunteer handler with Delta Therapy Dogs (2004 until the retirement/passing of both my former working therapy dogs), I have been an active member of the dog sport training community for 14 years & a committed responsible dog owner of over 40 years

I am strongly against the proposed amendments to the Animal Care and protection Act 2001 (as detailed below)

There are three (3) major points that are of major concern to me.

**POINT A**

- a) **The government has not followed it's own best practice guide for the amendment of legislation. As a result, key stakeholders and the wider community have not been afforded the opportunity to be consulted on the proposed amendments to the Act.**

*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 generates the greatest net benefit fir 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.

With reference 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. I include 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. 3515-21)

There remain 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. 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 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2021. The closing date for feedback on the review of the Animal Protection and Care Act, as detailed in the Outcomes Report, was 21<sup>st</sup> May 2021.

With reference to the *"Animal Care and Protection Amendment Bill 2022 Explanatory Notes"*, page 33, section titled *"Consultation"*. The use of prong collars or any other restraint based tools is in fact missing from the key consultation outcomes of the discussion paper.

It is of concern to me that the following has been stated in the bill (I refer to page 18), given adequate community consultation has not been completed:

*"New section 37A allows for the possession of additional types of collars or devices to be prescribed. The amendment is required because continuous developments in collars and devices for animals means that some existing and new collars and devices become unacceptable to the community"*

## POINT B

- b) Lack of genuine community consultation means the impacts on the community have not been adequately assessed.

*The Queensland Government Guide to Better Regulation May 2019* states that "The depth of analysis and consultation undertaken for a proposal should be proportional to the complexity and significance of the problem and the size of the potential impacts".

To quote from page 14 of the bill: *"New section 37A prohibits the possession of a prong collar or another restraint device prescribed by regulation, unless the person has a reasonable excuse"*

The proposed banning of restraint-based training tools presents a number of diverse impacts on the community, which have not been considered due to insufficient community consultation (as evidenced above). To quote from *The Queensland Government Guide to Better Regulation May 2019*, these include:

## Business Impacts

This will impact the level & quality of service businesses are able to offer to the dog owning community in both time & economical – ie the people like myself who through injury/illness/environmental issues may need this assistance with temporary management of their existing strong dogs, those rescue dogs which are found to have more 'challenging' behaviours than their new owners were advised at time of adoption etc. Unfortunately, time is a consideration for these people & their dogs – this is not a quick fix tool but a management/training tool as good dog training is not inexpensive & both finances are not infinite

## Competition Impacts

This will impact the wider dog training market by limiting options open to consumers searching for reputable professional training assistance, especially those who deal with behavioural, aggression & reactivity via targeting of select training methodologies.

## Social and environmental impacts

The social impacts of this legislation if passed will see many people who are currently working with trainers to rehabilitate or retrain behavioural issues with large/power breeds etc unable to safely manage & control these dogs during that training, meaning many will simply be locked in yards & never exercised or worse euthanised or surrendered to shelters for rehoming. My own parents would be unable to keep their beloved & well trained 10yr old GSD if they could no longer manage her on lead as they both been hit hard by arthritic conditions.

Alternatively, people will continue to walk high prey driven or aggressive dogs but not have the ability to manage their control under guidance with the best training tool/method available for their particular issue/circumstances.

## POINT C -

### c) **Conclusions regarding restraint based tools, specifically the prong collar, have been made based on unsubstantiated research and with out meaningful consultation of key stakeholders.**

I refer to page 25 of the bill, which states:

*"Imposing restrictions on the use of prong collars and other devices is justified as they are considered to be inappropriate as a training aid because they cause pain and fear in dogs which is 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"*

I would request a more comprehensive review of tools be considered prior to drawing such conclusions, as the above statement demonstrates a lack of understanding of behavioural science and the means in which training tools are most commonly used as a means of Negative Reinforcement (guiding the dog towards the correct behaviour), not Punishment. Adequate consultation with key stakeholders, including but not limited to:

- Members of the Queensland Government currently utilising these training tools, including Police and Military units
- 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

Would generate a more comprehensive understanding of the use of training tools in behavioural modification and the betterment of animal welfare.

I refer to page 3 of the bill, which states:

### *Prohibiting inhumane practices*

*The Bill amends the ACPA and introduces new offences which will prohibit the inhumane practice of:*

- *Possessing or using a prong collar, which is designed to bruise or pierce an animal's skin, or another prescribed restraint on an animal*

The above statement is factually incorrect – the tool is not **designed** to bruise or pierce an animal's skin. I refer further to page 25 of the bill, which states:

*If used incorrectly, prong collars can also cause physical injuries, such as bruising, scratching, and punctures to the skin of the dog. Over time, this can lead to scar tissue developing on the dog. In extreme but rare cases, prong collars have been associated with spinal cord injuries and other severe injuries.*

This refers to the **incorrect** use of the prong collar. It is reasonable to state that **incorrect** use of **any** tool (for example a leash, flat collar or harness) has the potential to cause injury. It is also reasonable to state that the correct use of the prong collar does not cause injury to the dog. I have cause to use a prong collar with training 2 of my own personal dogs under the guidance of two extremely ethical professional trainers who specialize in reactivity/aggression issues, as a management tool due to high prey drive around livestock, wildlife etc & whilst I was recovering from injury – at no time were my dogs injured by the use of the tool which I tried on myself before even fitting it to my dog so I would know exactly what pressure was required at any time. My dog comes when he hears the link jangle because he knows we're going out on a hike.

Additionally it is of great concern to myself that, as per the wording of the bill above, the use of potentially **any and all** restraint tools is considered to be inhumane. I am especially concerned by this wording give key stakeholders and members of the community have not been given room to provide feedback on this.

My understanding is that an individual can currently be convicted of animal cruelty for the misuse of any training tool. I would request that current and historical data on such convictions v=be cited and included in the consideration of amendments to regulation.

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

Based on the above, I would request that amendments to the use/availability/legality of tools not be considered as part of the proposed amendments to the Act, until such time as best practice process is followed and the community is consulted on the proposed changes.

Thank you for your consideration of this submission.

