

Inquiry into the Animal Care and Protection Amendment Bill 2022

Submission No: 316
Submitted by: Patricia Cavarra
Publication: Make my submission and my name public
Attachments: See attachment
Submitter Comments:

Patricia Cavarra

27th May 2022

State Development and Regional Industries Committee

Dear Parliamentary Committee,

Submission on proposed amendments to the Animal Care and Protection Act 2021

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

I am a dog training who has been running a very successful dog training school in Melbourne, Victoria for the last 22 years. The dog training school is one of a few dog training establishments accredited and recognised under the Domestic Animals Act 1994 and supporting Domestic Animal Regulations (DAR) 2015 (Victoria).

I am strongly against the proposed amendments to the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001 for the various reasons:

1. The QLD Government has not followed its 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.
2. Lack of community consultation means the impact on the community have not been adequately addressed.
3. Conclusions being drawn regarding restraint based tools, specifically the prong collar, have been made based on unsubstantiated research and without consultation of the key stakeholders.

Point 1:

The QLD Government has not followed its 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:
 - Consulting effectively with affected stakeholders at all stages of the regulatory cycle
 - Ensuring that Government action is effective and proportional to the issue being addressed
 - Considering a range of feasible policy options including self-regulatory, co-regulatory and non-regulatory approach
 - Adopting the option that generates the greatest net benefit for the community

Evidence that the Government has NOT followed its 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 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. 3515-21)
 - 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. 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 (2001), as detailed in the Outcomes Report, was 21st 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”

The same occurred in Victoria when the Act was amended back in 2002/3. Hundreds of industry professionals back then put together numerous requests to the then Bureau of Animal Welfare to be regarding the proposed banning of prong collars to no avail. Hundreds of submissions and physically signed petitions fell by the wayside as the Victorian Govt consulted only with a single body at the time, the RSPCA and no one else. This resulted in the rest of industry being left without the chance to speak and raise concerns over the ban as well as state our case.

Point 2:

Lack of genuine community consultation means the impact on the community have not been adequately addressed.

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 adverse 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:

A number of our clients in Victoria who were using prong collars on their dogs due to physical limitations (whether medical or weight) were left high and dry without a voice to their case. I can tell you that one dog paid the ultimate price of his life when the ban came into effect as the owner was no longer able to walk/exercise the dog without it and she feared for her well being due to the sheer size of her dog.

Point 3:

Conclusions being drawn regarding restraint based tools, specifically the prong collar, have been made based on unsubstantiated research and without consultation of the 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 specifically 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 correct use of the prong collar does not cause injury to the dog.

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 based tools is considered to be inhumane. I am especially concerned by this wording given 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 be cited and included in the consideration of amendments to regulation.

Further, after much searching, I have found that there isn't really any substantiated information on the case against prong collars. As you know research requires funding and as such in order to ascertain correct and substantiated results, a properly conducted study would need to be completed. Therefore, only a company who was aiming to make profit from such research would bother conducting such, however no such research has been performed.

There is absolutely nothing to prove that the prong collar causes 'fear' 'aggression' 'intimidation' in dogs other than opinion pieces from those who have either never used the tool before or those drawn into the believe due to the emotive words used in these campaigns.

Conclusion

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 of QLD is consulted on the proposed changes. I wished that the Victorian State Government had afforded same to us here in Victoria at the time.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'P' followed by a long, horizontal, wavy line that ends in a small loop.

Patricia Cavarra

