

Inquiry into the Animal Care and Protection Amendment Bill 2022

Submission No: 855
Submitted by: [REDACTED]
Publication: Make my submission public but keep my name confidential
Attachments: See attachment
Submitter Comments:

ACPA Amendment Bill Submission

Clause 14 Insertion of new ch3, pt5, Division 5 (Possession or use of prohibited devices)

Section 37A (1) A person must not possess any of the following devices (each a *prohibited device*) unless the person has a reasonable excuse-

(a) A prong collar

- Prong collars in the hands of responsible dog owners and trainers are a valuable training tool when it comes to safely walking and handling reactive dogs. These collars are frequently used in the police force and security, for controlling dogs in working situations. Taking away this tool from people who may have no other way of safely controlling a large, potentially aggressive dog could have serious repercussions. I'd expect it to be considered carefully before implementing knee-jerk legislation banning something that most people would have no experience with or understanding of.
- Any collar or restraint has the potential to be used cruelly in the hands of someone who does not have regard for animal welfare. Taking away a valuable tool from someone who uses it correctly will only disadvantage that individual, rather than reduce everyday animal welfare concerns.

(b) Another restraint device prescribed by regulation eg. Collars, leads, harnesses, muzzles, halters

- Preventing animal attack incidents, whether it be between dogs, or a dog on a person, should be considered a priority. The fact of the matter is that use of collars, leads, harnesses etc is known to reduce the likelihood of encounters between reactive dogs; as well as contact between aggressive dogs and humans. Taking away restraint devices; or requiring the everyday person to have a "reasonable excuse" to use one; is going backwards in terms of ensuring animals in public are kept under effective control and not endangering the community.
- Local laws address this exact scenario and most have legislation in place requiring that animals in public be under effective control; specifically referring to "holding it by an appropriate leash, halter or rein".
- Banning certain restraint devices blatantly contradicts what is already written in the legislation used on a day-to-day basis in enforcing responsible dog ownership at a local government level throughout the state.

Clause 16 Amendment of s42 (Feral or pest animals)

Section 42 (b) (ii) a poison that includes the ingredients carbon disulfide and phosphorus eg. CSSP pig poison

- According to HCPSL Poisoning of Feral Pigs handbook; "*CSSP is toxic to a wide range of bird and animal species, is generally slow acting and inhumane, and can cause secondary poisoning from the vomit or carcass of poisoned animals. In pigs, death may take from 2 hours to 5 days following the ingestion of a lethal dose. Phosphorus is considered inhumane and is undergoing deregistration as a commercially available toxin.*"

- It is hypocritical to consider CSSP inhumane when the same handbook states that similar effects occur from use of Compound 1080 *“poisoning of non-targets does occur, Dogs are the most susceptible of all animals to 1080. With a latent period (4 to 12 hrs). At least 25mm of rain is required [to be leached and deactivated in soil]. Some pigs may vomit for a number of hours after 1080 ingestion, creating a potential hazard for domestic dogs”*
- I don't believe the act of managing feral or pest animals should involve the use of 1080 sodium fluoroacetate bait for the exact same reasons that CSSP pig poison is being deregistered as an option. Non-target species are known to suffer inhumane deaths as a result of 1080 poisoning, and while it may not appeal or seriously threaten some bird species they are known to move baits from target areas.