

Inquiry into the Animal Care and Protection Amendment Bill 2022

Submission No: 908
Submitted by: Property Rights Australia
Publication:
Attachments: No attachment
Submitter Comments:

Submission by Property Rights Australia into the Animal Care and Protection Amendment Bill 2022

Property Rights Australia (PRA) was formed in 2003. We are a non-profit organisation of primary producers and small businesspeople mostly from rural and regional Queensland who are concerned about continuing encroachments on the rights of private property owners. The organisation was formed to seek recognition and protection of the rights of private property owners in the development, introduction and administration of policies and legislation relating to the management of land, water and other natural resources. Set up in South West Queensland, PRA's membership now extends across most states and multiple major rural industries. PRA is not affiliated with any political party.

27A Spaying cattle

In remote and semi-remote areas of Queensland, vets are required for life saving attendance on animals, not this kind of routine management.

Accreditation programs are likely to be also unavailable and/or expensive which will mean some landowners are unable to access the required service.

Inability to have basic management procedures performed will set back the efficient running of regional and remote landholdings by decades.

27B Testing for pregnancy in cattle

There are many areas in Australia where large animal vets are either unavailable, in very short supply or properties are too remote to access them. Put simply there just are not enough vets to get this low risk job done. Where vets may be available their talents are better used to attend to genuine animal illness and emergency, not a routine, safe procedure.

Similar comments no doubt apply to any, as yet, undetailed, accreditation scheme.

Considering that this procedure is not considered dangerous to the animals this is government overreach at its finest and smacks of lobbying from those who may stand to gain from it.

Inability to have pregnancy test performed by whoever is available in an area, will send regional and remote management, which often relies on neighbours, back to the dark ages.

Regulating/certifying routine management practices under 27A and 27B is introducing yet another layer of government intervention.

There are already too many businesses making a living from agriculture without actually adding value to agriculture. This certification plan could very well be one of those industries.

*

Property Rights Australia has always been concerned that there have been too many conflicts of interest around the powers of RSPCA officers and any increase in supervision by government is welcomed.

Some reported actions of RSPCA officers have been premature and incomprehensible with healthy animals euthanised and some unfairly harassed.

There needs to be a clear separation of powers and adequate oversight by government.

Not all of the Auditor General's recommendations are available in the notes but of the couple discussed, they seem reasonable.

It would be a much better scenario if RSPCA became purely a reporting agency and investigation, prosecution and decisions about animal fates were made by government officers from DAF as opposed to authorised officers.

Joanne Rea,

Chair,

Property Rights Australia.