

Inquiry into the Animal Care and Protection Amendment Bill 2022

Submission No: 1437
Submitted by: [REDACTED]
Publication: Make my submission public but keep my name confidential
Attachments: No attachment

Submitter Comments:

This Bill does offer certain vital improvements for animal welfare in Queensland. Yet, it does not represent contemporary animal welfare legislation or the quickly and significantly changing community expectations around animal welfare. I support the following amendments to the Bill:- (5) New breach of duty of care offence.- (6) New unreasonable abandonment offence.- (9) Ban of tail docking.- (14) Ban of prong collars (possession & use). Although, I would recommend the Bill go further and ban other cruel devices including tethering while unattended, electric collars, and other cruel training devices.- (14) Ban on firing or blistering.- (15) Allow for euthanasia of animals by vets where owner can't be located.- (16) Ban of CSSP pig poison. However, I question why this is limited to CSSP pig poison and recommend that this be extended to include other cruel poisons including 1080. - (32) Recognition of interstate prohibition orders.- (44) Expanding QRIC's powers to include retired racehorses in possession of a racing participant. I strongly urge the committee to consider changes to the following amendments:- (3) I welcome the inclusion of all Cephalopoda in the Act under the definition of animals. However, I would like to see inclusion of some Malacostraca such as crabs, crayfish, lobsters, and prawns, in line with modern animal welfare science.- (7) Calf roping should be banned. Rather than changing the Act to specifically allow what would be acts of animal cruelty at rodeos, the Bill should instead seek to ban calf roping as a prohibited event. A new study 'The legality of calf roping in Australia' (Stonebridge, UQ Law Journal, 2022) confirms that "beneficial contributions of calf roping do not justify the harm caused to the calves and that calf roping would therefore likely not be legal if the standard of unnecessary harm applied". This follows several recent Australian scientific studies (Sinclair et al, 2016 and Rizzuto et al, 2020) that confirm that this event causes significant stress to vulnerable calves.- (10) I have strong concerns that allowing spaying surgery on cattle to be performed by non-vets and allowing pregnancy tests by laypersons is a backward step for animal welfare.- (12) The restrictions on debarking and supply of 'debarked' dogs is a good thing. However, I would recommend the committee listen to advice from rescue organisations and shelters when considering obligations places on those that care for dogs. In particular, the penalty for supplying a dog from a shelter without a certificate being greater than the penalty for illegally performing debarking procedures on a dog in the first place seems disproportionate. - (22) CCTV required at 'livestock slaughter facilities' - The definition of livestock slaughter facilities should be expanded to include all facilities that slaughter livestock and not just horses. I note this is based on recommendations from the Martin Inquiry, where the scope of the inquiry was limited to racehorses. However, there seems to be a lack of any scientific justification for CCTV use on horses yet not recording other animals who are just as capable and likely of suffering. I also urge for an independent monitoring regime to be put in place to monitor the CCTV footage. If the CCTV recordings are only accessed on the basis of a complaint, then they are largely meaningless and will result in minimal animal welfare improvements if any. - Similarly, powers for inspectors to enter a slaughterhouse without a warrant or permission from the owner should not be restricted to only when horses are at the facility. It is vital that inspectors have the power to enter slaughterhouses (as well as factory farms) without notice. - I question the rationale for changes to s178. This appears to be a backward step for animal welfare and removes any possibility of private prosecution or even the ability of RSPCA Qld to independently decide to prosecute without permission from the Department (chief executive). This is a backward step for animals and concentrates all power to prosecute in one person. Notably, the person who authorises prosecution also has responsibility for the viability and growth of animal agriculture industries, which may at times represent a conflict of interest. Instead,

s178 (3) should be amended to explicitly allow private prosecution of animal cruelty offences, as well as by Queensland Police and RSPCA Qld. s178 (b) should also be amended to increase the statute of limitation of animal cruelty offences (currently 12 months, or 2 years in some circumstances). I note that some animal cruelty investigations currently take close to 12 months, so the current statute of limitation is completely unworkable. Currently, if someone commits a horrendous act of cruelty, but it is not discovered until 2 years later, they cannot be prosecuted under the Act. In addition to the points raised above, I urge the government to commit to further reviews and amendments to the Act and to properly consider:- An Independent Office of Animal Protection, separate from the Department of Agriculture.- Banning calf roping and other cruel events in the name of entertainment. - Give further consideration to mandatory reporting of suspected animal cruelty cases.- Specifically acknowledge the sentience of non-human animals in the Act.- Make meaningful changes to factory farming and other farmed animal welfare, including transport or slaughter, and ensure codes of practice do not provide excuses for committing acts of cruelty.- Major changes to monitoring and enforcement of animal welfare, especially for farmed animals. This should also include increased transparency around enforcement action taken by the Department of Agriculture.