

Nicole Leyden

As a professional dog trainer who regularly works with reactive, aggressive, fearful and poorly behaved dogs and who frequently employs the use of a prong collar I question what evidence was used to determine that a prong collar is cruel? Prong collars are designed to pinch the dog's skin gently around the neck with even distribution of pressure so as not to cause pain, injuries or damage to the dog. These collars are far more gentle to a dog than most other commonly used training devices such as Head Halters, Gentle Leaders, Haltis, No-pull harnesses, check chains, slip collars and martingale collars. These tools allow owners and handlers to gently control their dogs regardless of the handlers' size, strength or fitness level - they are particularly useful for handlers with impairments, disabilities or who have large dogs. These collars are effective, gentle and very safe to be used on many different dogs. Most dogs will never need a prong collar but for those dogs who behavioural challenges, poor manners or who have owners who can't physically control their dogs (for various reasons) these collars are irreplaceable. To ban these collars will result in more dogs being euthanised or more dogs who won't be able to go for walks due to safety risks - that is animal cruelty by definition and by passing this legislation government will be doing the opposite of what this act is designed to do (provide animal welfare).

I request that Biosecurity Tasmania provide all evidence that they have based these proposed amendments on. I do not believe that there is any scientific studies done to prove that a prong collar is in-humane, nor do I believe that there is any available evidence of injuries caused by the proper use of a prong collar. Should Biosecurity Tasmania have this type of evidence I request copies of it. And should Biosecurity Tasmania not have any actual and document evidence then I request that this amendment be removed from the Animal Welfare Bill.