

Dr Megan Alessandrini

I support this amendment.

I support this amendment. People who have an animal/s apparently in their care may later claim the animal is not theirs hence they have no responsibility for its care and wellbeing eg vet services, feeding, shelter. This amendment serves to ensure that regardless an animal in a person's care is regarded as theirs. This is a round-about way to lay blame and responsibility.

Duty of care provisions could also be applied in this instance.

Another more direct approach would be to amend the Act to say regardless of ownership, every individual has an obligation to relieve suffering and prevent neglect of sentient animals of which they could reasonably be expected to be aware.

The current exemptions of observational studies and administration of veterinary care are worthy of exemption. Animal ethics protocols derived from the Code of Practice are rigorous to protect the wellbeing of the animals, which is entirely appropriate. It is not logical that an animal who is subject to disease surveillance or a monitoring program, or 'normal management operations' should not enjoy the same protection. There is no justification for these animals to be treated with any less care and concern for their welfare. There is no acceptable reason for any exemptions or non-application of the Act to be embedded in the Act.

Section 8 (2) (i) needs to be expanded to ban the use of an electronic device to an animal under any circumstances other than in situations where lives are threatened.

Pronged collars must be banned. Muzzles come in many forms and muzzles that prevent a dog from drinking, barking (a normal dog behaviour that if prevented will cause anxiety and distress) or would possibly inhibit breathing should also be banned.

This amendment is supported.

this amendment is strongly supported. If in doubt there are a number of recent cases on the public record when an animal was left in situ at grave risk in full public view and subsequently died. This must never happen again.

supported, as it strengthens and offers increased sensible options for disposal.

A further amendment to this at 24 (1) (a)- insertion of words to the effect:

an officer or vet may kill an animal if-

(a) in their opinion the animal is injured or diseased or is otherwise suffering to an extent that
cannot be reasonably relieved by a simple physical or veterinary measure

it is agreed that the carcass should be available in 48 hours, with the following insertion-

the carcass must be made available to the owner **or institution or organisation deemed to be the owner at the time of death** within 48 hours.

supported- this is a loophole removed.

Normal animal management operations' (a grounds for exemption in 27 (2) (c)) is not well defined and has the potential to be interpreted loosely to allow inhumane culling or killing by eg blunt force trauma without sedation by experienced individuals... support this. Additionally **or otherwise

avoid by procrastination or lack of cooperation** Veterinary board inspectors need this coverage too- please include them.

This issue is a persistent problem for charitable organisations who provide care for animals subjected to court attention. It has been known after years of delay and amassing of significant costs for these bills not to be paid as the costs either remain in dispute between a council and an individual or an individual simply declines to pay. Is there a way the Act can be amended to reduce the incidence of this?

... [from point 14 on section 27- ran out of space] by individuals motivated to rid the state of a pest species to advantage a protected species. The ends do not justify the means. All such interactions with animals must be subject to the same considerations of humane treatment, regardless of the potential misfortune to be classified as a 'pest species'. In other words it is not their fault and there must not be an open season on these animals without pain mitigation.

I support the group submission from Tasmanian animal welfare organisations to which I was a contributor advocating for the inclusion of sentience. I do not accept the contention that sentience cannot be measured and is only symbolic. It is possible to measure it and its inclusion as an overarching principle simplifies the interpretation of all sections of the Act. The acceptance of the sentience of animals makes a mockery for example of the exemptions currently in place for hunting, entertainment, species management etc. The world has changed and it is time for Tasmania to look to other jurisdictions nationally and internationally and to embrace this.