

Samantha Sherrington, M.Ost, G.Dip (Animal Chiro)
Centaurus Osteopathy
263 Tennyson Road, TENNYSON, NSW, 2754
0452 472 959

31 May 2022

For the attention of: Committee Secretariat

Submission with regards to the proposed amendments to the Animal Care and protection Act (2001)

Submitted by;

Name: Samantha Sherrington, M.Osteopathy, Grad.Dip (Animal Chiro)

Address/email address/phone:263 Tennyson Road, Tennyson, NSW, 2754. Phone 0452 472 959

I write to submit feedback on the proposed amendments to the *Animal Care and Protection Act (2001)*. My position is such that I believe certain particulars of the proposed changes (detailed below) should be disregarded and not passed into law, as it is my understanding (detailed below) that due parliamentary process has not been followed in the lodgement of all tabled amendments.

Evidence of Due parliamentary Process Not Being Followed

I refer to the 'REVIEW OF THE ANIMAL CARE AND PROTECTION ACT 2001 CONSULTATION OUTCOMES REPORT', prepared by the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries and published in October 2021.

I refer to page 37 of the report, section titled "Relevant E-Petitions". It is acknowledged that "*there were six animal welfare related e-partitions that were tabled in the Legislative Assembly during the consultation period. Issues raised in these e-partitions (listed below) are also being considered as part of the ACPA review process*".

Of these six petitions, the relevant subject matter of three of these petitions was also included as part of the initial discussion paper; as such, stakeholders and the community were provided the opportunity to give feedback on these matters. I have included the 3 relevant petitions below:

- **Make suitable shelter mandatory for all farmed animals (Petition no. 3499-21)**
- **Tethering of dogs must be prohibited (Petition no. 3501-21)**
- **Continue the use of all methods, including dogs, to control feral pigs (Petition no. 3515-21)**

There remains three relevant e-petitions, for which there a-was no correlating subject matter in the initial discussion paper:

- **Ban the use of shock collars on dogs (Petition no. 3526-21)**
- **Illegal to import – Prohibit the use of prong collars n Queensland (Petition no. 3530-21)**
- **Prohibit the use of choke collars in Queensland (Petition no. 3531-21)**

These three petitions were made to the Hon. Mark Furner, with closing dates in May 2021 and a response due date in June 2021. I wish to note that , since the closing of these petitions, there has been no opportunity provided to relevant stakeholders or the community to be surveyed on these matters. All three petitions listed above closed on 23rd May 2021. The closing date for feedback

on the review of the Animal Protection and Care Act, as detailed in the Outcomes Report, was 21st May 2021.

I would consider here that key stakeholders would include, but are not limited to:

- Members of the Queensland Government currently utilising these training tools, including Police and Military units
- Certified Animal Training Professionals, working to improve standards of pet ownership and care, community safety and education around responsible pet training and ownership
- Animal Welfare Organisations
- Members of the public who own pets or have pet dogs living in their community
- Certified Professionals providing veterinary and allied health care to pets and working/sporting animals

I am of the position that changes to the Animal Care and Protection Act (2001) are serious in nature and have far-reaching implications for the wider community. I am in agreement with the closing remarks made in the Outcomes Report:

"The Queensland Government is committed to maintaining strong and effective animal welfare laws. It is important that the community and stakeholders have an opportunity to comment on animal welfare laws".

As there has been no opportunity for the community and stakeholders to make comment on the proposed banning of the training tools listed in the above petitions, I do not consider due parliamentary process to have been followed. As such I petition the committee that changes pertaining to the legality of these tools not be considered as part of the proposed amendments.

I am an Animal Biomechanical Professional/Osteopath, and as a member of the final group mentioned above, Professionals providing veterinary and allied health care to pets and working animals, I have seen no evidence of musculoskeletal, cutaneous or psychological damage within the animals I have treated who have worn prong/pinch collars or muzzles. On the contrary, I have found the correct use of these devices, as guided by professional trainers, either when handled by owners or by trainers themselves, has allowed me to provide Osteopathic and rehabilitative care to many highly aggressive or reactive dogs which they would otherwise not be able to receive without causing harm to myself or the handler. Often this care is a critical part of their rehabilitation for both physical problems as well as eliminating pain as a potential source of behavioural problems.

From a biomechanical perspective, prong collars exert a very small force directly into the neck. I have noted no signs of adverse effect of prong collars use on musculoskeletal health, nor have I noted any broken skin or lacerations upon palpation of the neck tissues.

By contrast I find greater problems with some of the shelf-bought restraint devices, which require no training whatsoever and rely purely on leverage to overpower the dog. I frequently manage acute and chronic postural problems, neck pain and degenerative joint disease in forelimbs especially, which appear to be closely related to the use of headcollars and harnesses of various designs. I have frequently noted sensitivity to tracheal palpation in dogs who make a habit of pulling on a flat collar.

Again, I would like to strongly express my professional opinion that the banning of prong collars and muzzles in particular would result in a serious reduction in the ability to safely and effectively provide veterinary and allied health care to aggressive and reactive dogs. The logical conclusion is that these animals would end up being euthanised rather than helped and rehabilitated.

Thank you for your consideration of this submission.