

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 11:24:19 PM

Dear David Honey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

As a volunteer for GAWA i have spent much time with greyhounds and feel my opinion has been formulated from empirical evidence.

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 10:35:35 PM

Dear Amber-Jade Sanderson MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

As a registered Veterinary Nurse in WA I frequently assist with the treatment of greyhounds. I also own a greyhound crossbreed, who for all intents and purposes is very much a fat greyhound. Therefore I have spent a great deal of time socialising with my own dog with groups of greyhounds and a lot of time spent hands on treating them. It has been my experience that greyhounds are by far the gentlest breed I encounter. My dog has unfortunately been attacked several times by other breeds and I now only feel at ease taking her to greyhound only events. Greyhounds can easily suffer horrific wounds due to the lack of fat in their skin yet they are extraordinary calm when being treated for these wounds at my work; wounds that they could not defend themselves against when wearing muzzle.

We never automatically muzzle any breed of dog at work. And we in fact remove the muzzle from greyhounds when treating them as we find it absolutely unnecessary and a hinderance when reassuring the patient.

Further more, I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 10:16:40 PM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I have a greyhound and believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 9:33:32 PM

Dear Reece Whitby MP,
cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

As an owner of two lazy and loving greyhounds, I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 9:20:18 PM

Dear David Honey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 8:38:04 PM

Dear Peter Watson MP,
cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

Hi Peter,

I'm sure you'll be getting lots of these, but as a greyhound owner who knows how gentle they are, I thought I should send it to you.

Best wishes,

Giles

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject:
Date:

Dear Rita Saffioti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme

As an owner of two greyhounds, I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Please support an end to the compulsory muzzling of Greyhounds
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 8:20:14 PM

Dear Stephen Price MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to read my email and for considering its contents. Should you wish to discuss this further, I can be contacted via email jodes67@bigpond.com or mobile 0418-958-376.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 8:19:44 PM

Dear John Quigley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Please consider changing these laws, as they would have a highly positive impact on the greyhounds of Western Australia and their owners. As a greyhound owner myself I have seen how people avoid my calm gentle girl just because she has a muzzle and would love this to change. Greyhounds like other dog breeds have provided much emotional support and love towards us, this is why myself and many others feel so compelled to change these laws. Greyhounds don't have a voice so we must become their voices and advocate for them.

Yours sincerely,
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 8:04:22 PM

Dear Rita Saffioti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

Greyhounds are so gentle, they are happy to meet other dogs but don't want any trouble. I've been on many greyhound walks where there have been over 30 hounds. There is never any aggression just a lot of butt sniffing and wagging tails. The muzzle can also be dangerous, they can get stuck in fences or trees etc while the dogs are having a sniff causing them to freak out and hurt them self trying to get free.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 7:36:26 PM

Dear Janine Freeman MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence suggesting that legislation which increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 7:13:53 PM

Dear Jessica Shaw MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I am writing to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks

Please consider supporting the change,

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 5:37:24 PM

Dear Alyssa Hayden MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 4:28:19 PM

Dear Lisa Baker MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks.

I hope you take the time to review these facts.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 3:26:03 PM

Dear Antonio Buti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

From Shana

Yours sincerely,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 1:53:07 PM

Dear Amber-Jade Sanderson MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

I have my own Greyhound and am fortunate enough to be able to afford for my girl to sit the test and no longer has to wear a muzzle. The difference of how other dogs react to her without a muzzle as well as their owners is crazy. It has made it so much more enjoyable but she shouldn't have to sit a test to not wear a muzzle. She's like any other dog and it should not be based on a breed. I hope you are able to support this cause and create a change to an old out-dated law.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 11:53:18 AM

Dear Josephine Farrer MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review WA

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 10:13:52 AM

Dear Senator Tincknell,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 9:36:45 AM

Dear Jessica Stojkovski MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete an assessment.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed.
2. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
3. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry. We've adopted two rescued greyhounds who have been living happily with my two young kids for the past two years.
4. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 9:01:57 AM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review and greyhound muzzling

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,
Erin Dowden

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Please support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 8:28:01 AM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

These dogs are the most kind and gentle creatures who are currently unnecessarily discriminated against.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 7:53:56 AM

Dear Simon Millman MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

Having had a rescue pet greyhound, and having spent time with other pet greyhounds, I believe their gentle docile natures should allow them to be free of muzzles. This would also mean that more ex-racing greyhounds would find homes because there would be less concern about having to muzzle their greyhound outside of their homes. Many people I have spoken to would not consider adopting a greyhound due largely to the hassle of the muzzle.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: My family support for the compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 7:52:23 AM

Dear John McGrath MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my family's support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme. We have a six-year-old greyhound that has completed the training programmed but she honestly didn't need it. She's the most docile dog we have ever had and when people meet her, she becomes the most docile dog they have ever met. We have a one-year old son who grew up with her around and she has never once growled/ snarled at him. Whilst we are responsible parents and only allow him to interact with her under supervision, I know that she can be wholly trusted around him.

Apart from the personal reasons listed above, I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following other ethical and evidence-supported reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 7:24:30 AM

Dear Reece Whitby MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Thank you for your time.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 7:14:15 AM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

As a labor supporter, having voted for you in the latest election and a greyhound owner I hope you can read the below points and understand the importance of representing your constituents in this dog act. Within Banksia Grove alone there are at least 8 greyhounds who I have met on my walks and I know we would all support ending this discriminating law.

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Summary

subjects:

Subject: _____
Date: _____

I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Thursday, 1 August 2019 6:58:45 AM

Thursday, 1 August 2019 6:58:45 AM

Dear Donald Redman MP,

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training program.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,



Figure 1

Subjects:

Subject: _____
Date: _____

I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Thursday, 1 August 2019 6:50:03 AM

Dear Francis Logan MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme. There are other dogs especially large off lead dogs in my community that probably should muzzled instead. My 14 year old Kelpie cross was mauled by a Great Dane off lead recently. When I share this story many others have similar stories of irresponsible owners. I think the focus needs to shift, my dog and I can no longer enjoy the beautiful parks in Yangebup.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current "prescribed training program" is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

From:



Subject:

Amend the Dog Act

Date:


Thursday, 1 August 2019 6:11:31 AM

I am urging you to amend the Dog Act regarding the language that requires greyhound to be muzzled.

This is a totally misguided requirement to a breed that are some of the sweetest dogs that are no different than any other dog breeds. Greyhounds have been given a bad rap by the greyhound racing industry who treats these poor dogs horribly.

Many organizations who specialize in dog welfare agree that greyhounds do not need to be muzzled and they need to be given a chance to be adopted and promoted as the kind animals they really are.

Thank you



From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 1:44:31 AM

Dear Stephen Price MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Thursday, 1 August 2019 1:18:47 AM

Dear Yaz Mubarakai MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time, in an unfamiliar environment for a few days at a time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 11:11:27 PM

Dear Zak Kirkup MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety.

Please free the hounds!

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 10:36:43 PM

Dear Alyssa Hayden MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
 2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
 3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
 4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
 5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
 6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
 7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
 8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
- 9.All of these points are relevant..these are outdated and discriminatory requirements..greyhounds are generally fabulous pets and don't deserve to be singled out because of their breed

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 9:14:38 PM

Dear Benjamin Wyatt MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

I have been looking after a greyhound for the last month and she is the most gentle and beautiful soul however I too walked her for the first time with a muzzle due to my preconceived notions. I'm proud to say I was able to change and so can the law.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 9:01:00 PM

Dear Terence Healy MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety.
10. As previous owners of 2 greyhounds I can verify they are truly the most gentle of dogs. We have never come across a greyhound ever being vicious, yet we have seen lots of other breeds being vicious.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 8:12:12 PM

Dear Liza Harvey MP,
cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Thank you for taking the time to read my email.

Yours sincerely,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 7:04:29 PM

Dear Yaz Mubarakai MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety
10. The law is old, it needs to be updated

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 7:01:27 PM

Dear Lisa Baker MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities.
On a personal note, I can attest to this point as I often hear children asking their parents why a greyhound is muzzled and hear all sorts of nonsense as explanations to that child.
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 6:59:37 PM

Dear Christopher Tallentire MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety
10. It's a very outdated law.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 6:58:07 PM

Dear Jessica Stojkovski MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I have met plenty of beautiful greyhounds. I have never felt threatened or scared by them. I really wish these amazing dogs have the same freedom mine do.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assessment may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety.

We have a beautiful pet greyhound and it's so sad to have to take him out with his muzzle. We get asked daily if he is vicious, and why he needs to wear the "face cage" and "Hannibal Lector mask". The fact of the matter is he is a very sweet and loving dog, and has not demonstrated any aggression or biting tendencies. The GAP GreenHounds program would involve him having to go stay in their kennels for multiple days to allow for assessment, and given he can be anxious when separated from us this process would just be too stressful for him.

██████████
██████████
██████████
██████████
██████████
██████████

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Please help stop compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 6:55:58 PM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

PLEASE let's catch WA up and change this act.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 6:25:32 PM

[REDACTED]
cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 6:15:49 PM

Dear Antonio Buti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme. My own personal experiences with Greyhounds have always been pleasant, they are placid calm and loving dogs.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support all tend to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 5:54:17 PM

Dear Christopher Tallentire MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

I have a rescue greyhound & he is a wonderful dog to have around. He is quiet and loyal and just a joy to have. I've had other breeds over the years but he takes the cake as in the best disposition ever. My greyhound & others do not belong in a muzzle, ever.

Yours sincerely,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support all time to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 5:53:22 PM

Dear John Quigley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I have two rescued greyhounds and they are, in my opinion, the best dogs in the world! They take retirement very seriously on the couch for 23 hours/day lol but when we are out walking they live to interact with all dogs & humans alike.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 5:52:26 PM

Dear Lisa Baker MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

As a new parent, I've met many greyhounds around the streets of Maylands, every one displaying a calm, gentle and friendly demeanour towards my child, my partner and myself and to think that this law still exists seems absurd to me.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From:

Date:

Support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Wednesday, 31 July 2019 5:36:38 PM

Dear Zak Kirkup MP,

cc: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety.

I have met some greyhounds and they are the least frightening dogs in the world and some of these dogs have been harmed so they would be scared to hurt anyone.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature block]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 5:31:41 PM

Dear Peter Katsambanis MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme. Greyhounds just love to run, and the fact that they can beat other dogs easily, does not mean they are going to attack them.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 5:30:04 PM

Dear Reece Whitley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 5:28:46 PM

Dear Yaz Mubarakai MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme. Having had a greyhound myself, I know how gentle and sweet natured these dogs are.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 5:17:14 PM

Dear David Kelly MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety.

I own a greyhound who is the most beautiful dog. Shy and loving. I will always have a greyhound. I am so impressed with this breed and their gentle ways.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 5:15:21 PM

Dear Rita Saffioti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety
10. As an owner of a greyhound, it's so upsetting to see how people won't even look or pet Fred and he must think he's ugly. :(

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support all kind of compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 5:07:21 PM

Dear David Kelly MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I have my own retired greyhound. He is in no way aggressive. He jussy wants to play with other dogs muzzle free

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 4:54:48 PM

Dear William Marmion MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 4:41:25 PM

Dear Zak Kirkup MP,

Feel free to come and meet our Denzel, a rescued ex-racing greyhound.

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I support an end to compulsory greyn
Wednesday, 31 July 2019 4:29:41 PM

Dear Lisa Baker MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free – there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

© 2006 The Authors

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Please stop Greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 3:23:27 PM

Dear Benjamin Wyatt MP,

I am writing this submission informally as I know you will be receiving many submissions in a formal format quoting facts. I wanted to write to you as a family who has always had second hand dogs as pets and love greyhounds.

My husband Peter Nevin, our son Travis, myself and our 5 fur kids live in Westminster Street, East Victoria Park.

Since 2012 we have had greyhounds in our family and are friends with many people who also have greyhounds. There seems to be a 'club' where like minded greyhound owners are instantly friends with other greyhound owners.

Our experience as been very positive with greyhound temperament. My nieces cuddle and lie with our greyhounds, we have 3 cats who live with them indoors.

As a family we feel quite strongly that greyhounds should not be required to be muzzled as they are gentle dogs. It is time that WA removed these laws to come into line with other states who have done away with the archaic rule of muzzling greyhounds.

I met a man yesterday when I was walking my dogs, he was afraid of them and told me that his impression was that they were dangerous because they often wore muzzles. This is very unfair for the breed as they are not a dangerous dog, they are very gentle and sweet natured. I also told him that my dogs lived with 3 cats and were very respectful of them too.

Evidence shows that there is no increased risk to the community if greyhounds are unmuzzled.

Thank you for taking the time to read my submission.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support the end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 2:38:12 PM

Dear Reece Whitley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

My own rescued greyhound has lived with a cat since we adopted her 3 and 1/2 years ago. There has not been any difficulties with these two creatures being together. I have never felt the need to put her muzzle on her.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 2:01:51 PM

Dear Emily Hamilton MP,

cc- Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

I have rescued Greyhounds for many years and I have found through fostering and adopting out hundreds of Greyhounds that the Greyhound is a beautiful well mannered animal, they are clean and live cleanly, they are gentle, they are sensitive, they are funny and do funny things they make me laugh and they make me cry when I see so many Greyhounds that have been injured because of the racing Industry, my children and my grandchildren have grown up amongst several Greyhounds in my home, we have never had an incident quite the reverse with my Grandson biting one of our Greys, the Muzzle makes Greyhounds look scary especially to children and we are often asked "why do Greyhounds" wear these cages which make them look mean, getting rid of the Muzzle means our Greyhounds can be treated equally along with all other Dog breeds and so they should be. I do many events and adoption days where I have come across many breeds of Dogs and I have found that the Greyhound behaves very nicely! they don't jump around or bark they are quiet, reserved, none barking in contrast to many other breeds I encounter for the sake of these beautiful animals we must get rid of this archaic law.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 1:12:50 PM

Dear Antonio Buti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Greyhounds are just like other dogs, why should one breed be compared to another? If a dog is race trained then I completely agree they should be put through the correct training etc before being allowed out without a muzzle, but a dog that's not been trained to chase, shouldn't be forced to wear a muzzle in my opinion.

Thank you

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 12:32:20 PM

Dear Roger Cook MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I completely support the removal of section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds.

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 8:28:38 AM

Dear Rita Saffioti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support all kind for compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 7:58:25 AM

Dear Jessica Stojkovski MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

As a local Canine Myofunctional Therapist (Dog Massage), I have been fortunate to have seen and treated lots of greyhounds. They are such gentle creatures who deserve so much respect for the horrors they have endured.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From:



Subject:

Muzzling greyhound s

Date:

Wednesday, 31 July 2019 7:39:26 AM

The ignorance of laws to muzzle greyhound originates from the track- an industry of horror abuse and torture .revoke all measures to muzzle greyhounds. Shut down the tracks. Man's greed stupidity & selfishness cause immense pain and suffering to intelligent sentient beings

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an bill to companion greyhounds muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 7:05:17 AM

Dear Reece Whitley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

I have adopted a greyhound recently.. she is a beautiful girl I organise local walks in the communit . We have had no issues with our greys walking in a group or singularly...

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From:



Subject:

Stop muzzling the GREYHOUNDS

Date:

Wednesday, 31 July 2019 1:09:06 AM

To Whom it May Concern:

I am wondering how in the world can you allow your country to be so cruel innocent dogs, let alone use them for your gambling entertainment pleasure? Do any of you people in Australia have a caring heart at all for animals, especially the dogs!!!!

I am writing this email out of loving concern for animals, especially about dogs. I hope that you people will change your ways and start having a loving and caring heart for these "Greyhound dogs". God created these loving creatures for us to love them and to take care of them NOT to be treating them like a piece of TRASH! Greyhounds are harmless they won't bite unless you are bullying them. I hope that you will reconsider in stopping this cruelty and foolishness of treating these animals with abuse, NOW!

Signed an Animal lover,



PS - Your country should also stop killing Koala Bears and Kangaroos, as well!

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 11:21:30 PM

Dear Jessica Shaw MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety.

As a long time greyhound owner, this subject is very close to my heart.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 10:27:08 PM

Dear Roger Cook MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

End these stupid muzzle laws for greyhounds now.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 10:17:42 PM

Dear Stephen Price MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training program.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 9:53:07 PM

Dear Michael Murray MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I have never come across a breed of dog so gentle and so misunderstood because of this one law. It is time to modernise these outdated laws and free the snoot!

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support all kind to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 9:10:27 PM

Dear Paul Papalia MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Greyhounds are wonderful non aggressive pets. I have 2 and they live with my cat. They do not need to be muzzled.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 9:07:10 PM

Dear Paul Papalia MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

From
Karen Gallant 9 boolandy rd golden bay wa6174

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 8:41:19 PM

Dear Michael Murray MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I have worked with 100's of retired racing greyhounds for over 10 years and the outdated muzzle law needs to go. The dogs do not like the muzzles, they constantly try to rub them off and the public view the muzzles negatively which impacts on their chance at rehoming.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 8:04:26 PM

Dear Emily Hamilton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I think the law is outdated and sends the wrong message about greyhounds to the public.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 8:00:23 PM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. My greyhound, Kairo, is kept as a pet. Like other greyhounds in countries all over the world that are muzzle free where there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals, I would like to be able to walk Kairo muzzle free here in WA.
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with the old law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed. My vet nurse owns a greyhound and assesses other dog behaviour, yet my gentle greyhound still has to wear one even if she says he is friendly. Very unfair.
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 7:23:23 PM

Dear Alyssa Hayden MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

As a Greyhound owner myself, this matter has personal interest for me. My Greyhound has passed her green collar assessment and is legally allowed to be in public muzzle free, however as these assessments cost money not every hound has the same freedom as mine.

I sincerely hope our voices are heard and we can #FreeThehounds

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 6:56:08 PM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 6:52:44 PM

Dear Liza Harvey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

These are such gentle dogs and deserve to live out their lives with dignity, not having to wear these terrible muzzles.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 6:51:17 PM

Dear Liza Harvey MP,

: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support all time to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 6:50:00 PM

Dear Peter Watson MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 6:36:11 PM

Dear Elizabeth Mettam MP,
cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I am a greyhound owner and
I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.
I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 6:32:54 PM

Dear De Nahan MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 5:22:28 PM

Dear Benjamin Wyatt MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals. Other breed require muzzles, greyhounds don't.
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose no greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 4:54:06 PM

Dear Yaz Mubarakai MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks.
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 3:47:27 PM

Dear Mark Folkard MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities. It also encourages other dogs to act aggressively towards a muzzled hound, causing stress to the hound.
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

F [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Monday, 20 July 2010 2:10:15 PM

Dani Antonio Roti MD

see **Get and Done** statistics readers.

Personally I have owned and fostered many different dogs for the past 30 years and in that time have been lucky enough to have had a number of greyhounds in my home. I have always found them to be very docile and on the whole, far less reactive than many other dogs breeds. Obviously every dog is different due to it's own personality and life experience however the greyhound as a breed is no more reactive or dangerous than any other breed.

In the past 5 years I have owned 2 greyhounds and fostered a number more. During this time I have had them out in public on an almost daily basis, attended a wide variety of public places and events. Never once has any greyhound in my care shown any signs of aggression or acted in a manner that would be considered threatening or harmful for any member of the public or any other dog.

I will always support responsible dog ownership however compulsory muzzling of one particular breed of dog, when there is no evidence to show that greyhounds are any more dangerous than other dog breeds, just doesn't make good sense.

I will always support responsible dog ownership however compulsory muzzling of one particular breed of dog, when there is no evidence to show that greyhounds are any more dangerous than other dog breeds, just doesn't make good sense.

I cannot the removal of this law for compassion not overheard for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yarrow sincerely

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 2:48:35 PM

Dear Simone McGurk MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme. It is completely outdated and should be abolished.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 12:39:20 PM

Dear David Kelly MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I want to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support bill for compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 11:09:52 AM

Dear Roger Cook MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

My girl Rosie is the most lovable gentle girl. The awful Muzzle inhibits Rosie from playing joyfully with a ball while at the beach or dog park.
Got muzzle caught on another dogs tag while playing which was distressing for both dogs.
Please push for no muzzle for companion greyhounds

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From:



Subject:

Greyhound Muzzle

Date:

Tuesday, 30 July 2019 10:11:36 AM

Please amend the Dog Act to remove misguided, breed-specific language requiring greyhound muzzling.

Thank you



From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 9:57:27 AM

Dear Yaz Mubarakai MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
 2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
 3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
 4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
 5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
 6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
 7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
 8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
 9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety
- I am a young uni student who loves dogs. When they do come on campus and the Greyhound s where muzzles, I feel terrible they aren't scary animals, they are kind and loving pups. They are not aggressive

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 9:33:45 AM

Dear Margaret Quirk MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety.

Any greyhound owner will tell you that they are among the most gentle dog out there.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]
Date: [REDACTED] 1 support for free to companion greyhounds muzzleing
Tuesday, 30 July 2019 8:13:27 AM

Dear Alyssa Hayden MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I have had rescued Greyhounds for 6 years, and have taken them to markets, dog walks, and pet fun days like Hounds Day Out. Not once has any of them showed the slightest aggression to other dogs, and has been happy to have children (even with icecreams!) give them a pat.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 8:54:36 AM

Dear Simon Millman MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

As an owner of a retired rescue greyhound I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 8:01:19 AM

Dear Simone McGurk MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

My personal story is I rescued a beautiful greyhound 3 years ago he's the sweetest most gentle dog I've ever met. We've moved to South Fremantle from QLD in April and love it here but I was horrified to hear that these ridiculous laws apply here!

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From:



Subject:

Time to get involved with the Dog Act and stop mistreating greyhounds. Stop muzzling.

Date:

Tuesday, 30 July 2019 7:35:17 AM

Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android Device

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 6:44:53 AM

Dear John Quigley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.
I have a greyhound
I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support air letter to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 4:34:35 AM

Dear Matthew Hughes MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

We have rescue dogs in our family and they're so friendly, loving and loyal.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From:



Subject:

Please Amend the Dog Act to End Forced Greyhound Muzzling

Date:

Tuesday, 30 July 2019 1:49:18 AM

Good Day,

I am reaching out today to lend my voice to those ask that you amend the Dog Act to remove breed-specific language requiring greyhound muzzling. As a breed, greyhounds are some of the sweetest dogs on earth. The RSPCA and leading veterinarians agree that it's time for state law to stop discriminating against greyhounds. Given the high "wastage" (kill) rate of ex-racing dogs Down Under, everything should be done to promote adoption, including letting people see just how wonderful these dogs are!

Thank you for considering my feedback.



"The animals of the world exist for their own reasons. They were not made for humans any more than black people were made for white, or women created for men."



From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 11:13:45 PM

Dear John Quigley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review.

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 10:15:22 PM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 10:10:51 PM

Dear Rita Saffioti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following

We have had our greyhound for 6 years
In that time we have enjoyed the most fantastic companion who loves everyone both human and furry. She has the most gorgeous personality. My girl does not deserve to be made to wear a muzzle, when there are aggressive dogs and owners who are free to terrorise others on our parks and beaches.
Why should a perfectly safe breed of dog be made to wear a muzzle and in the event of being attacked by another dog unable to protect itself.
It's just another example of how we are letting this beautiful breed of dog down, firstly by permitting the ridiculous so called sport of greyhound racing to continue along with the barbaric practice of sending unwanted dogs over to China.
Please give these gentle dogs the respect and love they deserve at last by ending the compulsory wearing of muzzles, we owe this to them.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 9:39:51 PM

Dear Roger Cook MP,
cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

My family recently lost our beloved greyhounds Livie at just 18 months. She was just a pup when we got her at 7 months, having come straight from a trainer as she failed to chase. My daughter and I took her every week to dog training where she failed terribly to learn or obey most of the commands. By the end of the course she still hadn't mastered 'sit'.

Whilst she may not have learnt what I had planned from dog training, everyone else who attended did. The Chinese couple who were attending with their puppy learnt that large, black dogs don't need to be a cause for fear. On our first morning they couldn't have stayed far enough away from us however by the third class they would rush over with their golden retriever pups to greet us.

Another couple who had just adopted an older shelter dog learnt ways to introduce their new dog to larger dogs without causing him to react aggressively or defensively.

An older lady who attended with her Maltese learnt that my gentle giant could play just as carefully with her precious puppy as any other dog.

The tiny chihuahua pup who was smaller than Liv's head felt the most comfortable around her and would hide between her legs when the other puppies got too crazy for her to handle.

The children who attended with their parents and puppies learnt that just because Liv had to wear a horrible wire mask over her face didn't mean that she was vicious or dangerous or posed a threat to them or their dogs. They learnt that behind that scary mask was the biggest smile you could imagine seeing on a dog who could not have been happier or more grateful to be around friendly, loving people and animals.

Greyhounds do not pose any more of a threat to any person or animal than any other type of dog could. I have fostered many dogs over the years, greyhounds and many other breeds. I have been heavily involved in the fostering / adoption process of many dogs and with different shelter groups. In all my experience I have witnessed one greyhound that could be labeled aggressive. One greyhound who attacked another dog. He attacked another greyhound that had come from the same shelter as him, from Northam, 22 dogs rescued at once. These dogs came down in horrid conditions, thick, tough kennel coat, bald spots all over their thighs, malnourished and fly bitten. They had been in this condition for an extended period of time. The dog attacked over food.

Whilst a dog's breed can attribute to some of their behaviours, it is the dog itself, it's upbringing and it's experiences which will determine if the dog has a higher chance of being aggressive or not.

The agencies who work to home these greyhounds work tirelessly to ensure they are placed in safe, loving homes where they can spend their days. Homes where they aren't going to be starved of food or affection. They work with the families to ensure that each dog is adjusting well to their new home and new way of life and are dedicated to showing off these dogs for the amazing family pet they are. Every effort is made to ensure that any stress, anxiety or behavioural issues any of these dogs may have are worked on and rectified with the support of their team. I don't believe the same can be said for many other dog breeds.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 9:23:23 PM

Dear Robyn Clarke MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I have my own greyhound who lives happily with two cats and a chihuahua! He's the most gentle and lovable boy and I completely trust him with my other pets. Not only does he hate wearing his muzzle he tries to push it of with his paws and finds it very uncomfortable.

I understand that greyhounds are taught to chase but with their right owners and alot of love and patience they can overcome that and happily spend the hours sleeping on the couch as my boy does!

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training programs' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour development
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support bill for compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 8:19:26 PM

Dear Elizabeth Mettam MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: muzzling greyhounds
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 8:18:48 PM

Dear Sirs and Madams,
Please realize that greyhounds do not need to be muzzled in public.....
or anywhere else for that matter. It is inhumane treatment for such loving animals. I have 2
greyhounds myself and can tell you first hand how sweet they really are.
Please eliminate the law that requires then to where this hideous contraption.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]



Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 7:51:55 PM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

My partner and I Foster greyhounds and have fostered many breeds of dog over the years. I find greyhounds to be the most docile and gentle breeds I have ever had the pleasure to have in my company. It's a shame to cage these poor dogs' sweet faces because it's the law when it in fact has no reflection on their behaviour or personality.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 7:51:01 PM

Dear Lisa Baker MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

Do some good please. Support the people.

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 7:50:19 PM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has

114

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 7:12:40 PM

Dear Francis Logan MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW. I have been around dogs all my life and currently own 2 greyhounds they are the friendliest dogs I have ever had and have never shown any aggression. We were recently at Tomatoe Lake in Belmont where there was a meet up of nearly 40 greyhounds which all got along together, no fighting what so ever. This breed is the most gracious dog you could ever meet. All they want to do is please you.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support all bred to companion greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 6:47:51 PM

Dear Lisa Baker MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owners from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety
10. I own a beautiful, gentle, sociable and very affectionate greyhound called Ruby. She has a green collar so doesn't need to wear a muzzle while on a lead, but owned a gorgeous greyhound before her who did need to. Because she hadn't been through a green collar program, by law she was required to wear the muzzle, despite her being a gentle soul living peacefully with two fluffy cats. It's an absurd, archaic law that needs to be abolished.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Discussion

Subject: [REDACTED]

Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 6:36:31 PM

Dear Antonio Krsticevic MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training

Having been brought up around greyhounds with my father being the Secretary of the WA Greyhound Racing Control Board from 1973-mid80s - I was constantly around greyhounds without muzzles, both pets and racers and even as a small child, I never encountered any aggressive behavior from any greyhound. They are a gentle dog, with a soft demeanor.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assessment may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds.

3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law

- 4 The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dog's attributes not its breed.

- 5 As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry.

- C. A. McMillan, *University of Minnesota, 111 Church Street, Minneapolis, MN 55455*; e-mail: cmcmillan@math.umn.edu

8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dog's behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pet's behaviour developments.

- 0 There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions – regardless of breed – for example through higher fines – leads to a reduction in dog bites and increases in community safety.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an ban to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 6:35:14 PM

Dear John Carey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Monday, 29 July 2019 6:29:27 PM

Dear Vincent Catania MP

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

As a primary school teacher I have seen greyhounds being used as therapy dogs and reading companions in schools throughout the world, including in Australia. They are known for their incredibly placid, affectionate and gentle nature. I am now adopting a failed racing greyhound for this reason, as well as to offset the euthanasia of thousands of these dogs who are no longer profitable to the industry.

I am shocked and horrified to realise that WA is one of the few places that requires greyhounds to be muzzled in public, in addition to the requirement that they remain leashed in public. Although I fully support the requirement for dogs to be muzzled when displaying aggressive behaviour, I do not support a blanket breed specific law.

In addition to my personal views, I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds based on the follow evidence:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by a variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 6:01:05 PM

Dear Simone McGurk MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I am a Volunteer for a greyhound rescue organisation, an this law of compulsory muzzling for greyhounds impacts us greatly as potential adopters think that these gentle animals are aggressive and it is so far from the truth.

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 5:25:43 PM

Dear Members of the Legislative Council,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety
10. Legally greyhounds have to be on a leash at all times unlike other breeds. This leaves my girl open to attack from off lead dogs and no way to defend herself with a muzzle on. Happened 3x now.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 4:42:58 PM

Dear Cassandra Rowe MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Having said that I know you are very supportive with The Great Global Greyhound Walk at Tomato Lake and thankyou for your ongoing support with our greys

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 11:00:57 AM

Dear Jessica Stojkowski MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

My family adopted an ex-racing greyhound almost a year ago, and she is the most gentle and affectionate dog we have ever had. However sadly, by law, we have to muzzle her when we take her out for walks. I have noticed that people approaching us on the footpath will quite often cross to the other side of the road, probably thinking she is a dangerous dog because of her muzzle. We often bring her with us to my sons football game at Kingsley oval, and because of her kind and affectionate nature she is often approached by children who want to pat her, who are then quickly pulled away by their parents, no doubt fearing their child is going to be attacked by this vicious muzzled greyhound - when in reality she is anything but vicious, and loves lots of pats and cuddles.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support all time to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 10:14:19 AM

Dear John McGrath MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat and Dog Review](#)
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 8:55:06 AM

Don't muzzle greyhounds. It's not necessary and they have been thru enough

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 8:13:50 AM

Dear Liza Harvey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments.

Thank you very much,

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 7:57:32 AM

Dear Zak Kirkup MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW.

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme.

I support the removal of this law for companion pet greyhounds for the following reasons:

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could be influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

I have had personal experience with greyhounds as pets and they are the most beautiful, friendly, family dogs. Let's leave it to the experts to decide if they are suitable to be rehomed after their racing careers. They are doing a good job now!

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: The Dog Act
Date: Monday, 29 July 2019 4:50:26 AM

Please amend the dog act that requires the muzzling of greyhounds. Thank you.

[REDACTED]

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:



Subject:

Greyhounds

Date:

Monday, 29 July 2019 12:33:17 AM

We have adopted three retired racing greyhounds in the past. They all were sweet and affectionate and gentle. I used to take one to visit my Mom in a nursing home and she made the residents' day. As long as you support the cruel sport of greyhound racing, I would hope you would at least make it easier to promote the adoption of the ex-racers by showing just how sweet and lovable they are. Forced muzzling just sends the opposite message.

[Redacted signature line]

[Redacted signature line]