

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Support air trial to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 7:24:06 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
- I have had my greyhound for almost a year now and I can safely say the only thing he's a danger to is himself. He truly has the sweetest disposition, and he would love to socialise with other dogs, but their owners are scared of him because he looks dangerous. If anything were to impact his attitude, it would be the lack of socialisation he receives. This is an archaic and outdated law, and for the sake of dogs and their owners everywhere, I sincerely hope it gets reconsidered. Thanks for your time, and have a good day.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 7:20:41 AM

---

Dear Antonio Buti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I find it so sad that WA is mostly last in line to realise that times have changed and we need to change with them. Greyhounds are lovely dogs, used and abused for profit by greedy humans. My aunt fosters these poor racing dogs and given enough time, in a safe environment, as we all do, they bloom. By removing the muzzle, adoption rates would increase, giving these innocent beings a second chance at a proper life, rather than being callously discarded when they are no longer making glorious money for their owners. Honestly, who wants to wear a muzzle for the rest of their life because of an antiquated belief system?

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 air tend to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 6:47:16 AM

---

Dear John Quigley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I am a committee member and adoption co-ordinator for Greyhound Adoptions WA. I also own my own greyhound and foster another.

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]

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I fully support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling in WA  
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 6:43:19 AM

---

Dear William Johnston MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my FULL 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 abhorrent and cruel racing industry that the government supports with tax payers money
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 can only 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 owners from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence suggesting 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]

### References

**subjects:**

Subject: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Eider, 2 August 2019 11:53:55 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.

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

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in many countries without the need to muzzle
2. There is no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Other states have removed this law with no repercussions
4. greyhounds are friendly and gentle disposition, it is unfair to keep them muzzled when no evidence supports its necessity
5. Muzzling is impacting adoption opportunities as many dog owners do not want to muzzle their pets

- There is no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds

3. Other states have removed this law with no repercussions

4. greyhounds are friendly and gentle disposition, it is unfair to keep them muzzled when no evidence supports its necessity

5. Muzzling is impacting adoption opportunities as many dog owners do not want to muzzle their pets

For the future of securing these beautiful animals to good homes please remove the muzzling law. Their future is in our hands.

Regards

Regards

11/11/2019

--	--

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 11:18:09 PM

---

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.

Our family were fortunate to have companionship with Jane, our beloved greyhound. We often walked her unmuzzled around the Wellard Village and up through the Wellard Square without any issues. I believe that 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]  
**To:** [Cat and Dog Review](#)  
**Subject:** dog review submission  
**Date:** Friday, 2 August 2019 10:37:39 PM

---

To whom it may concern:

## 1. Muzzling

On the 25 May 2019, my Greyhound, Nifty, training to be my family's assistance dog, was unfortunately bitten (of no fault of his own) by another dog, being a German Sheppard. Nifty is green collard, but received some nasty injuries and a lovely \$200 vet bill.

Nifty lives with two cats and two children (ages 9 and 6 years, who are both Autistic). We had to have Nifty green collared (another crazy, unnecessary steps, only feeding money back into the racing industry, as it is conducted through one organisation only - being Greyhounds As Pets) for the purpose of entering the requirements to be an assistance dog with my training company.

Muzzling Greyhounds is ridiculous. ALL DOGS have the potential to bite, muzzling needs to be individual dog specific over a blanket ruling over one specific breed only. In saying this, if ALL DOGS were required to be muzzled whilst in public, this will then reduce the number of dog bites / attacks etc, however I cannot see this happening due to it being an unfavorable solution by many canine owners. As it already stands, Greyhounds require to be on a lead by law at all times (due to their natural tenancies to run), so a muzzle and a lead is over kill! Muzzles do not make the community any safer, and leave Greyhounds defenseless if they are ever in a situation

Its time for this outdated muzzling law to be abolished. Greyhounds are the most placid, easy going dogs, which are so much like cats - that its crazy! Especially when they like to sleep for about 20 hours a day! Greyhounds are slowly becoming a popular breed as assistance / therapy / support dogs, besides their calm gentle, patient nature, their height is quite favorable in environments, such as retirement villages, hospitals and nursing homes, due to their height (as they can be easily be patted from a wheel chair or bedside).

## 2. Greyhound Export

Exporting of Greyhounds Internationally, needs to also cease. It is not a favorable solution to the racing industries refuse. These gentle creatures deserve more humane treatment than what they currently receive, including very little medical attention, unsatisfactory living conditions and environments, raced and bred excessively to name a few. Once Greyhounds are out of Australia, there are no or sub standard regulations in place compared to Australia, for the animals welfare! What a booming trade that has to be happening in the meat industry in these countries! Which needs to STOP.



I am looking forward to where all animals are no longer Dying for our Entertainment. You  
Bet They Die!

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

**From:**



**Subject:**

The muzzling of Greyhounds

**Date:**

Friday, 2 August 2019 10:12:51 PM

---

I ask that you please stop placing a muzzle on Greyhounds. They are some of the sweetest animals God ever created. This is simply not necessary. It is certainly not necessary.

Thank you,

[Redacted signature block]

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 9:45:41 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

While I have to customize this email I can't think of a better way to put it than the dot points listed  
I hope maybe you'd come along and go meet some greyhounds, worst case you'll get some puppy cuddles and best case real change will happen and you'll see more around :)  
Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Cat and Dog Review](#)  
**Cc:** [D M Martin](#)  
**Subject:** The Dog Act 1976  
**Date:** Friday, 2 August 2019 8:45:05 PM

---

As a concerned dog owner, I respectfully ask that the requirement for all greyhounds to be muzzled in public be removed as well as the requirement to complete a training program.

This breed of dog is not a naturally aggressive breed, as all experts already know, as do the thousands of people who rescued/adopted/fostered greyhounds inclusive of those dogs formerly in the cruel industry of dog racing.

I ask that you display courage, kindness and empathy on behalf of greyhounds and remove the aforementioned from the Dog Act 1976.

Thanks for your consideration.

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 8:37:54 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.

Yours sincerely,  
[REDACTED]

---

This email was sent by Alexis Culley via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Alexis provided an email address ([alexis.culley@hotmail.com](mailto:alexis.culley@hotmail.com)) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alexis Culley at [alexis.culley@hotmail.com](mailto:alexis.culley@hotmail.com).

To learn more about Do Gooder visit <https://us01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https://www.dogooder.co.uk/campaigns/02%7C01%7Ccatanddogreview%40dlgsc.wa.gov.au%7C%0034f9d8db0edbc294108d717463c1d%7Cc1aef0ac2d5044287b6f47caf6d6648d22%7C1%7C0%7C637003462739330719&data=Uw%2BZS2KdoWYIMjBtNlF69XcVcKc9tspN8LOR1qH3o8%3D&reserved=0>  
To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: <https://us01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https://www.rfc-base.org/%2Frfc-3834.html&data=02%7C01%7Ccatanddogreview%40dlgsc.wa.gov.au%7C%0034f9d8db0edbc294108d717463c1d%7Cc1aef0ac2d5044287b6f47caf6d6648d22%7C1%7C0%7C637003462739330719&data=c%2F46B4jXDd2dwpgIIPcY%2Fc23UvryJMAkDRpK4N213TMMf%3D&reserved=0>

Subject:  
Date:

Dear Sean L'Estrange 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 believe it will help to remove the stigma of greyhounds and allow them to be viewed as family pets as they should be.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: A support all time for compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 7:49:48 PM

---

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

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: Friday, 2 August 2019 4:54:35 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:

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

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.

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: [Beldur](#)  
To: [Cat and Dog Review](#)  
Subject: FW: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 3:42:21 PM

---

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

At some point common sense must prevail.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: [REDACTED]  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 3:41:41 PM

---

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

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

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]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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]

From:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Reece Whibly 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]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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 have been privileged to own my beautiful greyhound Grace for over 3 years now and she has the most consistently beautiful temperament towards both humans and other animals. Muzzling makes no sense as an arbitrary requirement and denies responsible owners such as myself to make reasoned and informed decisions based on experience and consistently observed behaviours. Compulsory muzzling often causes stress in other dog owners that are unaware of the requirement rather than specific need, whose fear is then picked up by their dogs as a result, all of which is counter-productive and unfair to all concerned.

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 above (personal) and 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]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Reece Whitty 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 suffer horrifically at the hands of people for the name of racing. Those lucky ones who are able to go on and live a 'normal' life in a family environment should not need to bear the brunt of their past, by being muzzled in public. As a regular to the Baldivis Dog Park, we interact with many greyhounds who are docile giants, not the aggressive, blood thirsty hounds this law makes them out to be.

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]

From:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Reece Whitty 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 community. We have had no issues with our greys walking in a group or singularly...

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



From:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Reece Whitty MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

As an owner of two gentle 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

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 3:13:12 PM

---

Dear Janine Freeman 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 met an aggressive greyhound.

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: Friday, 2 August 2019 3:06:12 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
10. This is an arcade law that should be abolished immediately.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 2:39:00 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 myself have a greyhound is not green collared and wears his muzzle, I find people do not want walk past us and think he is dangerous. Rex is a bosterious boy who loves other dogs, however he also has anxiety issues and as he gets anxious when away from me or in Albee environments I find leaving him with GAP for 3/4 days will make him and me very uneasy.

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: Friday, 2 August 2019 2:11:15 PM

---

Dear Liza Harvey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

Please see the below email regarding 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,

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

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 2:01:05 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

Thank you,

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

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 1:47:10 PM

---

Dear Zak Kirkup MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

My daughter has owned a female rescue greyhound for the past three and a half years and she is the most placid, gentle dog I have come across. She is fantastic with my young grandchildren and is friendly with all people and animals she has met.

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: Friday, 2 August 2019 1:26:37 PM

---

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
10. My comments are based on owning a number of greyhounds (as pets) over a number of years. I wish that ALL dog breeds were as gentle as greyhounds.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 12:10:57 PM

---

Dear Reece Whitby MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

As an owner of two gentle 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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 11:24:17 AM

---

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 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 two greyhounds myself and they have the loveliest temperaments. Forcing them to wear muzzles makes other people scared of my greyhounds when other dogs that do not have to wear muzzles are in fact much more vicious then mine.

Yours sincerely,

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

From:

**[REDACTED]**  
Date:

**[REDACTED]**  
support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Friday, 2 August 2019 10:07:05 AM

---

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:

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

Regards,

**[REDACTED]**

**[REDACTED]**  
**[REDACTED]**

**[REDACTED]**

**[REDACTED]**  
**[REDACTED]**

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 10:05:37 AM

---

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:

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

Thanks,

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

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 9:11:51 AM

---

Dear Reece Whalley 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

At some point common sense must prevail.

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

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support all kind of compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 7:54:14 AM

---

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. Other dogs involved in dog attacks have not been required to wear a muzzle yet still attack! I know this from personal experience yet the greyhound are still required to.
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: Friday, 2 August 2019 7:53:12 AM

---

Dear Roger Cook MP,

Review on Greyhound muzzling laws

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: Friday, 2 August 2019 7:52:19 AM

---

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.

My family and I adore our rescued (emphatically not 'retired') greyhound who is a courteous, friendly, affectionate, excellent example of the gentle disposition of the breed. You would be welcome to meet him if you need convincing!

Mr Kelly, please help free the snouts.

Thank you for the work that you do for the people of Bassendean.

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



From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 7:36:28 AM

---

Dear Peter Katsambanis MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I am a veterinarian and 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 provided veterinary care to greyhounds for 25 years and have never had a need to muzzle one.

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: A support all time for compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 7:30:34 AM

---

Dear Alyssa Hayden MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I am an animal lover with interest in animal welfare and animal rights.

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: Friday, 2 August 2019 7:09:08 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.

Greyhounds are incredibly gentle and sensitive dogs, and don't deserve the indignity of wearing a muzzle. They are the least aggressive, but unfortunately the public can't look past the muzzle and recognise their beautiful nature.

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]

**Subject:**  
**Date:**

Dear Simone McGurk MP

001 Cat and Dog statutory revision

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.

I have fostered greyhounds for the past 4 years, I am also currently foster care coordinator for the largest greyhound rescue in the state. I own 2 greyhounds, both badly mistreated by the racing industry, one of which was rescued from China after years of abuse, despite this, neither of my greyhounds are any sort of danger to the community, nor have any of my fosters been. Dogs of every breed may need to be muzzled, greyhounds included, myself and our rescue group encourages responsible dog ownership and the use of muzzles where necessary.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support all kind of compulsory greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 5:53:29 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
10. During the fostering process it is clear that the current mandatory muzzling has a negative impact on potential forever families. Having my staffy cross rescue stand side by side with a muzzled greyhound that deserves adoption into a loving family is bound by this archaic law just does not make sense.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: I support an end to companion greyhound muzzling  
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 12:43:57 AM

---

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 muzzleless 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: Friday, 2 August 2019 12:32:53 AM

---

Dear Michelle Roberts 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 partner has a beautiful greyhound we rescued. This dog is now part of our family he enjoys his walks and loves socializing he even does a little chatter but when walking he doesn't like the muzzle even goes as far as to push his face against the grass to try get it off! Hes a bit cheeky but everyone he meets loves him and it just gives all greyhounds a bad look when you see a muzzled dog. If an owner finds their dog to not be behaving then that should be their choice to put a muzzle on not just state law for the whole breed.

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]