

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Monday, 5 August 2019 6:18:05 AM

Dear Benjamin Wyatt MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry. I have my own rescued greyhound, Bunny as she is as sweet as can be!
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: Repeal Greyhound Muzzles
Date: Monday, 5 August 2019 11:56:56 PM

Repeal this dumb law

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat and Dog Review](#)
Subject: Greyhound Muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 7 August 2019 6:10:08 AM

I am shocked to hear that you would require muzzling in public on such a gentle dog as a greyhound. There must be some people who just hate animals to make such an unjust decision. I suggest you re-assess the people making these decisions & put some people on your decision making board who are more knowledgeable about this breed of dog.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat and Dog Review](#)
Subject: Please. Have a heart.
Date: Wednesday, 7 August 2019 12:38:04 PM

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

As a breed, greyhounds are some of the sweetest dogs on earth. The RSPCA and leading veterinarians agree that it's time for state law to stop discriminating against greyhounds. Given the high "wastage" (kill) rate of ex-racing dogs Down Under, everything should be done to promote adoption, including letting people see just how wonderful these dogs are

[REDACTED]

From:



Subject:

Submission re Feedback on cat and dog laws - Extension approved

Date:

Wednesday, 7 August 2019 12:58:47 PM

Attachments:

[GAWA Dog Act Submission Final.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please find attached the submission to the Cat and Dog Laws review for Greyhound Adoptions and Free the Hounds.

An extension to lodge until today was granted by Julie Knight of your office, please refer to email below.

I understand the submission may be made public. If so, can you please redact my personal mobile number and email provided on the cover letter of this submission.

All other details in this submission are fine to be made public.

Many thanks,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature block]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]
[Redacted line]
[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]
[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]
[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]
[Redacted line]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 4:16:47 PM

Dear Peter Katsambanis MP,

I am writing to you regarding the outdated and ridiculous law that requires greyhounds to be muzzled in public.

Over the last 18 months, I have had the honour of sharing my life, love and home with greyhounds. I have fostered, rehabilitated and rehomed 14 in total. Greyhounds are a patient, gentle, sensitive, intelligent, lazy breed. I am yet to meet one that is 'aggressive' or 'dangerous'. Considering the conditions involving confinement, exploitation and abuse that they experience being born into a life of racing, they are incredibly resilient, adaptable and friendly. As a breed, they should NOT be punished in their retirement for the exploitation and instinct that the racing industry has cruelly enforced on them.

Mandatory muzzling of greyhounds adds to the unfair discrimination of their breed, is detrimental to their socialisation with humans and other dogs, renders them defenceless and vulnerable to attacks from other dogs, deters people from rescuing/adopting them, and promotes unnecessary fear amongst the public. Other states have phased it out. WA needs to get with the times.

I currently have a greyhound companion named Cleo, who is the most gentle girl I have ever come across. She cuddles up next to cats, let's rabbits jump all over her, loves babies and children, and her best friends are you poodles. I refuse to muzzle her. She is not a danger to the community. She is an ambassador for retired greyhounds everyday when we are stopped by the public and asked questions. She is adored by everyone she meets. I am yet to meet any member of the public that has agreed with the mandatory muzzling of greyhounds after meeting one.

Please consider the applications of the public and help us to help our beautiful hounds. It would honestly mean so much for WA to take a stand for greyhounds and the people who love them so dearly.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Kind regards,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 4:20:18 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 have fostered many greyhounds and have never had any bad experiences with them, despite the way they may have been treated. They are such docile, gentle loving animals, who have so much love to give.

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: Sunday, 4 August 2019 4:29:40 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]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 4:32:34 PM

Dear Emily Hamilton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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 ban to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 6:28:10 PM

Dear Jessica Shaw MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

I know quite a few people who have taken rejected greyhounds who were going to be put down. They are the most placid, gentle dogs you could come across. They are so thankful for some love and kindness.

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: Sunday, 4 August 2019 6:52:56 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 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 three greyhound grandchildren, they are gentle dogs.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 6:57:20 PM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

I strongly support the change to the legislation to remove the requirement for muzzling of greyhounds in public.

The laws are antiquated, obsolete and completely unnecessary. The greyhound is the most gentle, loving and beautiful breed of dog, who are subjected to terrible treatment from the racing industry, yet emerge from this (if they emerge) loving, loyal and gentle.

My three greyhound girls Misty, Leah and Hope are beautiful creatures. For example Hope has been rescued from Macau, and she is still such a loving girl, even after the hell that she went through over there.

I look forward to the laws being updated to reflect the reality of the greyhound breed.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 6:59:00 PM

Dear Amber-Jade Sanderson MP,

Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 7:38:31 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[Animals Australia submission WA Dog and Cat Act review \(Muzzling of GHs\) 4 Aug 2019.pdf](#)

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find our submission attached.

Please contact me if you require clarification or further input.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From:

[REDACTED]

Dear Review Team,

Please find attached a submission to the above review. I consent to my submission being made public, but not my private email address or mobile number.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 8:32:26 PM

Dear David Kelly MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 8:41:35 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.

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

Due to the outdated muzzling laws greyhounds are getting a bad reputation that's completely unwarranted. Greyhounds are gentle dogs and pose no greater risk to the public than other breeds of dogs and should not have to be muzzled.

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: Sunday, 4 August 2019 8:49:33 PM

Dear Antonio Krsticevic MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training 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. I have recently adopted a greyhound and she is a beautiful girl. A real "couch potato" docile and a great disposition. So sad that I have to put a muzzle on her when we go walking.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 9:07:23 PM

Dear Jessica Shaw MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Cat and Dog Industry Review
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 9:19:55 PM

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the review of the Dog Amendment Act 2013.

I am writing on behalf of GreyhoundAngels of WA Inc., which is a volunteer run organisation that has been dedicated to the rescue and rehoming of greyhounds for the past 20 years.

As an organisation involved in greyhound welfare, we are limiting our comments to the current requirement that greyhounds be muzzled when on lead in public, unless they have undertaken a prescribed training program. In respect of the consultation paper, comparisons with requirements in other states regarding greyhound muzzling need to be updated to reflect recent changes in other state laws. For example, NSW has new requirements whereby greyhounds registered as pets are no longer required to wear a muzzle when on lead in public. And Tasmania allows greyhounds to be muzzle free on lead in public if the greyhound has passed a training program.

In regard to the current muzzle exemption for WA greyhounds who have successfully undertaken a prescribed training program, allocation of the Green Collar which indicates a greyhound has a muzzle exemption, is based on a behavioural assessment by Greyhounds as Pets. This assessment could not be considered a prescribed training program as presently suggested under the Act, as no training is actually undertaken during the assessment. If an exemption process is going to be continued, which GreyhoundAngels does not consider is required, then this provision needs to be more accurately described in the Act.

GreyhoundAngels has rehomed a significant number of retired racing greyhounds since its inception, and is one of the longest running greyhound rescue groups in Australia. The greyhounds coming into our care have come from a diverse range of training backgrounds; racing experiences; different state origins; and ages; and as a group have proven that racing greyhounds transition remarkably easily to their new life post racing, making great pets.

This extensive experience has clearly shown that greyhounds have no more propensity for on-lead aggression than other dog breeds, and so should not be discriminated against as currently occurs with the greyhound muzzling requirement under the Dog Act.

The current requirement does nothing to improve the safety of the public, and also gives people who are unfamiliar with the breed, the incorrect impression that greyhounds are vicious. This is far from the truth and so has an indirect, negative impact on the rehoming of greyhounds. This is counter productive to the Government's desire to ensure that racing greyhounds have a life after racing, and are not unnecessarily euthanased, as has happened in the past.

GreyhoundAngels is therefore strongly advocating that greyhounds should not be required to wear a muzzle when being walked on lead in public unless, in the very unlikely circumstance, one is declared a dangerous dog, as applies to other dogs under the Dog Act.

GreyhoundAngels looks forward to WA joining with other states to change the law so as to ensure that greyhounds can enjoy the same freedoms as other pet dogs in the community.

Thank you again for seeking community input into this review.

[REDACTED]

Results

Dear Stephen Price MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme. This will allow them to have a happier life without restrictions.

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,

[illegible]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 11:17:39 PM

Dear Dean Nalder MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

My daughters have fostered at least five greyhounds, one has been adopted, and all are the most gentle and laid back animals. They have all interacted easily with my own Labrador dog and no greyhound I have seen has ever posed any threat or danger to people or other dogs.

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. It is time for WA to align with other states that have removed the requirement to muzzle these dogs.

Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat and Dog Review](#)
Subject: Muzzling of Greyhounds Submission
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 3:10:58 PM

To Whom It may Concern

I am writing to support the removal of muzzles in rehomed and pet greyhounds. The blanket requirement of wearing a muzzle by these dogs is not scientifically based and does not likely reduce incidents of dog bites/attacks.

Any dog of any breed can bite given the right circumstances and although muzzles are useful in this animals they do not provide absolute safety. Any dog that is required to wear a muzzle to manage his/her behaviour would likely be able to be deemed a declared dangerous dog. A muzzle can then alert others to the dangerousness of the dog and the requirement for space around this dog.

Muzzle wearing should make the public notice the dog as one not to be approached.

I am happy to comment further and give future advice to any interested parties.

All the best,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support all end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 3:16:12 PM

Dear Francis Logan MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

As someone with years of personal experience with adopted ex-racing 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: Sunday, 4 August 2019 3:26:21 PM

Dear Benjamin Wyatt MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 3:34:59 PM

Dear David Templeman MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support in removing the requirement of pet Greyhounds to wear muzzles in public. As someone who has had their dog attacked by another dog which was loose in Mandurah, I don't see how muzzling specifically Greyhounds makes the public more safe. It is not muzzling, it's responsible ownership that keeps dogs from attacking others. An irresponsible owner would not even put on a muzzle even if it was required.

As per the facts from Fee The Hounds, an organization who specialize in Greyhounds:

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

There is much to be done for Greyhounds in Australia, but starting with removing the requirement to be muzzled starts the journey to changing the public perception of Greyhounds in the community.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 3:38:34 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.
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 3:49:38 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 own a greyhound, she is the sweetest most loving animal, to both humans and other animals alike. I feel like a monster putting the muzzle on her when we go out, just seeing it stresses her out and takes her usual happiness and excitement from her, leaving her almost catatonic on our walks. Out of all the dog breeds why is it only greyhounds that are forced to muzzle up in public??

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 hope you consider helping remove this law. Spend some time with a few greyhounds and you will see all the proof you need that this rule breed wide is ridiculous.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From:

Subject:

Date:

Greyhound Legislation

Sunday, 4 August 2019 3:59:29 PM

Muzzling Greyhounds

Over the last 15 years I have been adopting greyhounds and I currently own my fifth and sixth, one male and one female. Throughout the 15 years none of my greyhounds have displayed aggressive tendencies, and none have worn a muzzle in public.

Fortunately, living in the Belmont Shire, I have developed a good relationship with the local rangers and have never been cautioned or asked to muzzle any of my dogs.

Greyhounds are not trained with live bait in Western Australia and are NOT a dangerous breed.

I firmly believe that greyhound laws in Western Australia are vastly outdated, and I would like the requirement for muzzling to be cancelled.

Leashes and Walking Greyhounds

I always keep my greyhounds on a leash in public, even in "off leash" situations, because if one decided to run off I would have zero chance of catching it. I like to use the term "let common sense prevail".

At one stage I owned three greyhounds and I used to always walk them together. It is only in the last few weeks that I learnt that it is against the law for one person to walk three greyhounds together. I was shocked that such a ridiculous law existed and I would like this requirement also to be cancelled.

Green Collar Assessment

This is a nonsense requirement and a farcical assessment conducted by "Greyhounds As Pets" (GAP) which is funded by Racing and Wagering WA.

I recently applied to adopt a greyhound from GAP and was told during my interview on 1 July that the dog I was interested in was “green collar qualified” but that during the 28 day probation period the dog would be required to wear a muzzle in public areas, then once I adopted the animal, the green collar would be issued. I queried this several times during the interview and was given no explanation of why the dog was “green collar qualified” before probation, but not “green collar qualified” during probation, and then “green collar qualified” after probation. The only explanation staff could offer was that while the dog was “owned” by GAP, they could be held accountable if the dog was not muzzled in public during the probation period. I was eventually told that I couldn’t have the dog, and I was asked to leave the premises.

In an attempt to clarify this strange “qualification” process, I emailed Racing and Wagering WA. They told me that the 28 day probation period formed part of the “green collar qualification” training process. However, at no point did they even try to explain how 28 days of wearing a muzzle would or could provide any “training” or “reinforcement” for the dog.

Meanwhile, “non GAP greyhounds” can be “green collar qualified” during a four day/four night assessment program at GAP. If the dog is successfully “qualified” they are issued with a “green collar” immediately and there is no probation period – which begs the question: why does a “GAP greyhound” need a 28 day probation period of muzzling to reinforce the “training/assessment”?

Summary

1. Abolish muzzling requirements for greyhounds
2. Abolish the law stating that three greyhounds cannot be walked by one person
3. Abolish the “green collar” requirement for greyhounds

Regards





Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 4:07:24 PM

Dear Rita Saffioti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

In addition to this my two muzzled greyhounds were attacked by an off leash mixed breed dog and received injuries and lacerations, and I was bitten too. My greyhounds could do nothing to stop this attack. But this dog, obviously dangerous does not have to be muzzled?

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 1:03:09 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 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 volunteered with animal rescue for almost 10 years in WA now.

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

From:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 2:06:52 PM

Dear John McGrath MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

These dogs are just like other breeds and should be treated with the same rights as those breeds that do not have to wear muzzles. Please allow Greyhounds to live a muzzle free life.

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]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 2:19:04 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

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to greyhound racing and all animal cruelty!!
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 2:32:19 PM

Dear Benjamin Wyatt MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Regards

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 2:39:06 PM

Dear John Carey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

Yours sincerely,

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

(S)

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 3:03:48 PM

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.

I do not own a greyhound but am looking too based on their suitability as a family pet. I am keeping the below reasons added in the email as they are true and very worth considering:

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: Sunday, 4 August 2019 8:40:11 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.

Blanket muzzling of greyhounds sends an incorrect message that they are a dangerous breed, which negatively impacts their chances of being adopted.

So, 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: end compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 9:31:21 AM

Dear Lisa Baker MP,

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

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

Yours sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 9:41:26 AM

Dear Benjamin Wyatt MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go muzzle free in public without the requirement to complete a training programme. My Greyhound Jacko is the embodiment of a sweet, loving and gentle breed. Before I had him assessed for his green collar, I hated the perception that was given when going out in a muzzle. We need to do more for this breed, and if we can't (yet) outlaw dog racing, we can at least change the perception these muzzles give off.

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: Please end compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 9:58:59 AM

Dear William Johnston MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

It is time to end the compulsory muzzling of 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.

It is time to recognise greyhounds for the beautiful breed they are and get rid of these outdated laws.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 10:10:59 AM

Dear Lisa O'Malley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I am writing to 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: Sunday, 4 August 2019 10:21:10 AM

Dear Matthew Hughes MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 11:28:17 AM

Dear Alyssa Hayden MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

Please get rid of the compulsory muzzling laws. Greyhounds are gentle natured dogs, as a breed they should not all be impacted by laws designed for the cruel greyhound racing industry.

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: Sunday, 4 August 2019 11:41:39 AM

Dear Simon Millman MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

I have a greyhound and he is a gentle, kind and sweet dog who wouldn't hurt a fly. He lives at home with our cat and they get along very well.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Support air force to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 12:36:33 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.

This seems ridiculous when the usual offenders are not grey hounds but other fighting breeds ect. Perhaps it's time for a review.

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: Sunday, 4 August 2019 12:44:01 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

Please stop this silly law.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support air-raid to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 10:12:51 AM

Dear Margaret Quirk MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

On personal note, I unfortunately had a recent experience with another dog of a different breed not required by law to be muzzled. I was walking my greyhound, Gertie, at our local park early in the morning, as per our usual routine. Given that she never had proper opportunity to socialise with other dogs before us adopting her, I have worked really hard to responsibly encourage more socially acceptable behaviour (both by human and dog standards).

When Gertie sees another dog on our morning walk, she just wants to go meet them and say hello. I understand that a loud large black dog with a muzzle can seem a bit scary to some. For the first couple of months, I myself, had even mistaken her overzealous playfulness for aggression. So on our walks, I have trained her to focus on me and when we see other dogs just trying to enjoy their walk, to stand next to me and wait patiently and let them pass before we continue. Gertie has done really well to learn this and many other things I expect of her, such as playing nicely with other dogs when she has the opportunity to do so, and I'm very proud of her progress.

This particular experience, she complied with my usual request of her to stay next to me patiently. The other dog was very aggressive and was pulling against its owner to move directly at Gertie. Unfortunately, this other dog was too strong for his owner, and she could not hold him back. Before I knew it, the initial space we had created to let them pass was closed very rapidly and this dog lunged at Gertie before I could react accordingly, as I had put too much trust in the other owner to gain control of her dog.

Gertie's muzzle may prevent her from her hurting other dogs or people (even though she presents no risk), but it does not prevent another dog from doing serious damage to her. In this case, that's what happened. She was attacked, and because of the muzzle, she couldn't at the very least, defend herself. The exchange was so quick and it was quite dark so I didn't realise how bad it was. When we managed to get into some light, I realised that her mouth and gums were badly cut and her canine tooth was ripped outwards and sideways. Not only pulling her tooth mostly out, but also fracturing her jaw. By the time I realised what had happened, the other dog and owner were already gone and out of sight.

Gertie immediately had to go into surgery. After a long day at the vet and \$1200 later, she had become very timid and very unsure of herself, especially when around other dogs. This was so disheartening given her exemplary progress adjusting to domestic life.

I say it is completely unfair that, because there is no mandatory muzzling for other dogs, other owners don't feel they need to be responsible and muzzle their dogs when they exhibit aggressive or undesirable behaviour. This lady obviously felt that it wasn't necessary despite having a clearly aggressive dog that she barely has the strength to control. Her lack of judgement and no care to check if we were okay had cost me \$1200, but most importantly, set Gertie back in her progress and confidence.

I am in support of using muzzles in a case by case basis, and it is the owner's responsibility to recognise certain behaviour and make use of one. I also believe that they make effective training tools when teaching a dog to exhibit more socially acceptable behaviour. If there is a way to effectively enforce and police this, I'm all for it.

What I don't support is to single out a particular breed and muzzle them by default based on no real evidence.

Yes, given the history of greyhounds being used as sighthounds for hunting and for racing, they have a high prey drive. But other breeds that have been used as guard dogs, or even war/attack dogs aren't required by law to wear a muzzle. Even small terriers, that have a history of being used as alarm dogs, can become very aggressive and cause significant injury if not trained. Yet, they are not required to wear a muzzle either. I believe mandatory muzzling of any particular breed is unjust.

I implore you to take all of this into consideration in the review of the Act. Thank you for taking the time to read my very long email and to understand my personal story.

Best regards,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 10:41:11 AM

Dear John Carey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me if you'd like any more information.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 10:49:14 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. I've only ever experienced smaller "safe" dogs being vicious and attacking other dogs.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 10:52:07 AM

Dear Mark McGowan MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review
As an owner of 2 rescue greyhounds i strongly support the below.
It is unfair on these animals to have to wear a facemask in public.
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]

Discussion

I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Saturday, 3 August 2019 10:52:38 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.

I have many friends and family members that own these beautiful creatures and I have never come across a greyhound that has not need a lovely, placid and gentle creature. The muzzling law is definitely unnecessary and outdated.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

██████████

From:



Subject:

Muzzles on Greyhounds

Date:

Saturday, 3 August 2019 11:23:44 AM

It is time the government and all those who advocate the muzzling of greyhounds grew up and realised that just because they are scared of ALL dogs that is no excuse for forcibly muzzling greyhounds. They are NOT dangerous when the racing days are over. There are only bad owners not dogs !.

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 11:36:49 AM

Dear Members of the Legislative Council,

Dear Libby,
cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I am writing to you to express our 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 all you do for our local community.

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 11:41:32 AM

Dear Michelle Roberts MP,

Please take a moment to consider the following points regarding muzzling greyhounds in public. It is of my opinion that this would encourage more greyhound adoptions which is so important.

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 11:54:33 AM

Dear Christopher Tallentire MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

As a greyhound owner through adoption.

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: Saturday, 3 August 2019 12:04:40 PM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in ACT, Victoria and NSW. I have fostered many rescued greyhounds and only know them to be lazy, gentle, docile happy dogs despite their awful racing experiences.

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]

Subject:

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Further to this, I have owned a rescue greyhound which I kept muzzled and on a lead while out walking. He was one of the most placid animals I have ever owned and mainly they just want to sleep all day in the sun or on a couch.

Unfortunately, he was attacked by another dog that was off-leash and due to his muzzle being on, he was unable to defend himself and has since past on due to this attack. I do believe that if the muzzle was off that both these dogs could have walked away from the attack rather than me having to lose a friend because of an outdated law.

I do hope you can express my support for this change.

Thankyou and enjoy your day.

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 2:13:35 PM

Dear Lisa Baker MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

Greyhounds are beautiful gentle dogs. I have never felt unsafe around a greyhound ever. There are loads of them down at Riverside gardens and the most dangerous thing is when they lean on you, they put their whole body weight against you which is actually quite adorable. I have friends who own greyhounds and meet new ones all the time, no one has ever said no you can't put my dog he'll bite you! The law is ridiculous and should be abolished, it shouldn't be breed specific, dangerous dogs need muzzles not beautiful gentle greyhounds.

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support all time for compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 2:19:44 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 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. Wise up the lot of you. Open your eyes!

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 2:21:16 PM

Dear Jessica Stojkovic 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]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 2:25:16 PM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 2:56:21 PM

Dear David Honey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I have a friend with a greyhound who has a few cats and the greyhound is so well behaved around them, I was so surprised when I found out that there was a greyhound and 2 cats living together, but they are the best of friends, it is amazing to see them interact with each other. Please consider changing this law.

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 3:08:14 PM

Dear John Quigley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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: Saturday, 3 August 2019 3:17:05 PM

Dear Reece Whitby MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review please.

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support all kind to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 3:29:18 PM

Dear Amber-Jade Sanderson MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 3:31:59 PM

Dear Lisa O'Malley 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 wholeheartedly support the removal of the flawed legislature for the following reasons.

The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds. I have interacted with many greyhounds in public and each of them were calm and had their enjoyment of public amenities hindered because of an unnecessary muzzle. There are many breeds that have aggressive natures and have displayed threatening behaviour to myself and my pet, yet they are not legally required to wear a muzzle in public. This law is causing a stigma surrounding the breed and is, quite frankly, unwarranted.

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

There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks. All that is occurring is a rise in the power of the disgusting greyhound racing industry, higher abandonment rates when the dogs fail to win races and lower adoption opportunities because the breed, one with an extremely friendly disposition, has been stigmatised and made to seem aggressive. Please, stand up for what is right. Remove the greyhound muzzle law.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 3:48:56 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

Please end this archaic law.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 4:15:52 PM

Dear John Quigley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

There have been numerous accounts of muzzled greyhounds being attacked by other dogs and being unable to defend themselves, suffering severe injuries. They have been bred to death and run to the ground to support gambling habits. Please allow them to be un muzzled for their final years

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 4:22:30 PM

Dear Antonio Buti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I have met many greyhounds in my line of work, and not one has been in anyway aggressive towards the small animals I have, and that is why I disagree with this muzzling law.

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 4:26:13 PM

Dear Mark Folkard MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

I've fostered several greyhounds & owned a very gentle, sensitive, loving & friendly boy for 4 years. He shared his home & bed with a small dog & had the best temperament of any dog I've met, ever. We had to say goodbye to him recently due to old age & illness - It's really unfair that he had to remain muzzled when out in public, as the least likely dog I've known to attack a person or any other animal.

If temperament was based on breed I could think of several other breeds that should be muzzled before a greyhound.
Please review this archaic law!

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: Saturday, 3 August 2019 4:39:48 PM

Dear William Marmion MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

My family has greyhounds and I have grown up with them, I couldn't imagine my life without them, but I think it is really unfair that they have to wear the muzzle because it makes other people who don't know the breed think they are aggressive and it is far from the truth, the dogs have such a bad rap because they have to wear the muzzle which they don't need.

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: Saturday, 3 August 2019 4:44:58 PM

Dear Zak Kirkup MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Please fight to change muzzling in WA

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 5:08:46 PM

Dear Donald Punch MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Kind regards

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

Discussion

FROM: [REDACTED]

Subject: I've been bitten three different dogs...
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 5:23:19 PM

Dear Roger Cook MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

... and not one of them was a greyhound, despite spending much time around them.

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 5:45:26 PM

Dear Reece Whalley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I would love to first let you know about my greyhound named Rusty. He is an ex-racing greyhound that my partner and I adopted last year. He is such a gentle soul, he leans on anybody that pets him and has never even nipped at another living thing. One look into Rusty's big doe-eyes and you feel the love and affection he wants to give, like every other greyhound.

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 6:51:56 PM

Dear David Michael 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 that it is unnecessary to continue to maintain the current regulations and support the removal of muzzles for greyhounds.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 7:17:15 PM

Dear Mark McGowan 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 lovely dogs and don't need muzzles, it's 2019 now and times have changed. I've met lovely greyhounds and they don't need this.

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: Saturday, 3 August 2019 7:32:19 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 have two adopted greyhounds who are very sweet and gentle and of no danger to anyone. We also have a cat and they couldn't care less about her.

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: Saturday, 3 August 2019 7:40:14 PM

Dear David Michael MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
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: Saturday, 3 August 2019 7:54:15 PM

Dear Jessica Shaw MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

Please consider the following points as reasons not to remove the law against greyhounds

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support all kind for compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 8:20:24 PM

Dear Peter Tinley 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.i have 2 greyhounds and they are harmless they live with cats and ferrets and no bites at all I believe greyhounds are better pets than the small dogs they are the ones you have to watch out for
2. 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
3. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
4. 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
5. 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
6. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
7. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
8. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
9. 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
10. 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:

Dear Jessica Shaw MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

I became the lucky adoptee of my greyhound, Boots on March 16, 2019.

He has been the best thing to happen to this family. I have anxiety and my daughter ASD and Anxiety. Boots is medicine for us both. But i cannot take him out like other dogs and this isn't fair.

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 signature block]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 8:25:40 PM

Dear Antonio Krsticevic MP,

cc- Cat and Dog statutory review

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

We have many greyhounds in our area and they are always calm and well behaved when interacting with my dog.

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: Saturday, 3 August 2019 9:02:50 PM

Dear De Nahan MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Saturday, 3 August 2019 9:13:57 PM

Dear Roger Cook MP

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free as 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. There are many dogs in the community that due to behavioural issues SHOULD be muzzled but as they are not greyhounds there is no legislation to do so.
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry. Most greyhounds are much better at sleeping than terrorising other dogs or people.
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities. Plus, other dogs do not react well to muzzles, often making them aggressive to greyhounds.
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,

[illegible]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 9:14:20 PM

Dear Kevin Michel MP,

We cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: A support all-into to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 9:43:35 PM

Dear Emily Hamilton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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 fostered twelve greyhounds and they have all been lovely dogs. I would love to see the option for owners to decide whether their greyhounds should be muzzled or not.

Many thanks for your time and hope to hear the outcome soon.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 9:52:06 PM

Dear Dean Nalder 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 - this includes my homeland Sweden - 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:



Subject:

please end forced muzzling of greyhounds

Date:

Saturday, 3 August 2019 10:43:27 PM

As a breed, greyhounds are some of the sweetest dogs on earth. The RSPCA and leading veterinarians agree that it's time for state law to stop discriminating against greyhounds. Given the high "wastage" (kill) rate of ex-racing dogs Down Under, everything should be done to promote adoption, including letting people see just how wonderful these dogs are.

Please remove misguided, breed-specific language requiring greyhound muzzling.



From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 11:38:26 PM

Dear Rita Saffioti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I'm certain you'll have seen a lot of these, and to be honest I see no need to alter the below as I believe the points made are valid. However I would like to say that as a dog owner and lover, it is never the dog that is the problem. It's the owner. Please consider our request to remove the muzzle.

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: Sunday, 4 August 2019 2:27:55 AM

Dear John Quigley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Greyhounds deserve to be treated like every other dog. My greyhound Noah was very shy when we first got him, now he's very open and playful. He loves to go on walks but hates his muzzle, help him enjoy the beautiful WA scenery.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 6:47:15 AM

Dear Alyssa Hayden MP,

We 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: Sunday, 4 August 2019 8:04:50 AM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

We are the proud owners of a beautiful greyhound, who is kind and gentle. When we go for walks, putting on the muzzle is never fun as we can see his discomfort.

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: Sunday, 4 August 2019 8:29:55 AM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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 myself rescue and will continue rescuing greyhounds as Will continue to fight this ridiculous law

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Sunday, 4 August 2019 8:36:55 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:

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.

As an owner of 2 greyhounds I can attest to them being in no way a dangerous dog and would argue that there are far more aggressive breeds that would warrant compulsory muzzling before a greyhound would ever enter consideration.

Yours sincerely,

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