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 by 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]

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 by 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: 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 by 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: 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 by 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]

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 by 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]
[redacted]
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.

--
~[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 by 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 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 by 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]

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 by 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,
Aaron Agnew

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
[redacted]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: 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 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. 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 by 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 9:02:50 PM

Dear Dr 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 by 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]

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 by 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 8:21:55 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 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 by 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 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 by 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]

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 by 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 7:52:41 PM

Dear David Honey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

Our own greyhound, Pharaoh, is a gentle soul who is affectionate and placid.

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 by 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 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 by 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]
To: [redacted]

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 by 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 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 by 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 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 by 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]

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

Dear Reece Whitby 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 by 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'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 tima 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 by 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]
[redacted]
Subject: 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 by 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

Amanda Browne
[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 by 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]

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 ware 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 the 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 by 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 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 by 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]

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 by 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 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 by 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]

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 by 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]

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]

From: [redacted]
Subject: I support an end 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 by 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 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 by 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 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 by 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 2:54:21 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 by 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 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 by 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]

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

Dear Jessica Stojkovski MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

I 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 by influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments
9. There is evidence that suggests that legislation that increases the responsibility on all dog owners for their dog's actions, regardless of breed, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Thank you
Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Subject: I support an end to 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 by 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]

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 pat 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 by 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 1:39:11 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

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 attached 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.

[redacted]

Yours sincerely,

[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 then othto 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 by 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 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 by 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 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 by 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]
[redacted]
Cc: Cat and Dog Review
Subject: I 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 by 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]

From: [redacted]
To: Cat and Dog Review
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: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: 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 by 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 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 by 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 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 by 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]

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 by 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]

From: [redacted]
Subject: I support an end 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 by 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 oppurtunity 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]

From: Belinda Stanley
To: Margaret Quirk
Cc: Peter Collier; Alannah MacTiernan; Michael Mischin; Martin Pritchard; Tjorn Sibma; Alison Xamon; Cat and Dog Review
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 10:02:03 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 by 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 9:34:15 AM

Dear Mark Folkard MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

I believe companion greyhounds should be allowed to go 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]

From: [redacted]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 9:20:06 AM

Dear David Honey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

My friend has a greyhound and she is the most gentle dog on this planet, this law is really outdated and unnecessary, please help these gentle creatures and change the 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 by 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 9:10:04 AM

Dear Christopher Tallentire MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals

2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds. These dogs are the calmest dogs I have ever had the pleasure to meet. Any dog has the potential for aggression with incorrect handling so to tar one breed with this bad name is just not fair. The law is from a time where we just didn't understand, please support a change.

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 by 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 7:24:06 AM

Dear Reece Whitby MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals

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

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

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

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

6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities

7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks

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

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

I have had my greyhound for almost a year now and I can safely say the only thing he's a danger to is himself. He truly has the sweetest disposition, and he would love to socialise with other dogs, but their owners are scared of him because he looks dangerous. If anything were to impact his attitude, it would be the lack of socialisation he receives. This is an archaic and outdated law, and for the sake of dogs and their owners everywhere, I sincerely hope it gets reconsidered. Thanks for your time, and have a good day.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

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

Dear Antonio Buti MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals

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

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

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

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

6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities

7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks

8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could by 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 6:50:36 AM

Dear John Quigley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I am a greyhound owner.

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 by 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 6:47:16 AM

Dear John Quigley MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals

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

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

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

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

6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities

7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks

8. The current 'prescribed training program' is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal's behaviour at a certain point in time. It doesn't recognise changes that may occur in a dogs behaviour over time, which could by 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 fully support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling in WA
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 6:43:19 AM

Dear William Johnston MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 9:04:27 AM

Dear Alyssa Hayden MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

I 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 by 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

When I walk my greyhound I often assencounter is two types of people - one group who assume he must be dangerous and avoid us as soon as they see the muzzle, pulling their dogs away as if he were about to attack and a second group who obviously have some experience of greyhounds who stop to stroke him and comment on the unfairness of such lovely dogs being muzzled. Of course I agree that a responsible owner should take steps to make sure a potentially aggressive dog is safe around others and that might include a muzzle, but a blanket enforcement (especially on such a gentle breed) is not the answer.

Regards

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 8:33:27 AM

Dear Roger Cook MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

1.Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals

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

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

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

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

6.Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities

7.There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks

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

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

Kind regards

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 8:29:13 AM

Dear Paul Papalia MP,

Re: 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 by 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: support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 8:27:49 AM

Dear Simone McGurk MP,

Dear,

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 by 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 8:01:15 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
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 by 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's disgusting for dogs to be be muzzled based solely on their breed. As someone who has had multiple dogs of all different breeds including pit bulls, terriers, blue heelers ect. Breed specific legislation is unfair as there is already legislation for dangerous dogs. It's how you raise them, and socialise the animals in the community that's vital, not their breed to automatically discount the breed. People who don't know this law exits may act differently towards the dogs and owners believe the dog is dangerous when in reality the breed is reasoning behind the muzzle.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Saturday, 3 August 2019 7:34:17 AM

Dear Simon Millman 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 by 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 7:33:42 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 by influenced by variety of factors. Its implied assurance may discourage dog owner from ongoing responsibility for their pets behaviour developments

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

As a fellow dog enthusiast, please help abolish this outdated muzzle rule and free the snoots of many a lovely greyhound.
Yours sincerely,
[redacted]