

---

**FORMAL SUBMISSION  
SENATE REGIONAL, RURAL AFFAIRS  
AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE  
INQUIRY INTO THE NATIONAL  
ANIMAL WELFARE BILL 2003**

<b>Author:</b>	Robert H Bromwich Country Coordinator (Australia)
<b>Organisation</b>	Dogs Deserve Better – NO CHAINS!
<b>Postal Address</b>	PO Box 203 CAPALABA QUEENSLAND 4157
<b>Electronic Mail</b>	<a href="mailto:rhb_community@powerup.com.au">rhb_community@powerup.com.au</a> (Australia) <a href="mailto:info@dogsdeservebetter.com">info@dogsdeservebetter.com</a> (United States)
<b>Web site</b>	<a href="http://www.dogsdeservebetter.com">http://www.dogsdeservebetter.com</a> (International) <a href="http://www.powerup.com.au/~rhb/DDB_files/DDB_Home.htm">http://www.powerup.com.au/~rhb/DDB_files/DDB_Home.htm</a> (Australia)
<b>Telephone</b>	0408 789 356 (Australia) 1.877.636.1408 (United States)

---

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Dogs Deserve Better – NO CHAINS is an international non-profit animal welfare organisation dedicated to the relief of dogs from the tyranny of being continuously chained. The organisation received the ASPCA's 2002 award for the most innovative new organisation.

The organisation established operations during 2002 by Ms Tammy Sneath Grimes and has about eighty representatives in 22 states in the USA plus representatives in Puerto Rico and Australia. The organisation is registered under section 501 c (3) of the Internal Revenue Service taxation code. Dogs Deserve Better Australian office was established during 2003 and is aiming to becoming formally complaint under Corporations Law by April 2005.

The author is available to participate in any hearings that may be scheduled as part of this inquiry.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Executive Summary ..... i  
Introduction..... 1  
Review of Animal Welfare Bill 2003 ..... 2  
Conclusion ..... 3  
Annex A - List of Abbreviations ..... 4  
Websites..... 4

## INTRODUCTION

The issue of animal welfare has evolved over the past 100 years. During the early 1900's, the issue was focussed primarily on the economic and social effects on society rather than being ethically proper with the treatment of animals. During the course of the century, the issue has waxed and waned on the public conscience until the 1960's when an increased effort was undertaken to understand the benefits (other than economic and social) of humane treatment of animals.

Prof Frank Ascione of Utah State University has led this effort, particularly the relationship between animal and other forms of maltreatment. Due to the scope of this submission, this issue will be left aside to avoid confusion and misinterpretation.

Internationally, HUA is conducting a campaign against puppy mills – a term that describes factories or commercial operations that is conducted as a production line of dogs in **at a profit with no regard to the welfare of animals**. Such practices need to cease immediately. Responsible breeders and rescue organisations thoroughly check potential clients for any sort of issue prior to placing any offspring or rescues.

In an Australian context, differing state statutes have facilitated confusion and a wide range of standards for the treatment of animals. A comprehensive national statute, combined with legally enforceable standards will assist in raising the profile of humanely treating animals.

## REVIEW OF ANIMAL WELFARE BILL 2003

The bill provides significant progress on promoting proper animal welfare conduct by organisations and the community. DDBI welcomes the integration

There are several issues of concern relating to particular topics that do not appear in or are not adequately covered in the draft bill. These are:

- **No reference to excessive tethering:** Our experience in the United States indicates strongly that the major issue is the excessive tethering of dogs is a major factor in our callouts for assistance. Express reference on this issue needs to be included to deliver the message that this practice is unacceptable.
- **Lack of imprisonment options:** While welcoming the option for imprisoning offenders, the option of longer imprisonment time needs prompt consideration and implementation. An education program for judicial officers needs implementation in conjunction with these provisions to ensure awareness of the sentencing options that will be available as part of the act.
- **Puppy Mills:** No mention is made of the outlawing of puppy mills. This practice is barbaric, inhumane and cruel to animals and to the families that take in the animals. *DDBI recommends that provisions outlawing puppy mills be incorporated into the bill with fines (minimum \$10,000) and imprisonment (up to 15 years) options listed in the bill.*

## CONCLUSION

The need for a national animal welfare framework has become increasingly important over recent years. The interest of the media in certain cases, particularly in Queensland, has highlighted the inadequacies and diversity of current statutes.

The implementation of a national framework, both statute and regulation, will serve an important purpose – that of harmonising the disparity across state and federal jurisdictions. The framework needs further effort to improve education of the community and funding of enforcement actions, but is a good first step.

## ANNEX A - LIST OF ABBRIVATIONS

ASPCA – American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals

DDBI – Dogs Deserve Better – NO CHAINS International

HUA – Hearts United for Animals

RSPCA – Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Australia

WSPCA – World Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals

## WEBSITES

### DDBI

<http://www.dogsdeservebetter.com> – International site

<http://www.dogsdeservebetter.com/rep.html> - Listing of representatives

### HUA

<http://www.hua.org/> - Main site

<http://www.prisonersofgreed.org/> - Anti puppy mill site

### ASPCA

<http://www.asPCA.org/> - Main site

### RSPCA - Australia

<http://www.rspca.org.au/> - Main site

<http://www.millionpawswalk.com.au/> - Fundraiser event and animal awareness project