

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: End forced muzzling of greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:59:26 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 amend the Dog Act to remove misguided, breed-specific language requiring greyhound muzzling.

Thank You/

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:58:51 PM

Please stop muzzling retired greyhounds they don't deserve this kind.of treatment. Thought better of your country

From: 
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Muzzling of Greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:58:32 PM

Please stop the practice of muzzling the Greyhounds. They are sweet, intelligent dogs that go through enough abuse, and don't need to be treated so cruelly.

Thank you!

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:58:15 PM

Stop muzzling adopted greyhounds. Didn't they suffer enough racing? It is really disgusting what people do to animals all over the world and how the governments allow it. It is very disturbing that you won't let these beautiful animals enjoy their lives. Please end this persecution now. They are not vicious and should not have to wear muzzles when they finally have a loving home. Thank you for doing the right thing. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: End muzzling of greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:57:51 PM

End the wearing muzzling for greyhounds

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Please end greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:57:51 PM

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: muzzling greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:57:26 PM

Please end the law that requires Greyhounds to be muzzled in public. This implies that they are aggressive dogs and instills fear in people.

They are by nature a gentle dog. Thank you. [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Stop muzzling Greyhounds!
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:57:23 PM

Please stop muzzling these amazing animals. They are not mean and are very docile dogs. Have a heart and do the right thing for these dogs who have been through so much already.



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: PLEASE HELP!
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:56:59 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.!



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Remove BSL language requiring greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:56:53 PM

Good afternoon,

I am writing to ask you to do the right thing and amend the Dog Act to remove misguided, breed-specific language requiring greyhound muzzling.

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

Thank you for your attention on this important issue.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Greyhound muzzles REMOVE
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:56:51 PM

Attn Sir / Madame please Remove greyhound muzzle mandate. How uncomfortable they must be. Have you heard of a greyhound causing distress to other animals? They basically keep to them selves and are gentle dogs by nature.

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Grey Hound Muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:56:29 PM

Dear sir/ Madam - Please amend the Dog Act to remove misguided, breed-specific language requiring greyhound muzzling.- thank you [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:56:10 PM

Stop muzzling these animals! It's just abuse and it needs to stop

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: End muzzling of greyhounds.
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:56:00 PM

Racing greyhounds face horrific conditions so ending muzzling will at least mitigate their discomfort.
Please help.

Thank you
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Muzzling greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:55:49 PM

I am writing to provide input on the Dog Amendment Act 2013, which is currently under review. Please act humanely and update this outdated Act.

A few points I'd like to make:

There is no evidence to suggest that the compulsory muzzling of greyhounds provides any benefit to the community nor makes the community safer

Western Australia's Dog Act is outdated and lagging behind the majority of other states who have already removed this requirement

Globally, Northern Ireland is the only other country in the world that has compulsory muzzling laws

Both the RSPCA and Australian Veterinary Association support the removal of compulsory muzzling laws

The WA racing industry regulator, RWWA has also indicated they support the removal of this law

There is no evidence to suggest that by changing this law there would be any increase in incidents involving greyhounds

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:55:46 PM

Please look after these sweet dogs. They dont need muzzling and its cruel and unnecessary. Just stop enforcing this unnecessary stuff



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Free greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:55:40 PM

Please pass law to end greyhound racing and muzzling. This is horrible!

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: end greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:55:26 PM

I am asking officials to amend the Dog Act to remove misguided, breed-specific language requiring greyhound muzzling.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Stop muzzling greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:55:20 PM

My dog gets so scared if we muzzle her for doctor visits so I no longer do it. Please change your law muzzles are unneeded in most cases.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Stop greyhound muzzling please!
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:55:05 PM

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Please end muzzling of greyhound dogs
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:54:01 PM

WA Authorities:

Please end the law that requires that greyhound dogs be muzzled, because they are gentle dogs and there is no need to muzzle them.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: amend the Dog Act
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:53:56 PM

I am asking you to amend the Dog Act to remove misguided, breed-specific language requiring greyhound muzzling.

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

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:53:53 PM

Please amend the legislation that requires greyhounds to be muzzled in public
Many thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:53:26 PM

I think requiring greyhound dogs to be muzzled while in public is wrong and I am asking you to drop this requirement altogether.

Thank you

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:53:22 PM

Please treat these animals with the love, care, & respect you would want your own flesh & blood to be treated with!

No muzzles!

[REDACTED]


From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Animal cruelty.
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:52:58 PM

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

Thank you.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: 
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:52:36 PM

Stop greyhound muzzling!!! Juliet

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: PLEASE STOP MUZZLING GREYHOUND DOGS
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:52:36 PM


Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:52:31 PM

Is this how you send your time, finding ways to torture animals. This is totally ridiculous and unwarranted and this needs to end now. Perhaps you would like to be muzzled in public, seems to me that is a great idea.

--

[REDACTED]

From: 
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Please stop muzzling greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:52:00 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.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Greyhound
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:51:35 PM

End forcing greyhound please
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Remove Greyhounds from Muzzling Requirement
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:51:13 PM

Greetings:

I am writing to urge you to remove Greyhounds from muzzling requirements. Greyhounds are not vicious or biters by nature and especially considering that many of them have led confined and sad lives in the racing industry, it is unfair to impose this restriction on them.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Muzzled Grey Hounds - The Injustice of the Innocent & Voiceless!
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:50:48 PM

All animals deserve lives free from human-inflicted suffering. As the highest created being, humans have a moral obligation to be wise stewards of animals. Just because we happen to be the most powerful species on earth, we humans have the ability, but not the right, to abuse the so-called lower animals. The ends do NOT justify the means!

Every Living Creature deserves the Right to Live as Nature has intended.

If you have men who will exclude any of God's creatures from the shelter of compassion and pity, you will have men who will deal likewise with their fellow men.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Amend the Dog Act to prevent muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:50:33 PM

Dear Sir/Madame,

Please amend the Dog Act to prevent muzzling of dogs. Thank you for considering this request.

Thanks again,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: What is wrong with your thinking
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 11:49:43 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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support all dogs to companionary greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 10:54:27 PM

Dear Dean Naldler 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 of all dog owners, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Every Dog regardless of breed should only wear a muzzle when deemed necessary. My Greyhounds have been attacked by a dog that jumped a brick wall and came for us. My dogs could not defend themselves as they had muzzles on. They required vet treatment which the owners of dog refused to pay, so I had to let it go. They sustained bite wounds, bruised ribs etc. Greyhounds are gentle. Any responsible owner should have control of their dogs and if they are proven to need muzzle when out so be it. But it's not right to label one breed, when any breed can be a threat. Please support removing the muzzle like other States....

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat&DogReview](#)
Subject: Amend dog act - stop muzzling greyhounds
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 10:12:28 PM

Dear WA Dept. of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries,

Please amend the dog act of 1976 to stop the requirement that greyhounds wear muzzles in public. Given how many ex-racers dogs are killed in Australia, adoption must be promoted as much as possible. Greyhounds are gentle and make wonderful pets.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

--

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support bill title for compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 2:16:49 PM

Dear John Carey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

I have my own greyhound called Gromit, he is three years old and we rescued him a year ago. Every time we go walking he scratches at his muzzle in pain. It's a torture device and he is confused and hurt about why we insist he wears it. Gromit is scared of many things after his racing upbringing, he does not like to be around any type of cable and simple things like suitcases scare him. So having him wear a muzzle to go outside makes no sense. When we adopted him he was living with two other dogs and a cat in his foster home. His foster owner told us he would often curl up with the cat at night.

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 of all dog owners, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 8:13:21 AM

Dear Amber-Jade Sanderson MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

I have had adopted rescue greyhounds for just under 10 years. I never considered having a greyhound as a pet. We've always had beautiful kelpies. When I discovered the story of greyhounds and saw how awful their lives are I couldn't help but adopt and care for greyhound's wellbeing around the world. Getting rid of the blanket law for all greyhounds to wear muzzles will make a great difference to how greyhounds are seen in the general public.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Wednesday, 17 July 2019 4:05:49 AM

Dear John Carey MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

Please repeal the law requiring the muzzling of adopted greyhounds.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 6:26:59 PM

Dear Christopher Tallentire MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

I have free range chickens and foster greyhounds. These dogs do not attack by chickens. I even have had 1 who was afraid of them.

Please remove this law

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [Redacted]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 6:06:23 PM

Dear William Johnston MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

My Greyhound, Chaley, is a very sweet natured dog. Shenis very good with people, notably children. So gentle and loving.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature block]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 5:44:29 PM

Dear Kevin Michel 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 of all dog owners, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Regards

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

From:

Simon Millman 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 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 of all dog owners, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature block]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 3:14:43 PM

Dear Yaz Mubarakai MP,

cc: Greyhound muzzle 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 of all dog owners, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 2:13:38 PM

Dear Cassandra Rowe MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

I strongly 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 of all dog owners, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Support for bill to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 11:14:01 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 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 of all dog owners, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

I am a responsible greyhound owner. I have done much research into breed behaviour. I am extremely weary around other dogs when I walk her due to both her being extremely protective of her personal space and the potential for other dogs to be aggressive. I believe many greyhound owners are well educated due to greyhound adoption programs in the state being informative and educational for all potential greyhound owners. Because of this I believe that greyhound owners are more naturally aware of dog behaviour than many other dog owners or backyard puppy purchasers. Because of this and the fact that the breed is typically a very docile breed I believe it is in the best interest to remove these archaic muzzling laws.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 10:47:36 AM

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

1. Greyhounds are kept as pets in countries all over the world muzzle free and there has been no increased incidence of greyhound dog bites to people, other dogs or animals
2. The RSPCA have found no evidence to suggest that greyhounds as a breed pose any greater risk than other dog breeds
3. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are the only Australian states still with this law. All other states (VIC, NSW, QLD, ACT, NT) have removed this law
4. The view supported by veterinary behaviourists is that the behaviour of a particular dog should be based on that individual dogs attributes not its breed
5. As a breed, greyhounds are known for their generally friendly and gentle disposition, even despite their upbringing in the racing industry
6. Muzzling contributes to unwarranted negative public perceptions about greyhounds and their suitability as pets, impacting adoption opportunities
7. There is no evidence that shows that Breed Specific Legislation such as greyhounds wearing muzzles is effective in preventing or reducing dog attacks
8. The current "prescribed training program" is called the Green Collar assessment. As with any behavioural assessment, it only can provide a snapshot of an animal'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 of all dog owners, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety
10. As a greyhound owner myself of a rescued racer I have never met a more gentle breed. With no signs of aggression ever from our hound, Herbert, he has become a gentle, loving family member who lives with 2 adults, 2 young children and 3 cats! He does not deserve to have his snout caged purely due to a perceived risk. As a Paediatric nurse at Perth Children's Hospital I have never witnessed a greyhound bite in the numerous dog bite cases I have seen. From personal experience as well as evidence I do not support the muzzling of Greyhounds.

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 10:36:59 AM

Dear Janine Freeman MP,

cc- Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

After all, greyhounds have a disrespected nature of being a therapy dog and what is a therapy dog with a muzzle. Muzzle on a dog quickly creates the idea of the dog being aggressive but are they really? They are nothing but speedy couch potatoes boiled with love ;)

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 9:55:31 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.

Greyhounds are glorious dogs and pose little threat to society.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support bill to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 9:34:50 AM

Dear Paul Papalia MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

My rescue greyhound Molly has brought so much joy to my life and to others and is scared of the family cat and wouldn't dream to chase any person or animal whatsoever. She has never been formally raced and in guessing she was "disposed of" due to her soft and gentle nature. It is against a greyhounds instinct to "chase and catch", these laws are only there because of what they have cruelly been taught against their will. The muzzle needs to be on the ones who teach this behaviour, not our innocent and gracious greys.

On top of all this, I believe the look of the muzzle deters people from rescuing these lovely placid animals and they deserve a fair chance and respect like any other animal.

The reasons below are needed to be reviewed and the law changed to give back the basic freedom to life for all involved. I strongly agree with the need for this outdated law to be lifted and I hope you do to. Animals are also our family and our lives are so much better when they are in them, dont you agree?

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Support all end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 9:22:55 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.

It should be the responsibility of the owners of ANY breed to assess an individual dogs temperament and need for muzzling. We have two very lazy, gentle rescue greyhounds, who are lucky to be awake or vertical, let alone a threat to anything.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Support for ban to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 9:09:15 AM

Dear Simon Millman MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

All animals deserve to be treated with respect.

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in 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 of all dog owners, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 8:31:58 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. Greyhounds are beautiful gentle dogs and the use of a muzzle is totally unnecessary.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Support for bill to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 8:10:05 AM

Dear John McGrath MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Thankyou for you help to remove this outdated law.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 5:04:29 AM

Dear Mark Folkard MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

I have had four rescue greyhounds and NONE of them have been muzzled. Two rescued from the notorious Macau Canidrome where approximately 20,000 Australian greyhounds were sent to a certain death and horrific conditions, only a small number surviving. Despite this, gentle greyhounds that lived with a small white fluffy dog. My greyhounds are also cat friendly.

I would like to express my support for the complete removal of the section 33(1) of the Dog Act 1976 in relation to companion pet greyhounds - namely that similar to the recent changes in 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 of all dog owners, for example through higher fines, leads to a reduction in dog bites and increase in community safety

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 12:38:48 AM

Dear Sabine Winton MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

From: [Redacted]
Subject: I support an end to compulsory greyhound muzzling
Date: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 12:30:12 AM

Dear Zak Kirkup MP,

cc: Cat and Dog statutory review

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

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

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

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

These Greyhounds need your help desperately.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature block]