



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

**JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON
GREYHOUND RACING IN TASMANIA**

**Inquiry into Greyhound Racing in
Tasmania**

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr Bacon
Ms Courtney
Mr Gaffney
Mr Mulder (from 24 May 2016)
Ms O'Connor
Ms Rattray (Chair)
Mrs Rylah
Mrs Taylor (until 6 May 2016)
Mr Valentine

GLOSSARY OF DEFINITIONS

Where possible, the definitions listed below relate to the definitions in the *Racing Regulation Act 2004*, the *Tasmanian Greyhound Local Rules of Racing* and the *Greyhounds Australasia Rules*¹. In some instances, definitions from other Australian jurisdictions have been used.

Term	Definition
AA	Animals Australia
ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
AJP	Animal Justice Party of Australia
AVA	Australian Veterinary Association
AWAC	Animal Welfare Advisory Committee
AWLA	Animal Welfare League of Australia
BOARDING RATE	The price paid or charged for dog boarding – a service offered by some veterinarians and pet boarding kennels, allowing owners to house a dog for a set amount of time in exchange for a fee.
BREAKERS	Breaking is an intensive form of physical and mental training during which the greyhound learns to chase a lure around a racetrack, which is required in order to become a racing greyhound. ² The breaker is the person responsible for training the dog in this manner.
BREEDER	A registered owner or authorised person who is engaged in the breeding of greyhounds as at the date of whelping and for racing purposes. ³
BREEDERS' BONUS	A bonus of \$1,300 will be paid to the Breeder on registration by Racing Services Tasmania of any litter which is whelped in Tasmania. At the close of each month the Office of Racing Integrity shall provide a list of litters

¹ <https://tasracing.com.au/greyhounds/rules-policies/>

² <http://www.grv.org.au/ownership/frequently-asked-questions/breaking-in/>

³ <https://tasracing.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Local-Rules-01-01-2016-with-cover.pdf>

	registered during that month to Tasracing. ⁴
BULLRING	An enclosed circular training facility designed to train the greyhound to run. The specifications of a bullring vary but it is usually surrounded by a fence and uses the natural surface of the ground. Some bullrings will have infrastructure for the use of lures. ⁵
C3 VACCINATION	A C3 vaccine that protects against parvovirus, distemper and hepatitis.
CATCHER	means a registered person who catches a greyhound at a meeting or qualifying trial. ⁶
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CPI	Consumer Price Index
CVO	Chief Veterinary Officer
DIRECTOR	The person appointed to the statutory position of Director of Racing within the Office of Racing Integrity, Tasmania. ⁷
DISQUALIFICATION	Disqualification means disqualified with or without limitation as to time by a decision of stewards. A person who is disqualified under the Rules of Racing for one code of racing is, during the period of the disqualification, disqualified for all codes of racing, in any State or Territory of the Commonwealth of Australia or New Zealand. ⁸
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic Acid
DPIPWE	Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment
DRAINING	Draining is a term used to describe the process of extracting blood from a greyhound that will be subsequently euthanased
DSG	Department of State Growth

⁴ <https://tasracing.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Bonuses-Owners-and-Breeders-vs21.pdf>

⁵ <http://www.grv.org.au/racing/glossary/>

⁶ <https://tasracing.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Local-Rules-01-01-2016-with-cover.pdf>

⁷ http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/tas/consol_act/rra2004179/

⁸ http://www.thelaw.tas.gov.au/tocview/index.w3p;cond=all;doc_id=62%2B%2B2004%2BAT%40EN%2B2016021000000;histon=;prompt=;rec=;term=racing%20regulation%20act

EDUCATOR	An individual responsible for the delivery of industry training programs for greyhound racing participants.
ENVIRONMENTAL ENRICHMENT	Environmental enrichment can involve the provision of social contacts and through the provision of toys, cage furniture, auditory and olfactory stimulation. ⁹
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
FY	Financial Year
GA	Greyhounds Australasia
GAP	Greyhound Adoption Program
GAR	The Greyhounds Australasia Rules (also referred to the National Rules) approved by Greyhounds Australasia Limited. ¹⁰
GBE	(Tasmanian) Government Business Enterprise
GOTBA	Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania
GRADING	The system of classification which stipulates the grade of a greyhound based on its experience, the number of competitions it has competed in, the results it has gained and its age at time of race. The grading is used to programme the schedule of races. ¹¹
GRADING SCHEDULE	Means that schedule approved by the Director. ¹²
GREYHOUND RACING	Official greyhound racing in Tasmania is conducted at Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, Launceston Greyhound Racing Club and North West Greyhound Racing Club (Devonport) under the control of Tasracing.
GREYHOUND REFERENCE GROUP	A group comprising representatives of Tasracing, all Tasmanian greyhound racing clubs and the Greyhounds Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania, which meets quarterly to discuss industry issues and make recommendations on rules and policies. ¹³

⁹ Wells, D, 2004, 'A review of environmental enrichment for kennelled dogs, *canis familiaris*', Applied Animal Behaviour Science, vol.85, pp.307-317.

¹⁰ <https://tasracing.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Local-Rules-1-5-2013.pdf>

¹¹ <https://tasracing.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Local-Rules-01-01-2016-with-cover.pdf>

¹² <https://tasracing.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Local-Rules-01-01-2016-with-cover.pdf>

¹³ https://tasracing.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/TasracingAREp_SpreadsWeb.pdf

GREYHOUND TRIAL TRACK	A racecourse or a facility registered by the Director utilised for the purpose of education and/or training greyhounds. ¹⁴
GRNSW	Greyhound Racing New South Wales
GRV	Greyhound Racing Victoria
HGRC	Hobart Greyhound Racing Club
LGRC	Launceston Greyhound Racing Club
LIVE BAITING	<p><i>The practice of using live animals for the purpose of training greyhounds. This practice is illegal in all states and territories in Australia”.</i>¹⁵</p> <p><i>“Live baiting involves small animals such as a rabbits, possums or piglets being used as a lure or bait to train greyhounds to race around a track. 'Bait' animals are tied by rope to the mechanical lure and are hurled at speed around the track while greyhounds are released to pursue, catch and maul them. Live baiting may also involve pulling animals on leads/ropes and inciting dogs to maul them.”</i>¹⁶</p>
LOCAL RULES OF RACING	Tasracing is responsible for the making of the rules of greyhound racing. These Rules are made pursuant to section 11(1)(k) of the Racing Regulation Act 2004. These Rules may be altered from time to time by Tasracing. These rules are pursuant to Greyhounds Australasia Rules. ¹⁷
LURE	The object used during a race or trial to entice a greyhound to chase. It is generally a toy designed to resemble a large rabbit or hare.
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MUZZLE	In terms of greyhound racing, a muzzle refers to a guard made of straps or wire that's worn over the 'muzzle' or nose and mouth of an animal's face to keep it from biting.

¹⁴ <https://tasracing.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Local-Rules-1-5-2013.pdf>

¹⁵ http://kb.rspca.org.au/Is-the-use-of-live-baits-and-lures-in-greyhound-racing-illegal_241.html

¹⁶ http://kb.rspca.org.au/Is-the-use-of-live-baits-and-lures-in-greyhound-racing-illegal_241.html

¹⁷ <https://tasracing.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Local-Rules-01-01-2016-with-cover.pdf>

NATIONAL RULES OF RACING	The Greyhound Australasia Rules are the National Rules of Racing under the control of that peak body and are adopted by the respective controlling bodies. In Tasmania, that authority is Tasracing.
OHS	Occupational Health and Safety
OZCHASE	OzChase is an online nominations portal, allowing users to carry out tasks including the nomination of a Greyhound; Editing or deleting a Nomination; Scratching a Greyhound and submitting a Kennel Notification. ¹⁸
PINK CARD	Breeding Identification Card, issued by Racing Integrity, Tasmania ¹⁹
PRIVATE TRIAL	A trial where the time recorded by the greyhound is not available to the general public.
PRIVATE TRIAL TRACK	A privately conducted track which is not registered and is used primarily by the owner of the property on which it is constructed.
PROHIBITED SUBSTANCE	“Prohibited Substance” means any substance which is outlined in the definition of prohibited substances in the Greyhound Australasia Rules.
PUBLIC TRIAL	A trial where the time recorded by the greyhound is publicly available.
REARER	A rearer is responsible for the upbringing of a greyhound, with the aim of bring it up to racing standard. Rearing involves diet management, exercise and galloping, socialisation with other greyhounds, human interaction and handling and preventative health care ²⁰
REHOMING	The process of finding homes and foster care for greyhounds, particularly once their racing career is over.
THE REVIEW REPORT	Refers to the Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry, conducted by Dr Rod Andrewartha, Chief Veterinary Officer and Tony Murray, Director of Racing, dated 13 March 2015.
RSPCA	Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
RST	Racing Services Tasmania (now the Office of Racing Integrity), the division of the Department of Infrastructure Energy and Resources responsible for the integrity control of greyhound racing in Tasmania
RTO	Registered Training Organisation

¹⁸ <http://www.thedogs.com.au/DPage.aspx?id=291>

¹⁹ http://www.racing.tas.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/107030/Application_for_PINK_Card.pdf

²⁰ <http://www.grv.org.au/ownership/frequently-asked-questions/rearing/>

STARTER	a greyhound which has been placed in a starting-box for the purposes of a race or qualifying trial and which has not been subsequently withdrawn prior to the start of the race or qualifying trial by order or permission of the stewards
STEWARD	means a person appointed to control a meeting or qualifying trial or to adjudicate on a matter which may arise at or from a meeting or qualifying trial.
TAFE	Technical and Further Education. (Tasmanian public sector provider of vocational education and training).
TASBRED	“Tasbred” means a Tasmanian Bred greyhound as defined in the Grading Schedule as a greyhound whelped in Tasmania. ²¹
TASRACING	Means the body established under the Racing (Tasracing Pty Ltd) Act 2009.
TCO₂	Plasma Total Carbon Dioxide.
TRAINER	The person registered as the trainer of a particular greyhound.
TRIAL	A race in which a greyhound races against the clock under race conditions to obtain a time which indicates its performance.
TRIAL TRACK	A racecourse or a facility registered by the Director utilised for the purpose of education and/or training greyhounds. ²²
WASTAGE	“wastage” means the number of healthy greyhounds bred for the purpose of greyhound racing that are subsequently destroyed either prior to being named, prior to being raced or upon retirement from racing. ²³
WHELPING	The accepted term used to describe the act where a pregnant bitch gives birth to puppies. A whelp is the term given to the young given birth by a dog and some other animals. ²⁴

²¹ <https://tasracing.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Bonuses-Owners-and-Breeders-vs21.pdf>

²² <https://tasracing.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Local-Rules-1-5-2013.pdf>

²³ http://www.greyhoundracinginquiry.justice.nsw.gov.au/Documents/Breeding_Issues_Paper.pdf

²⁴

http://www.racing.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0009/83673/Information_for_persons_Interested_in_Breeding_a_Litter_2012.pdf

Table of Contents

Glossary of definitions	ii
Executive Summary	10
1 Background, Appointment, terms of reference and conduct of the inquiry	12
Background	12
Appointment and Terms of Reference.....	12
Conduct of the Inquiry.....	13
Key dates	13
Members’ Attendance.....	15
2 Recommendations.....	18
3 Live Baiting	21
Historic practice	22
Obtaining evidence	24
Differences between the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry and the industry interstate	31
Behavioural differences in greyhounds.....	36
Industry monitoring and regulation	40
4 Wastage.....	43
Wastage Rates	45
Overbreeding	50
Tracking of greyhounds.....	57
5 Draining	66
6 Welfare Standards and Initiatives.....	70
Welfare Standards	70
Housing.....	71
Racing Injuries	82
Illegal substances.....	92
Initiatives to improve welfare standards	96
The introduction of tighter controls on breeding	97

	Eliminating breeding incentives	100
	Rehoming	101
	Greyhound Adoption Program (GAP).....	106
	Non-GAP rehoming agencies	109
	New Grading system.....	112
	Other potential welfare reforms for the industry	116
	Education and training of participants in the industry	120
	Export of greyhounds.....	124
	Powers of stewards.....	125
	Regulation of bullrings and private training tracks	131
7	Regulation and reform in the Greyhound Racing Industry	137
	Regulation of the Greyhound Racing Industry	137
	Regulation of Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry.....	140
8	Industry Financial Arrangements	153
	Sustainability	153
	The economic impact of the industry	164
	Government subsidies	167
9	The ‘Review Report’	170
	Status of the recommendations	171
10	Future of the Industry.....	193
	Relationship between Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity	193
	Relationship between Industry Participants and Tasracing.....	195
	Impact of judicial decisions on the regulator’s role.....	199
	Industry culture.....	204
	Community expectations	207
	Attracting young participants	212
11	Matters Incidental to the Inquiry	216
	Muzzling of greyhounds.....	216
	Banning greyhound racing	222

Proposals from stakeholders	223
Dissenting Statement of Hon. Rob Valentine MLC, Independent Member for Hobart.....	227
Dissenting Statement of Ms Cassy O'Connor MP, Tasmanian Greens' Member for Denison.....	229
Appendices.....	241

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The greyhound racing industry in Tasmania, as in other jurisdictions, has been subject to scrutiny because of concerns for animal welfare.

The Inquiry provided an opportunity for stakeholders including regulatory authorities, industry participants and animal welfare advocates to present their views.

This Report focuses on the practices and culture of the greyhound racing industry in Tasmania in so far as it impacts on animal welfare outcomes. It also recommends reforms and initiatives to promote best animal welfare practices in the industry. Consideration is also given to the financial arrangements pertaining to the industry.

While the Committee received anecdotal evidence implying illegal practices it received no substantive evidence of live baiting occurring in the Tasmanian greyhound industry, in recent years.

The Committee recognises the roles of the Office of Racing Integrity and Tasracing in improving animal welfare standards in the industry and acknowledges that certain reforms have been implemented before and during the course of this inquiry.

In view of the challenges highlighted during the course of the Inquiry, the Committee considers further reforms warrant action to ensure animal welfare standards in the industry are in line with changing community expectations.

The Committee notes that the majority of recommendations made in the *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry* commissioned by the Government have been adopted or are in the process of being implemented.

The Committee acknowledges recent announcements in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory to ban greyhound racing in those jurisdictions from 1 July 2017. These changes have heightened expectations from some community members, for other jurisdictions to follow this approach. At this stage, the Committee has not received enough evidence to warrant banning of the greyhound racing industry in Tasmania.

The Committee considers that the Government should establish benchmarks for continual improvement of animal welfare standards which are required to be reported annually.

The Committee has recommended measures and strategies, which if adopted, it considers will improve animal welfare outcomes in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry. The Committee encourages the Government and regulatory authorities to implement the recommendations as a matter of urgency.

The Committee would like to acknowledge the work of the previous Chairs and I would like to thank all Members of the Committee for their participation in the inquiry.

The Committee Members extend their thanks to all individuals and representatives of organisations who made submissions and provided evidence to the Inquiry.

The Committee Members also appreciate the efforts of Committee Secretariat staff, Ms Stephanie Hesford, Mr James Reynolds and Mr Todd Buttsworth for their support during the Inquiry.

The Committee looks forward to the Tasmanian Government's response to each of the Recommendations in this Report.

Hon. Tania Rattray MLC
Chair

1 BACKGROUND, APPOINTMENT, TERMS OF REFERENCE AND CONDUCT OF THE INQUIRY

Background

- 1.1 On 16 February 2015, the ABC's *Four Corners* program aired the episode *Making a Killing*, which showed graphic images of live baiting in greyhound racing across New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria.
- 1.2 A number of investigations and inquiries were established in the wake of this *Four Corners* story including the *Review of animal welfare arrangements in the greyhound racing industry in Tasmania*²⁵ which was undertaken by the Chief Veterinary Officer and the Director of Racing.

Appointment and Terms of Reference

- 1.3 The Joint Select Committee on Greyhound Racing in Tasmania was established by both Houses in March 2015 to inquire into and report upon:
 - (a) practices in the Tasmanian greyhound racing industry, including whether live baiting, 'wastage' and 'draining' of greyhounds is occurring, and if so, to what extent;
 - (b) the role of regulatory authorities in upholding animal welfare standards in the industry and encouraging best practice;
 - (c) the level of state government funding provided to the industry in Tasmania in the form of a 20 year funding deed signed in 2009;
 - (d) the comprehensive report already completed by the Director of Racing and the Chief Veterinary Officer into these issues and the 29 recommendations for consideration by the State Government; and
 - (e) any other matters incidental thereto.

²⁵ *Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry, Final Report*, 13 March 2015

Conduct of the Inquiry

- 1.4 The Committee resolved to invite, by way of advertisement on the Parliament of Tasmania website and in the three major Tasmanian newspapers, interested persons and organisations to make a submission to the Committee in relation to the Terms of Reference. In addition to such general invitation, the Committee directly invited a number of persons and organisations to provide the Committee with any information they deemed to be relevant to the inquiry.
- 1.5 The Committee received 86 submissions and held 6 public hearings, including one in Launceston, with 18 witnesses. In addition, the Committee heard from a number of other witnesses in camera.
- 1.6 The Committee also attended a greyhound race meeting in Launceston in August 2015 to gain an understanding of racing preparation and practices.

Key dates

Date	Activity/Event	Description
16 February 2015	Airing of ABC <i>Four Corners</i> episode <i>Making a Killing</i>	<i>Making a Killing</i> , an investigative documentary, examined live baiting practices in the greyhound racing industry across Australia.
18 March 2015	Committee appointed	Resolution agreed to by the House of Assembly.
26 March 2015	Committee appointed	Resolution agreed to by the Legislative Council
21 April 2015	First meeting	Cassy O'Connor MP elected as Chair; Adriana Taylor elected as Deputy Chair.
21 April 2015	Extension of Reporting Date	Resolution agreed to by the Committee to extend the reporting date until 30 October 2015.
29 April 2015	Call for Submissions	Advertisements calling for submissions were published in <i>The Mercury</i> , <i>The Examiner</i> , and <i>The Advocate</i> . Deadline 12 June 2015
30 June 2015	Public Hearing	Held at Parliament House, Hobart
1 July 2015	Public Hearing	Held at Parliament House, Hobart
10 August 2015	Attend Greyhound Racing Meet	The Committee attended a greyhound racing meet at Launceston
11 August 2015	Public Hearing	Held at Henty House, Launceston
18 September 2015	Public Hearing	Held at Parliament House, Hobart
18 September 2015	Extension of Reporting Date	Resolution agreed to by the Committee to extend the reporting date extended until 31 March 2016
16 October 2015	Public Hearing	Held at Parliament House, Hobart
20 November	Public Hearing	Held at Parliament House, Hobart

2015		
30 November 2015	Public Hearings	Held at Parliament House, Hobart
22 February 2016	Election of new Chair	That in light of recent media coverage and in the best interest of the greyhound inquiry, that Ms Cassy O'Connor be replaced as Chair. Hon. Adriana Taylor MLC elected Chair and Mrs Joan Rylah MP, elected Deputy Chair.
8 March 2016	Extension of Reporting Date	Resolution agreed to by the Committee to extend the reporting date until 31 May 2016
6 May 2016	Extension of Reporting Date	Resolution agreed to by the Committee to extend the reporting date until 22 September
7 May 2016	Legislative Council Elections	Mrs Taylor was defeated at the election resulting in a vacancy in the membership of the Committee and the need to elect a new Chair
24 May 2016	Appointment of new Member	Hon. Tony Mulder MLC, appointed Member, as a result of vacancy left by Mrs Adriana Taylor
24 May 2016	Election of new Chair	Hon. Tania Rattray MLC elected as Chair
14 September 2016	Report Tabled	The Report of the Committee Tabled in Parliament

Members' Attendance

Attendance by Committee members at committee meetings over the duration of the Committee's life is recorded below:

Please note that Mrs Adriana Taylor was a Member of the Committee for a total of 23 meetings between 21 April 2015 and 6 May 2016. Mr Tony Mulder was a Member of the Committee for a total of 7 meetings between 25 May 2016 and 2 August 2016

		ATTENDANCE								
Meeting no.	Meeting Date	Scott Bacon	Sarah Courtney	Michael Gaffney	Tony Mulder	Cassy O'Connor	Tania Rattray	Joan Rylah	Adriana Taylor	Rob Valentine
Meeting no.1	21 April 2015	✓	✗	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.2	4 June 2015	✗	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Meeting no.3	19 June 2015	✗	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.4	30 June 2015	✓	✗	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.5	1 July 2015	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.6	11 August 2015	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.7	25 August 2015	✗	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Meeting no.8	18 September 2015	✗	✓	✓	-	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓
Meeting no.9	16 October 2015	✗	✓	✓	-	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓
Meeting no.10	6 November 2015	✓	✗	✓	-	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Meeting no.11	20 November 2015	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Meeting no.	Meeting Date	Scott Bacon	Sarah Courtney	Michael Gaffney	Tony Mulder	Cassy O'Connor	Tania Rattray	Joan Rylah	Adriana Taylor	Rob Valentine
Meeting no.12	30 November 2015	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	x	✓
Meeting no.13	2 February 2016	✓	x	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.14	22 February 2016	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.15	25 February 2016	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.16	2 March 2016	x	x	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.17	3 March 2016	x	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.18	21 March 2016	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.19	30 March 2016	x	x	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.20	31 March 2016	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.21	21 April 2016	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.22	22 April 2016	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.23	6 May 2016	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	x	✓	✓	✓
Meeting no.24	25 May 2016	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓
Meeting no.25	17 June 2016	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓
Meeting no.26	2 August 2016	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	-	✓
Meeting no.27	12 August 2016	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓

Meeting no.	Meeting Date	Scott Bacon	Sarah Courtney	Michael Gaffney	Tony Mulder	Cassy O'Connor	Tania Rattray	Joan Rylah	Adriana Taylor	Rob Valentine
Meeting no.28	19 August 2016	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	-	✓
Meeting no.29	26 August 2016	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓
Meeting no.30	9 September	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓
TOTAL		21	22	30	6	29	26	29	19	29

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: That the Government review the legal framework underpinning the prohibition of live baiting in Tasmania.

Recommendation 2: That the Government instruct the Office of Racing Integrity to educate industry participants and the general public of the contemporary legal framework underpinning the prohibition of live baiting in Tasmania.

Recommendation 3: That the separation between the Office of Racing Integrity and Tasracing be maintained.

Recommendation 4: That all training facilities including but not limited to trial tracks, training tracks and bullrings be registered with the Office of Racing Integrity.

Recommendation 5: That the Government review the legal framework underpinning animal welfare and the prohibition of live baiting in Tasmania with a view to increasing regulation and investigative powers with an emphasis on training facilities and industry practices.

Recommendation 6: That the Government support the Office of Racing Integrity and Tasracing's stated commitment to Greyhounds Australasia's "Towards Zero Euthanasia"²⁶ framework and to actively monitor progress towards this goal.

Recommendation 7: That the Office of Racing Integrity develop and maintain a comprehensive database to enable all greyhounds whelped in Tasmania, or imported, for the racing industry to be tracked at all stages of life.

Recommendation 8: That the Government implement, as a matter of priority, Recommendation 19 of the Review Report: *Create a rule of racing that at all times (from whelping onwards) a greyhound must be in the possession of, and under the ownership, care and control of a licensed person.*²⁷

Recommendation 9: That the Office of Racing Integrity undertake a review of the standards, guidelines and policies in place for the housing and rearing of greyhounds to consider how best welfare practice requirements can be improved and enforced.

²⁶ See submission 37, Greyhounds Australasia.

²⁷ *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry Final Report*, 13 March 2015.

Recommendation 10: That Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity collect data, information and report on injuries sustained during trialling and racing.

Recommendation 11: That Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity investigate the reasons for injuries and if the design and/or condition of the track is identified as a contributing factor, improvements must be undertaken to the track.

Recommendation 12: That the Office of Racing Integrity undertake a review to ensure the penalties imposed for the use of prohibited substances reflect the seriousness of the offence.

Recommendation 13: That the Office of Racing Integrity be appropriately resourced in order to increase inspections of properties and strengthen its capacity to undertake effective routine swabbing.

Recommendation 14: That the Minister for Racing require the Office of Racing Integrity to review and report on the number of litters bred in Tasmania, five years from the introduction of the new breeding rules, to determine whether the breeding rules have reduced wastage rates.

Recommendation 15: That the Government commission an independent review of the Greyhound Adoption Program and other adoption services. This review is to include examination of existing funding and resources for greyhound rehoming/adoption programs as well as investigating additional mechanisms to support such programs with a view to increasing the number of greyhounds rehomed.

Recommendation 16: That the Minister for Racing require the Office of Racing Integrity and Tasracing to review and report on the new grading schedule annually to determine whether it is reducing wastage rates.

Recommendation 17: That the Government further investigate whether provisions regarding mental suffering should be incorporated in the *Animal Welfare Act 1993*.

Recommendation 18: That mandatory education and training on contemporary animal welfare standards and the provisions of the *Animal Welfare Act 1993* be required for all licensed participants within the greyhound industry.

Recommendation 19: That Tasracing provide timely information and ongoing education to the industry when the Rules of Racing are amended.

Recommendation 20: That the Minister for Racing engage formally with the appropriate Federal Minister(s) to address the issue of greyhound export.

Recommendation 21: That the Government review the powers of stewards under the Rules of Racing and the *Animal Welfare Act 1993*: to seize evidence; to question and obtain evidence from unlicensed persons; and to compel unlicensed persons to appear before an inquiry.

Recommendation 22: That the Office of Racing Integrity progress the registration and unannounced inspections of all private training facilities as a matter of priority.

Recommendation 23: That the Government require Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity to reach an agreed position on rules affecting animal welfare standards. This position be presented to Greyhounds Australasia with the aim of achieving best practice in animal welfare through consistent application and improvement of national standards.

Recommendation 24: That the Government advocate for the Board of Greyhounds Australasia to be expanded to have Tasmania's separate integrity and commercial bodies equally represented on the board.

Recommendation 25: That the Government undertake an independent cost-benefit analysis of the Tasmanian racing codes to inform a review of the current funding model for the racing industry.

Recommendation 26: That continued government funding of the greyhound racing industry be conditional on upholding contemporary animal welfare outcomes.

Recommendation 27: That a lifetime ban be implemented for a person found guilty of live baiting in Tasmania.

Recommendation 28: That Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity review their current communication methods to effectively engage with industry participants to improve animal welfare.

Recommendation 29: That the Minister for Racing instigate a review of existing penalties and appeal provisions to determine whether changes should be introduced, particularly pertaining to issues of animal welfare.

Recommendation 30: That the Government establish standards and identify benchmarks for improving animal welfare outcomes to be reported in Tasracing's annual report.

Recommendation 31: That the Government review the differentiation of greyhounds under the *Dog Control Act 2000* with the intent to exempt greyhounds from wearing a muzzle while on lead in public.

3 LIVE BAITING

- 3.1 Live baiting refers to the use of live animals such as rabbits, possums or piglets as a lure for the purpose of training greyhounds to race around a track. Under the practice the ‘bait’ animal is tied to a mechanical lure or pulled on a lead or rope to incite the dogs.²⁸ This Chapter sets out the evidence presented to the Committee regarding whether live baiting is occurring in Tasmania. In doing so, it considers historic practice, the difficulties in obtaining evidence, differences in the Tasmanian industry to those in other jurisdictions, and whether behavioural differences in dogs can indicate that they have been exposed to live baiting. It also discusses industry self-monitoring and self-regulation and whether this is sufficient to ensure live baiting does not occur and if it does, that it is dealt with appropriately.
- 3.2 The review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry (the Review Report) found:

There has been no evidence identified that could result in a prosecution for live baiting in Tasmania. Both RSPCA inspectors and RST stewards have conducted inspections and surveillance; however, there has not been evidence to proceed to action under the Animal Welfare Act or the Rules of Racing.

That said, this finding does not exclude the possibility that live baiting could be happening in Tasmania. The Panel reached this view as, in the absence of any credible intelligence to enable the regulator to be in a position to observe the activity at the time it is occurring, the likelihood of obtaining sufficient evidence to support a prosecution of live baiting is extremely remote.

The Panel has identified some positive trends with respect to forming a view that live baiting, if it is occurring, is at a very low level. These are:

- *There are no large private greyhound trialling and education centres in Tasmania.*
- *The large trialling and education tracks used in Tasmania are registered by the Director of Racing and are under the operational control of Tasracing and racing clubs.²⁹*

- 3.3 The submissions to the inquiry received during the hearings held in Launceston and Hobart, provided testimony both supporting and refuting the existence of live baiting practices in Tasmania.

²⁸ See information on live baiting on the RSPCA website: http://kb.rspca.org.au/Is-the-use-of-live-baits-and-lures-in-greyhound-racing-illegal_241.html accessed 11 December 2015.

²⁹ *Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry: Final Report – 13 March 2015*, pp 21-2.

Committee findings:

- 3.4 The Committee finds the ABC Four Corners Program aired in February 2015 raised public awareness about illegal practices in the Australian greyhound racing industry.
- 3.5 The Committee finds as a result of the ABC program there is public concern about the possibility of live-baiting in the Tasmanian industry.

Historic practice

- 3.6 Historically, live animals were used in Tasmania for greyhounds to chase for sport and in the training of greyhounds. Over time, the use of live animals has been prohibited under the Rules of Racing and has become illegal. The following timeline sets out when the changes were introduced:

- 1954: *Last hare coursing event in Tasmania held.*
- 1988: *On 1 October 1988, a Rule of Racing was introduced which prohibited the use of any species of bird or animal which is alive in greyhound racing and training.*
- 1993: *Animal Welfare Act enacted – live baiting is in contravention of the Act (Sections 10 and 11).*
- 1995: *In November 1995, the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Board introduced a policy which permitted the use of dried skins to the arm of the lure in fightback trials. It specified that it did not permit the use of carcasses.*
- 2006: *In May 2006, a Rule of Racing was introduced which provided that “no person shall use or cause to be used any live animal or animal carcass as a lure for greyhounds or for the exciting of greyhounds on any Greyhound Trial Track or any other location.”*
- 2015: *On 30 April, 2015, a comprehensive Rule of Racing was introduced which prohibited the use of any live animal or animal carcass in the connection with greyhound training, education or preparation to race (GAR 86B).*

- 3.7 Dr Sally-Anne Richter, President of the Tasmanian Division of the Australian Veterinary Association (AVA) commented:

... I spoke to trainers at the Launceston Racing Club. They said that in the past - and this was 20 or more years ago - it was a practice that was used. Now it is considered completely taboo, so it should not be used at all.³⁰

³⁰ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 4-5

3.8 Industry participants also acknowledged that live baiting was a past practice used in the industry. Anthony Bullock, a leading Tasmanian Trainer, commented:

Mr GAFFNEY - In Tasmania I was talking to a steward last night and he said he had not heard of any live baiting. He also felt that because it is such a close-knit community that if somebody was doing something untoward, it would come out fairly quickly or the whispers would get around the track.

Mr BULLOCK - It would be well spoken of and I don't think the percentage of the people would tolerate it. It is an unfair advantage. It is uncouth and it is barbaric. No-one needs to do it. There are other ways around it. Years ago it was very rampant but I don't think it is anymore.

Mr GAFFNEY - Because you have been involved for 40 years and your parents and no doubt their parents as well, when did you start to see a cultural shift? It was known to have been part of the practice beforehand. When do you think the watershed moments came in?

Mr BULLOCK - Probably 10 to 15 years ago it changed. It is very competitive race-wise. You make one mistake, you don't win a race, simple as that. You stick to what you know, stick to your same practices, doing the same things.

Mr BACON - You said it was rampant.

Mr BULLOCK - I didn't say it was rampant. I said it was known to be done years ago.

Mr BACON - Other people might?

Mr BULLOCK - Yes. it was well known 30 to 40 years ago; it was practice to let them go on wallabies or whatever...³¹

3.9 June Phillips, an owner and breeder, also commented that live baiting was a practice that people spoke of happening 50 years ago:

CHAIR - June, you know the terms of reference relate to animal welfare practices within the greyhound industry, specifically in response to the Four Corners episode, to investigate allegations of live baiting. In your 40 years' experience in the industry in Tasmania, have you seen evidence of live baiting?

Ms PHILLIPS - No, never once. We never did it ourselves and I have never heard about anyone doing it. When I was chairman there were instances where people would say, 'So-and-so gave them something', but no substances, names or anything. We are going back 50 and 60 years where someone knew someone who used something, and we're still dealing with that today. I don't believe you have to do that. We don't have the private tracks in Tasmania that they have in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland.³²

³¹ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 3 -4.

³² June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 1-2

Committee findings:

- 3.10 The Committee finds the evidence indicates that live baiting has occurred in Tasmania in the past.
- 3.11 The Committee finds that due to legislative, regulatory and cultural change, live baiting is neither legal nor acceptable in Tasmania.

Obtaining evidence

- 3.12 The Committee heard that there is no clear evidence of live baiting currently occurring in Tasmania. John Newson, Chairman of the Launceston Greyhound Racing Club (LGRC), commented:

CHAIR - *Do you think people have got the wrong idea about the dogs, or do you think there have been a few bad players in your industry that have given the industry a bad name? It has flowed from interstate but we have some material here from the RSPCA that acknowledges live baiting has happened in Tasmania.*

Mr NEWSON - *Where is the proof? Where are the people who have been charged?*

CHAIR - *It has been put to us by the RSPCA that obtaining enough material evidence to get a conviction is one of the problems we have.*

Mr NEWSON - *You are not guilty until you are convicted, are you?*

CHAIR - *I understand that.*

Mr NEWSON - *That is the problem. Everyone is being tarred with the same brush. It might only be one per cent.*

CHAIR - *It could only be one per cent.*

Mr NEWSON - *It could be 0.5 per cent, who knows?*

CHAIR - *In Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria, the industry was adamant there was no live baiting happening, until the cameras from which Four Corners had the material proved that it was happening. Subsequently, charges have been laid. To say there is not a problem with the industry is probably not true, or not quite accurate.*

Mr NEWSON - *Probably not accurate. You could say it might be not quite accurate, but what goes on, who knows?*

CHAIR - *This is what we are trying to find out.*

Mr NEWSON - *I know where you are coming from, but who knows? There have been accusations, but there has been no true, hard evidence.*

CHAIR - You would agree it is very hard when you have private bull rings and private trial tracks, out of sight and mind. It is very hard to obtain that evidence.

Mr NEWSON - It is like anything. It is like any other racing. You have the other forms of racing. People are getting convicted for things every day. How does it go?³³

3.13 Mr Newson further commented:

Ms COURTNEY - John, if we presume for a moment that there was a person doing the wrong thing and performing illegal activity, what would you recommend the industry do to stamp it out? First of all to discover it, and then to stamp it out? We have this area of not really having the information and not knowing. What could the industry do to give the public and us confidence that it is not happening, going forward?

.....

Mr NEWSON - It is a very tricky question. I know with ourselves, most people would now say if anyone gets caught doing it, it is a mandatory life ban. If you get caught, you are gone. You are not going to be back into the industry again. It would not matter how many times you appealed, you are gone.

The only other thing, the way you said before, maybe all these people have their own trials. They should be reached and be open to scrutiny from the relevant authorities to be able to have checks on these properties.

Mr VALENTINE - On a random basis?

Mr NEWSON - Yes, on a random basis. Maybe random, or turn up to people's places. Maybe not walk straight on to their property, but to turn up and ring on their gate and say, 'We are here to inspect your facilities, can we come in and have a look?'

May be that is another way. People will at least know they are under scrutiny. If anything untoward is going to happen, they must do it at their own peril. There could be someone around, who knows?³⁴

3.14 The Committee also heard that despite this lack of hard evidence that it cannot be guaranteed that live baiting is not occurring. Dr Sally-Anne Richter commented:

The AVA has not heard concerns from members about specific animal welfare issues such as live baiting taking place in Tasmanian greyhound racing. However given the scale of problems uncovered in three states by Four Corners

³³ John Newson, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, pp 12-13.

³⁴ *Id.*

and now emerging in other reviews, it would be naive to think that animal welfare concerns did not exist in the Tasmanian greyhound racing industry.³⁵

3.15 Dr Richter also stated:

CHAIR - Thank you, Sally-Anne. The Veterinary Association says in the submission that it would be naive to think there are not animal welfare practices of concern happening here in Tasmania. Can you expand on that a little?

Dr RICHTER - Sure. Given how the Four Corners report outlined issues occurring in the other states despite having regulations in place, I think it would be naive to think we are so far removed from what is occurring, given that now it is a national sport and Greyhounds Australasia oversees it. At the same time, I would be surprised if it isn't occurring. I suppose that's where I'm coming from.

CHAIR - In representations made by industry it has been put to us that it is not occurring here. How do you explain that difference in perspective between the Veterinary Association and industry organisations?

Dr RICHTER - Prior to that investigation on Four Corners I'm fairly sure those other states also thought it wasn't occurring there either. I think it's important for stewards and the RSPCA to be able to investigate to see whether it is occurring or not and part of that is also giving them the power to do spot checks on properties that are breeding, rearing and using greyhounds within bullrings so they can see whether or not it is occurring. I think we have a lack of information. We don't have any evidence that it is occurring but we're also not looking enough into it to see that it isn't specifically to make sure.³⁶

3.16 The RSPCA considered that despite the lack of evidence that would result in a conviction for the practice of live baiting, it was likely it was occurring prior to the Four Corners program going to air in February 2015:

CHAIR - In your opening statement when you were talking about live baiting, you said it would be naive to think that live baiting wasn't happening here in Tasmania. We have had the exact same language put to us by the Australian Veterinary Association of Tasmania, yet in its written records to the review, I understand the RSPCA stated there had been no evidence of live baiting here in Tasmania. That was also in the report of the review. How do you marry those two statements, that it would be naive to think it is not happening but there is no evidence?

Ms NORRIS - Given the extent of the issues in other states, that is why we made the statement that it would be naive that it wouldn't be occurring over here. We are not aware of any distinct differences between the mainland and

³⁵ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 2.

³⁶ *Id.*

Tasmania that would create any differences to explain that. In terms of live baiting evidence, I will hand over to Paul.

Mr McGINTY - The most recent complaint we received that was specific to live baiting was prior to the Four Corners episode, in 2008. That was jointly handled by the RSPCA and Racing Services Tasmania. Since then we haven't received any specific complaints purely pertaining to live baiting. However, as a result of that story, we received a subsequent nine statewide complaints specifically alleging live baiting. We attended all nine of those and from a legal point of view were unable to find any evidence that could have taken any case forward, so we haven't been able to prove beyond reasonable doubt that live baiting has occurred.

CHAIR - You talk about the nine properties you attended and I think your language was clear that it was about an evidentiary test, not having enough evidence that would hold up in court. Are you able to tell the committee if there was any suggestion, when you went to the properties, that there had been live baiting occurring?

Mr McGINTY - Some of the properties had apparently recently disused bullrings. They had stuffed, squeaky toys covered in fleece and the like and there was an amount of skins or carcasses within the vicinity. Unfortunately, a lot of the properties back onto bushland where possums habituate anyway so there is a suggestion that the possums may have become close to or within the confines of where the greyhounds were. Those things we cannot prove or disprove from a legal point of view.

.....

...The things we can prove and the things we believe, unfortunately within the framework of our role, are two different things. I personally went to three of those nine properties and I have received information from the inspectors in relation to the other six. My personal belief, from what I have seen and heard from my staff and from a background of over 20 years as an investigator, is that it would be very likely that this was occurring prior to the episode and, as a result of that episode, there was a removal of potential evidence. Unfortunately, that's just my opinion and not a legal opinion.³⁷

3.17 Emma Haswell, Founder and President of Brightside Farm Sanctuary, also referred to circumstantial evidence that her volunteers had witnessed when picking up greyhounds from trainers:

Ms HASWELL - ...I had a trainer from the north-west coast call me and ask me to take a greyhound. I said I couldn't get to the north-west coast and he wasn't coming down. He had another trainer to bring the dog halfway, which is common. That trainer lives near Campania and I couldn't meet the trainer on the side of the road, so they took the dog back to their property.

.....

³⁷ RSPCA, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 45-46

This particular trainer took the dog home. I couldn't go to collect it so I sent two of my volunteers. They are people who foster dogs for me regularly. When they turned up at the property she was not going to let them out the back, but where they did go was near the greyhound shed. In a row along, as they walked in, there were cages of rabbits and at the door of the shed into the greyhound shed there was a pile, I am not sure how many, I think she said about three rabbits, that had obviously been mauled. They had blood on them and they were dead outside the greyhound door. Having heard everything I have heard over the years and looking at Tasmania and other states, I cannot imagine why we would be different to any other states. Going on the greyhounds I have had it is likely that live baiting is more prevalent on the mainland but I am certain it has been happening in Tasmania.

CHAIR - This incident you talk about and the trainer in Campania, how long ago did that happen?

Ms HASWELL - That was only a couple of months before the Four Corners story, so within the last six months, leading up to the Four Corners story this year.

CHAIR - Did the volunteers report this to the RSPCA or police?

Ms HASWELL - No, because I didn't see it. The plan was that we try to collect some more evidence and be sure. Because of what has happened in the past with other animal welfare issues I wanted to get it right. Then Four Corners came out and I had not reported it at that point. I have been asked whether I reported it to the RSPCA, but during my years of helping pigs and chickens, I have not had any joy there, so I wanted to get it right. It might have been a mistake but I didn't feel I had the right avenue to go down until I had some more information. That is what I chose to do.

Ms RATTRAY - Why wouldn't you have at least made a call and then someone from the authorities could have gone and checked?

Ms HASWELL - Because I didn't see it and I wanted us to look into it ourselves, and then Four Corners came out and we did not have the opportunity..³⁸

3.18 Tony Murray, Director of Racing, also commented on the difficulty of having evidence which would result in a conviction:

CHAIR - In the report tabled in Parliament in March this year, the opening line in 5.1 is there has been no evidence identified that could result in a prosecution for live baiting in Tasmania. That is an appropriately qualified statement, isn't it, but it is about being able to reach prosecution or having enough hard evidence where authorities can be sure of a prosecution.

Mr MURRAY - The difficult part is establishing the burden of proof where we can prosecute somebody under the rules in relation to our role and other regulatory bodies under appropriate legislation. There has been one case in

³⁸ Emma Haswell, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 13-15

Tasmania in 2008 at the trial track in Carrick where stewards were close to laying a charge for live baiting. Again, there was not the necessary evidence to enable them to do so. There was a strong circumstantial case but it was not backed by forensic analysis to take it to the next level.

*That is the difficulty: you can have circumstantial evidence, you can have a whole range of hearsay, you can have your own views on what is happening, but to take it to that level you must be satisfied with the evidence before you that you can proceed to conviction. That is, I will not say impossible, but highly difficult unless you actually observe the act.*³⁹

- 3.19 As noted, the Review Report found that despite the lack of evidence that could result in a prosecution for live baiting, it did not exclude the possibility that live baiting could be happening in Tasmania. It noted that a barrier to obtaining sufficient evidence was obtaining credible intelligence to observe the practice:

*... in the absence of any credible intelligence to enable the regulator to be in a position to observe the activity at the time it is occurring, the likelihood of obtaining sufficient evidence to support a prosecution of live baiting is extremely remote.*⁴⁰

- 3.20 In evidence before the Committee, Dr Andrewartha, Chief Veterinary Officer, elaborated on some of these difficulties:

CHAIR - *There is a real problem, would you acknowledge, in obtaining evidence of live baiting? We have heard it not just from the RSPCA but also from Brightside, and obviously there are problems gathering evidence because Four Corners required a remote camera and some quite interesting ways of getting into a property and obtaining evidence. Is it very difficult to obtain evidence of live baiting in Tasmania?*

Dr ANDREWARTHA - *If it is occurring. Looking at the facilities, we made announced visits. Just where they are, the people coming up the road are visible for two or three kilometres away. It would be very hard to sneak up on these properties unannounced. You can see them coming. A couple of the bull rings we saw were well down the property. In one case your car would have been visible for a couple of kilometres coming up. You have then got to walk. You have got to get past a locked gate and then walk probably 500 metres through open ground with no cover to get to the bull ring, assuming that was the site you were concerned about. They are not places you are going to sneak up on. It is unlikely that unannounced visits are going to catch many people out if they were trying to do it. The comments have been made in some of the submissions that people had been warned. If we had found evidence of live baiting within four weeks of that program going to air somebody would have*

³⁹ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p. 39

⁴⁰ Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry, Final Report, 13 March 2015, p. 21.

not been doing very much thinking because obviously everybody was hyped up to it.

We looked at the concept of closed circuit television on the bull rings and things like that. Who is going to watch the video? Who is going to make sure the cameras are working? We did put the question to a couple of people and it was a case of 'we are not stupid'. If we were going to do it we would go somewhere where the camera wasn't. I do not think calling for closed circuit television on people's private land is the way to go.

I am not sure on the legality of the way the evidence on Four Corners was collected, whether that would be allowable as evidence in a court here.⁴¹

3.21 The Review Report also identified the following obstacles in detecting and discouraging live baiting:

- *Aging demographic with an entrenched culture in the industry which inhibits self-regulation and reporting of offenders.*
- *Lack of education and understanding regarding contemporary animal welfare standards of care.*
- *Lack of understanding of consequences and penalties.*
- *A situation whereby even the most severe penalty under the Rules of Racing – disqualification – can result in “business as usual” under the training name of another person (who may or may not be related).*
- *Use of “bullrings” for the education of greyhounds, which are located on private property and are often a significant distance from access points to that property.*
- *Limitations on resourcing of animal welfare officers and stewards.*
- *Potential for a greyhound to be under care and control of unlicensed person between registration (approximately 4 months old) and naming (approximately 14 to 18 months old).*
- *Lack of formal communication protocols between regulators.⁴²*

Committee findings:

3.22 The Committee finds that it received no substantiated evidence of live baiting currently occurring in Tasmania.

3.23 In light of historic difficulties in obtaining evidence of live baiting, the Committee finds that it is difficult for the Office of Racing Integrity to obtain evidence that would lead to a prosecution.

Recommendation 1: That the Government review the legal framework underpinning the prohibition of live baiting in Tasmania.

⁴¹ Dr Rod Andrewartha, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 76-77

⁴² *Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry*, Final Report, 13 March 2015, p. 23.

Recommendation 2: That the Government instruct the Office of Racing Integrity to educate industry participants and the general public of the contemporary legal framework underpinning the prohibition of live baiting in Tasmania.

Differences between the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry and the industry interstate

3.24 Many industry participants suggested that differences between the States in regard to industry structure and lure and training facilities made the chances of live baiting in Tasmania less likely.

3.25 In evidence before the Committee, Tony Murray referred to the difference in the structure of the industry in Tasmania from the other States, noting:

Tasmania is the only state-based racing jurisdiction whereby the integrity unit is completely separate. It is no surprise to me that the greyhound reports already handed down in Queensland and Victoria have identified separation of integrity as one of their primary recommendations. My views on the separation of integrity are well known and I formed the very strong position on the subject when I commenced as Director of Racing in August 2003 and immediately observed both real and potential conflicts of interest in play across the three codes.⁴³

3.26 In evidence before the Committee, Dr Rod Andrewartha commented that while he could not rule out that live baiting is occurring in Tasmania, there are some differences from other states that make it less likely:

CHAIR - *Had you previously in your position heard allegations of live baiting happening here in Tasmania?*

Dr ANDREWARTHA - *No, I have not. I have been Chief Veterinary Officer for nearly 16 years and before that I worked in a clinical practice for the Government, and at no time have I ever heard or seen evidence of live baiting.*

CHAIR - *Do you think that Tasmania would be any different from the other three mainland states where the Four Corners program revealed that it was quite widespread?*

Dr ANDREWARTHA - *The fact it was shown to be present in three states means it would be a little naive to think it could not happen elsewhere. There are some differences in how training is done in the other states. The private trial tracks, for example, which we do not have here. So there are some differences,*

⁴³ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p. 37.

*but as we said in the report, we could not say it definitely does not occur in Tasmania. The fact that we do not have private trial tracks suggests that it is less likely, but you could not rule it out.*⁴⁴

3.27 Tasracing, commented on some distinctions between the regulation of lures in Tasmania compared to other jurisdictions:

To provide some context, training with a mechanical lure in Tasmania only occurs on properties owned and operated by Tasracing and supervised by its staff or experienced club officials.

This is a very important difference between Tasmania and the interstate examples presented on ABC's 4 Corners program.

The Tasmanian properties are locked at night and are subject to regular security checks. Tracks are inspected first thing every morning.

Tasracing has been advised by RST that properties of licensed industry participants in Tasmania are regularly inspected and their activities are subject to ongoing surveillance.

*Carcasses on lure arms for training is also banned here. The last time this happened was in 2008. Two trainers were disqualified as a result.*⁴⁵

3.28 Industry participants noted the differences between Tasmania and other States in relation to the availability of, and access to, trial tracks in an unsupervised environment. In its submission to the inquiry, the Hobart Greyhound Racing Club (HGRC), observed that the training style in Tasmania was different to that practised in other States and did not involve the use of private trial tracks:

Tasmanian greyhound trainers have not been implicated in the live baiting scandal and we believe that the training practices in this State are major reasons why. The training style in Tasmania is different to practices interstate as there are no private trial/breaking in centres in Tasmania. Interstate the private trial tracks are used by many trainers who congregate together at trial times and I believe they also are able to have private trials as well, these facilities are not staffed by the controlling body but are owned privately whereas training and trialling in Tasmania are done on race tracks or trial tracks that are operated by Tasracing and staffed by the Clubs or Organisations who are registered by Racing Services Tasmania, this includes run on arm trials.

These trial sessions are the major training method for getting a greyhound fit for racing or maintaining their greyhound's fitness, the run on arm trials are a reward for greyhounds where they are allowed to catch the lure at the end of their run. The lure is made from a synthetic material, as this is all that is needed to encourage greyhounds to chase the lure. Trainers and greyhounds have

⁴⁴ Dr Rod Andrewartha, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 64

⁴⁵ Submission 36 Tasracing, p 3

access to all facilities at the track such as water, wash bays, kennelling and weighing facilities.

Some trainers have straight tracks on their properties that are used for fitness training; some also have bull rings where young greyhounds are educated to the boxes and chasing a lure before being brought to the track to get fit and ready for racing. These facilities come under scrutiny from the Stewards during kennel inspections.⁴⁶

3.29 This view was reinforced by the Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania (GOTBA) which commented:

The Director of Racing and the Chief Veterinarian for Tasmania, in a recent investigation and report to the Minister for Racing found no evidence of live baiting being conducted in Tasmania.

Tasmania does not have any private greyhound trial tracks, which is where the live baiting problems occurred on mainland Australia.

The three race tracks at Hobart (Elwick), Launceston and Devonport are all administered by registered race clubs. All tracks are open to the public and all three race clubs conduct regular race meetings and also trial sessions. All three tracks are maintained by TasRacing.

At the Launceston venue there is also a straight trialing track which is again administered and operated by the Launceston Greyhound Racing Club (LGRC). The straight trialing track at Brighton is administered by the GOTBA and also maintained by TasRacing. This track is also registered with Racing Services Tasmania and operated under strict rules and guidelines. Only GOTBA track volunteers and TasRacing maintenance staff have keyed access to the driving tower, so it is not possible for any other person to use this facility to live bait a greyhound on the lure.⁴⁷

3.30 June Phillips commented that the size of Tasmania makes it unlikely that such practices would occur without being reported:

CHAIR - ...Can you explain why you think it is not happening here when it clearly is happening on mainland states and was only exposed as a result of covert surveillance? Prior to that, the industry had been saying it is not happening here.

Ms PHILLIPS - Mainly because we are so small. Everyone has a phone now that can take photos and I think the first time someone beat them they would expose them...⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Submission 46, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, p. 2.

⁴⁷ Submission 26, Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania, pp 2-3.

⁴⁸ June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, p 8

- 3.31 Anthony Bullock stated that Tasmania does not have private trial tracks, and that people generally trained their own dogs on their own property, making it less likely that live baiting was occurring:

CHAIR - *Do you believe, though, there is any reason Tasmania would be different from Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria where Four Corners demonstrated live baiting was a common practice in the industry?*

Mr Bullock - *Those sorts of places all have trial tracks. We only have race tracks, which are governed by Tasracing. I have a bullring, as has been stated. I don't know who else has a bullring. We've got straight tracks and everything is self-sufficient where we don't have to go to trial tracks. It's different because you've only got a person's property where most people only have their own dogs on that property.*⁴⁹

- 3.32 However, when asked if live baiting could only happen on a racing track, Mr Bullock commented that:

Mr BULLOCK - *It can happen in a bullring.*

Mrs TAYLOR - *Lots of people have bullrings, don't they?*

Mr BULLOCK - *Yes, but I don't know who has them. I have one but I don't know who has them, but it can happen there. I don't think it does because for most people you need more than one or two people to help you, so you need more people involved.*⁵⁰

- 3.33 Mr Bullock also observed:

*I know everybody in the industry but I can't talk for anyone else because I don't know and I don't go to anyone else's place to do anything. I do my own thing at my own place.*⁵¹

- 3.34 The Committee heard that live baiting could occur in Tasmania regardless of the differences between the Tasmanian greyhound industry and the mainland States. In evidence before the Committee Jade Norris, Scientific Officer, from the RSPCA commented:

The RSPCA welcomes this inquiry on greyhound racing in Tasmania. For many years the RSPCA has held serious concerns about the extensive animal welfare problems associated with greyhound racing, including illegal live baiting. These concerns were confirmed in the recent Four Corners ABC program. Multiple greyhound trainers, including those with a high profile in the industry, are directly implicated in live baiting practices, indicating that animal cruelty is widespread and entrenched in the industry. For example, in Queensland alone

⁴⁹ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 1.

⁵⁰ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 1-2.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, p 2.

the initial investigations have seen 68 charges of serious animal cruelty against 25 people. Given the extent of the issues uncovered so far in the greyhound industry across multiple states, it would be naive to think live baiting is not occurring in Tasmania and therefore stringent measures must be implemented to ensure it is effectively prevented.⁵²

3.35 Heather Neil, CEO of the RSPCA, commented:

CHAIR - Given your national oversight in the RSPCA, what is your view on the likelihood of live baiting happening here in Tasmania?

Ms NEIL - I know Tasmania is a lovely place, but I don't think there is anything different with the greyhound industry. There is nothing that makes the greyhound industry in Tasmania any different than the greyhound industry anywhere else. It seems a sad fact that it is an entrenched practice in many other places and there is evidence being collected on a daily basis and three reports so far from various jurisdictions showing that they have clear evidence and there are investigations being pursued as we speak. It would be nice to think Tasmania was different but I am not sure you have the evidence to suggest that.

Mr VALENTINE - Except in the size of the operations, perhaps?

Ms NEIL - I couldn't comment on whether there is a relationship between the size of the trainer or the operations and the facility.

Ms RATTRAY - It has been suggested by the Australian Veterinary Association that Tasmania is in a better position than many jurisdictions because we already have an independent regulation for the greyhound industry. Do you not accept that that is working better in Tasmania than anywhere else?

Ms NEIL - I think it sets you up for success better, but remembering that live baiting has been illegal in every jurisdiction in Australia for some time, if those practices want to be underground the best regulator may not find them. We really support the regulatory system in Tasmania. The split between the industry and the integrity function is a very good thing to have. There are a few more tweaks that could be made to that to make it even better but certainly you are leading the way in terms of other jurisdictions.

Ms RATTRAY - It has been suggested that it varies between one to two inspections to up to four inspections a year for breeding and training facilities, and there hasn't been any evidence found, so do you still stand by the fact that it must be happening?

Ms NEIL - I think those same inspection regimes have been occurring in the jurisdictions that we saw on Four Corners.

Ms RATTRAY - I don't think that's fair to say, not in Victoria, especially.

⁵² Jade Norris, RSPCA, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 43

Ms NEIL - My understanding is that there have been inspections required under their act as well and –

Ms RATTRAY - Seventeen a year?

Ms NEIL - I cannot speak for the racing authorities.

Mr BACON - I think it was Queensland where they mentioned that.

Ms NEIL - I would like to think that it wasn't happening in Tasmania. However, I think as a committee it is better to take a precautionary approach and put in place procedures and structures to ensure that if it is occurring, it ends, and if it isn't occurring, it never starts.⁵³

Committee findings:

- 3.36 The Committee notes that unlike other jurisdictions, the integrity and commercial arms of the industry are separate in Tasmania.
- 3.37 The Committee finds the separation of regulatory roles in Tasmania provides an opportunity for improved welfare outcomes for racing greyhounds.
- 3.38 The Committee finds there is inconsistency in the definition and use of the term 'trial tracks' within and between the States.
- 3.39 The Committee notes that while there are different lure registration requirements and there are no registered private 'trial tracks' in Tasmania, the existence of other training facilities and the lack of information about them increases the difficulty of investigating the possibility of live baiting.

Recommendation 3: That the separation between the Office of Racing Integrity and Tasracing be maintained.

Recommendation 4: That all training facilities including but not limited to trial tracks, training tracks and bullrings be registered with the Office of Racing Integrity.

Behavioural differences in greyhounds

- 3.40 The Committee heard evidence that the behaviour of certain greyhounds indicated they had been trained with live baiting. Emma

⁵³ Heather Neil, RSPCA, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 47-48

Haswell claimed she could tell whether or not a greyhound has been trained with live baiting:

Ms HASWELL - After 300 greyhounds I can almost tell before they get out of the car just by looking at their eyes and the way they are when they're driven in - it's extraordinary. I have a dog at the moment that was given to me by a Tasmanian trainer from Sydney and one that was sent over from Melbourne because no-one could get him into a rescue group. The bitch from Sydney is not re-homeable. She is the sweetest dog with people but she would tear any animal apart. You cannot have her out in the car park. Even on a lead, you have to be so careful. She's a tiny little dog but she's just such a killer. Then you get –

CHAIR - Do you think she's been trained with live bait?

Ms HASWELL - Absolutely, because I've had hundreds of greyhounds and I've only had a small number of Tasmanian greyhounds that have had that level of intensity. Unless something is moving fast, 90 per cent of them won't even look at the chickens or the cats until they run, and that's when they go, but when you get dogs like Myrtle the animal does not have to be moving. With pigs she goes completely off and it's the same with the one from Melbourne. The one from Melbourne is lovely with dogs, and so is Myrtle, but with any other living creature she's not so I can't re-home that dog.

CHAIR - You have had dogs come to Brightside that to you have clearly been trained with live bait, that have been blooded?

Ms HASWELL - In my opinion, with what I have seen across the spectrum, yes.

CHAIR - How did they behave and were they Tasmanian dogs?

Ms HASWELL - I was thinking about it last night. Out of the 300 greyhounds I have had, I have probably had maybe 10 or 15 euthanased. You might have to have them for five or six months, but at the end of the day they come right. Often they start to come right just by sitting them in a paddock where they can see all the animals and letting them calm down over a month. But there are some dogs, like that one from Sydney, that are in a frenzy. Their eyes are on stalks and they are so wired. The animal could be dead beside them and they would still go berserk. That is not, in my opinion, the way a greyhound behaves, having had hundreds of them. The ones I have had range from 15 months to 11 years and they've all been racing greyhounds. It is just not characteristic of them to go berserk over the animals in the car park.⁵⁴

3.41 Ms Haswell commented:

Ms RATTRAY - When the dog gets out of the car, you can tell by their eyes whether they have been on live baiting?

⁵⁴ Emma Haswell, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 20-21

Ms HASWELL - Their eyes and their ears. Not on live baiting, but you can tell whether they are going to be an easy dog to retrain or a hard one. Then you can see some of them are extreme cases of, 'I want to kill everything.' You can see it by the way they stand, the way they hold their ears, and the look in their eyes; you can read greyhounds like a book. It is quite an amazing thing to see. I had one that the RSPCA in Launceston asked me to take a few years ago. It was from down the Tamar, this dog. I do not know how it ended up at the RSPCA but it was so depressed that they asked me to take it. I took her home and drove into the car park. I had a bag of bird seed on the back seat of the car next to the greyhound. She saw a piglet out of the window and she picked up the bag of birdseed, shredded it, spread it all around the inside of the car, and started scratching at the windows. She got out of the car and went absolutely berserk. I put her in a pen and she spent about three days trying to dig through the concrete.

Ms RATTRAY - And you think that is because of live baiting?

Ms HASWELL - Yes, because I think when you have had hundreds and hundreds of dogs and you see the occasional one like that, there has to be a reason. I am talking about something so off the rails compared to 99 per cent of the greyhounds. It was a frenzy. If you watched Four Corners, you would know that with those dogs it is like a frenzy to get to that lure when they are being held. I have had a lot of greyhounds; I am not just judging it on a handful. I have had hundreds of them and they are a really gentle breed.⁵⁵

3.42 John Newson dismissed claims from Animal Welfare Groups that dogs which had been live baited behaved differently to dogs that had not:

CHAIR - John, you have been in the industry since 1972. In your view, is a dog that hasn't been live-baited as fast as a dog that has been?

Mr NEWSON - Some dogs are faster than others. There is no proof that says that live baiting is going to make the dog run faster. I don't think there is any proof.

How can I say this? I don't think there is any proof of it. A dog can either run fast or he can't. It is like humans. You get 20 people and line them up; you are going to get some faster than others.

I did see in one of those submissions there that someone said, 'I know these dogs have been live-baited', because if they see something furry or another small dog they'll go mad and they'll want to tear it apart. That is totally untrue. They are a hunting animal. Anything that moves, they will want to chase it, live-baited or not.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Emma Haswell, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 24

⁵⁶ John Newson, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, p 18

- 3.43 June Phillips considered that while some greyhounds showed a strong prey drive that it was just the nature of the dog and not an indication that they had been trained by live baiting:

CHAIR - We had Emma Haswell from Brightside in yesterday who talked about the different characters of greyhounds that come to Brightside. We asked her if she could tell the difference between a dog that had been blooded here or sent to Victoria - and I take on board what you said about not knowing anyone who practised live baiting here. She said there is a very distinct temperamental and behavioural difference between a dog that has been blooded and a dog that has been trained with soft toys and balls under the rules of racing.

Ms PHILLIPS - No.

CHAIR - You have never had a dog come through GAP that displayed frantic play instinct?

Ms PHILLIPS - Yes. I have taken a dog that was given to me for GAP to the vet the next morning and had it put down because it had such a strong prey drive. I always had a little fluffy dog that I educated the dogs with. That is nothing to do with live baiting; that is the nature of the dog. You can have 10 litters of perfectly happy, contented puppies and in the next litter you can have one that will run around and they rip the other puppies at four or five months old. That is in all breeds of dogs, not just greyhounds. They have a very strong prey drive and you can't put a dog into GAP that is like that; it can't be done; it has to be euthanased.⁵⁷

- 3.44 Dr Kim Barrett, veterinarian to the industry considered that there was no distinct behaviour that could indicate whether a dog had been trained by live baiting:

CHAIR - Has a dog ever come into your vet, a greyhound that is exhibiting behaviour to make you suspect it has been trained like that?

Dr BARRETT - I do not know what would make you suspect that it has been, if that makes sense...⁵⁸

Committee finding:

- 3.45 The Committee finds there is conflicting and inconclusive evidence of behavioural differences in greyhounds that have potentially been involved in live baiting.

⁵⁷ June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 5-6

⁵⁸ Dr Kim Barrett, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 25-26.

Industry monitoring and regulation

3.46 The Review Report concluded that:

... no level of regulation or compliance inspection could absolutely ensure that live baiting was not occurring. The motivation to make sure it does not occur must come from the industry participants and there must be a degree of self-regulation.⁵⁹

3.47 The Committee heard from animal welfare groups that self-regulation of the industry is a failure. In its submission to the inquiry the Animal Justice Party of Australia (AJP), commented on industry self-regulation:

Recent evidence has made it clear that a significant number of greyhound trainers, including highly successful and respected trainers have been involved in live baiting – in NSW Victoria and Queensland. Given logic and anecdotal reports, and given that the industries exist with the same structure in the different states and territories, it is simply not believable that live baiting would not also be taking place in Tasmania. If the members of the board are actually not aware of this practice taking place, or if they say they are not aware of it, they are not doing their job. It is the position of the AJP that the existing structure of the industry, which includes one arm of the body being responsible for monitoring and policing, and another arm of the same body being responsible for promoting the industry suffers from a serious conflict of interest. It has been revealed to be a spectacular failure.⁶⁰

3.48 The Review Report found that the possibility of live baiting happening in Tasmania could not be excluded:

There has been no evidence identified that could result in a prosecution for live baiting in Tasmania. Both RSPCA inspectors and RST stewards have conducted inspections and surveillance; however, there has not been evidence to proceed to action under the Animal Welfare Act or the Rules of Racing.

That said, this finding does not exclude the possibility that live baiting could be happening in Tasmania. The Panel reached this view as, in the absence of any credible intelligence to enable the regulator to be in a position to observe the activity at the time it is occurring, the likelihood of obtaining sufficient evidence to support a prosecution of live baiting is extremely remote.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry, Final Report, 13 March 2015, p. 22.

⁶⁰ Submission 3, Animal Justice Party of Australia, p. 2.

⁶¹ Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry, Final Report, 13 March 2015, p. 21.

- 3.49 Despite the finding that live baiting could not be excluded from occurring, Tasracing considered it to mean that live baiting was not occurring at all. In its submission to the inquiry Tasracing commented:

*Tasracing obviously welcomed the formal finding by the Director of Racing and the Chief Veterinary Officer that there was no evidence of live baiting occurring in Tasmania.*⁶²

- 3.50 Further, during the scrutiny of Tasracing by the House of Assembly Government Businesses Scrutiny Committee in December 2015, Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO of Tasracing, made a similar claim:

*Certainly the finding of the Director of Racing with his inquiry was that there was no evidence of live baiting in this state.*⁶³

- 3.51 This claim was also expressed by John Newson, who stated in evidence before the Committee:

*Regarding the live baiting, there has been an inquiry by Mr Murray and Dr Andrewartha and they have found no evidence of it occurring.*⁶⁴

- 3.52 The Committee heard there was some reluctance among industry participants to report live baiting if it is occurring. Dr Rod Andrewartha, noted in evidence before the Committee that in undertaking the review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound racing industry that the attitude of some within the industry was to turn a blind eye to the practice. He commented:

*We put the question to a couple of trainers. If you knew somebody was live baiting what would you do with it. Their attitude was, well we wouldn't. We would ignore and we wouldn't tell anybody. That's their business and not my business. I don't think all members of the industry would be open to reporting it if it were occurring. Some members of the industry, yes, definitely, but I couldn't say all.*⁶⁵

- 3.53 It is acknowledged that the industry has introduced a number of changes following the Four Corners program. Greyhounds Australasia (GA) noted that new national lure rules were put in place after the Four Corners program:

⁶² Submission 36, Tasracing, p. 3.

⁶³ Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO, Tasracing, Transcript of evidence before the House of Assembly Government Businesses Scrutiny Committee, 2 December 2015.

⁶⁴ John Newson, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, p. 8

⁶⁵ Dr Rod Andrewartha, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 71.

In media interviews during and immediately following the Four Corners program that showed evidence of live baiting in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland, the GA CEO Mr Scott Parker advised that GA would be reviewing all national and local lure related rules and penalties.

That review took place immediately and with effect on 30 April 2015, new national rules have been in place that:

- *Allow a person to only use or have in their possession at any place where greyhounds are, or are able to be kept, trained or educated or prepared to race, or racing, a lure that is approved by the Controlling Body;*
- *Impose a penalty of not less than 10 years disqualification and up to \$20,000 for any person who witnesses but fails to report the use of a lure contrary to the rules to their controlling body.⁶⁶*

Committee finding:

3.54 The Committee finds that self reporting and self regulation of any live baiting practices within the industry are unlikely to occur to an effective degree.

Recommendation 5: That the Government review the legal framework underpinning animal welfare and the prohibition of live baiting in Tasmania with a view to increasing regulation and investigative powers with an emphasis on training facilities and industry practices.

⁶⁶ Submission 37, Greyhounds Australasia, p 7.

4 WASTAGE

- 4.1 The level of wastage within the greyhound racing industry is an issue that has been raised as a serious concern. The Special Commission of Inquiry into the Greyhound Racing Industry in New South Wales defined the term ‘wastage’ as:

... the number of healthy greyhounds bred for the purpose of greyhound racing that are subsequently destroyed either prior to being named, prior to being raced or upon retirement from racing.⁶⁷

- 4.2 This Chapter considers wastage rates both nationally and specifically in Tasmania, and the link between overbreeding and wastage rates. It also considers the need for greater transparency in the data regarding the number of greyhounds and ensuring every greyhound can be tracked throughout its life.

- 4.3 The Committee heard that the term ‘wastage’ itself was a contributing factor in heightening community concern about the greyhound racing industry. In its submission to the inquiry Tasracing noted:

Tasracing’s strong view is that “wastage” is an emotive and non-descript term that adds no value to community debate.⁶⁸

- 4.4 Other industry participants considered that while the term may be emotive it was accurate. June Phillips commented:

... it's a horrible word, but that is exactly what it is, wastage. To me there has to be a better way of doing it.⁶⁹

- 4.5 Biosecurity Tasmania advised the Committee that as the greyhound industry is a ‘livestock’ industry it was accepted there would always be a level of euthanasia, and as long as this was done humanely, that there were no animal welfare issues:

... while wastage may cause some community concern, if the animals are euthanased in a humane manner it does not cause a welfare concern under the [Animal Welfare] Act. Greyhound racing is a livestock industry and like all livestock industries there will be excess or cull animals that need to be disposed of by euthanasia or slaughter.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ See *Issues Paper on Overbreeding and Wastage*, Special Commission of Inquiry into the Greyhound Racing Industry in New South Wales, available at: http://www.greyhoundracinginquiry.justice.nsw.gov.au/Documents/Breeding_Issues_Paper.pdf accessed 13 January 2016.

⁶⁸ Submission 36, Tasracing, p 4.

⁶⁹ June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 3-4

⁷⁰ Submission 1, Biosecurity, p. 2.

- 4.6 In evidence before the Committee Dr Rod Andrewartha noted that while ‘wastage’ within the greyhound industry is not an animal welfare issue when done humanely, it is an animal rights issue and that he would like to see fewer greyhounds euthanased:

Dr ANDREWARTHA - *From a strict animal welfare perspective, as in the Animal Welfare Act, provided those dogs have been euthanised in a humane fashion, it is not an animal welfare issue.*

CHAIR - *It is the difference between the law and ethics here.*

Dr ANDREWARTHA - *Working in this area, as I do, it gets very confusing. I have to separate animal welfare from animal rights. The wastage issue here is an issue of legitimate community concern. To me, it is an animal rights issue rather than an animal welfare issue. If we compare it to any other industry, if we are talking about horses or cattle, unwanted animals tend to wind up in a meatworks so there is a use for them. Here there is no use for the animals. People have a close affinity with dogs because the average person has more of an understanding of dogs and cats than most other animals. From a strict point of view, if we assume people can use animals for a purpose, provided the animals are euthanased in a humane fashion, that is dealt with. We are breeding animals here to race - and I am not trying to support or not support the industry. We are breeding animals to race and to get elite animals you have to have a pool to select from. You have to breed more than will win races.*

Because I have to work in the area of animal welfare, I try to avoid confusing my thinking with animals rights. If it is acceptable to the community, I need to focus on whether the animals are managed in a humane manner. It is up to Parliament, as a reflection of the community, as to whether it is acceptable for us to use animals in this way. It is a concern. I would like to see less dogs euthanased, and at the end of life a number of dogs are euthanased. Even with things like the GAP program, there is a limited number of places where dogs can be placed.

CHAIR - *Perhaps that comes back to the breeding numbers issue and the controls you can put in place to limit the number of pups that are born to die?*

Dr ANDREWARTHA - *In this industry, the pups are bred to race. That is the primary purpose for breeding them, not to re-home them post racing.*

It is a livestock industry. Where I come from with Biosecurity Tasmania, this is an industry which is legal and it is our job to make sure the animals are handled in a humane manner, consistent with the Act.⁷¹

- 4.7 A similar position was taken in the Review Report which considered that a process was required to deal with surplus animals within the greyhound industry but that strategies needed to be introduced to minimise the number of surplus animals. The Report commented:

⁷¹ Dr Rod Andrewartha, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 73-75

It is an undeniable fact that greyhounds are bred specifically for commercial purposes. Greyhound racing is a livestock industry and as with all livestock industries, there must be a process of dealing with surplus animals.

The Panel identified the need for collecting and maintaining accurate data sufficient to inform critical policy decisions impacting the lifespan of a greyhound. In particular, strategies such as improving breeding policies and extending racing opportunities for slower and mature greyhounds can minimise wastage and improve the longevity of a greyhound.⁷²

Committee findings:

- 4.8 The Committee notes the concerns raised by the industry that the term ‘wastage’ is both emotive and is a factor in raising community angst.
- 4.9 The Committee notes the common understanding of the term ‘euthanasia’ is the practice of intentionally ending a life in order to relieve pain and suffering, however the Committee finds the term ‘wastage’ is a more accurate descriptor for premature deaths in the industry.

Wastage Rates

- 4.10 The Committee heard that there is evidence of significant overbreeding and high wastage rates within the greyhound industry across Australia. The RSPCA commented:

Evidence shows that significant overbreeding and high wastage rates are inherent in greyhound racing. Thousands of greyhounds are born each year in Australia that are surplus to industry requirements. On a national level, about 35-40 per cent of greyhounds born (about 6000-7000 greyhounds every year) will never receive a registered racing ‘name’ and hence never race. This represents the immediate wastage rate. Further ongoing ‘wastage’ occurs over time as ‘named’ racing greyhounds retire from racing or are discarded due to injury or sub-optimal performance, among other reasons.

In Tasmania, Greyhound Australasia industry statistics and the Tasmanian Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry Final Report (Tasmanian report) show that between about 600-700 greyhounds are whelped each year in Tasmania. The Tasmanian report also reveals that about 50 per cent of the greyhound pups born in Tasmania in 2011/2012 are recorded as ‘unnamed’ (this includes ‘unnamed’ and ‘deceased prior to registration’). Of the 269 dogs listed as ‘unnamed’ for the 2011/2012 cohort, the majority are listed as deceased (216 dogs), 24 retired and 29 still in active training/education.

⁷² Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry, Final Report, 13 March 2015, p. 24.

The high initial failure rate is a significant finding as it indicates fundamental problems in the quality of the breeding, rearing and training practices that currently occur in Tasmania.

In addition, to immediate wastage, further ongoing 'wastage' occurs over time in the population of 'named' Tasmanian greyhounds. Of the 273 'named raced greyhounds' from the 2011/2012 cohort, 98 dogs (over one third) are listed as deceased. It is also important to note that according to Racing Services Tasmania (RST) data, a proportion of named greyhounds will also not go on to race. In the 2011/2012 cohort 306 greyhounds were named and of these named greyhounds, 33 are reported as 'unraced' (28 of these dogs are reported as deceased).

The consequence of high wastage is a high number of unwanted greyhounds. This situation is compounded by a concomitant lack of capacity to rehome these unwanted greyhounds and in some cases a lack of interest in attempting to rehome them, which then leads to high euthanasia rates.⁷³

- 4.11 In relation to the 'wastage' rates in Tasmania, the Review Report noted data collected on greyhounds in Tasmania that had been retired, rehomed, euthanased or died from natural causes indicates that approximately 76 per cent of these greyhounds met premature deaths in the 2013/14 racing season and 68 per cent during the 2014/15 racing season:

In the 2013/14 racing season, 635 greyhounds were euthanised, retired, rehomed or deceased –

- 486 euthanised
- 28 deceased (natural or other cause, for example snake bite)
- 121 retired/rehomed (62 in GAP)

In the 2014/15 racing season to date (1 August 2014 to 10 March 2015) 392 greyhounds were euthanised, retired, rehomed or deceased –

- 267 euthanised
- 27 deceased (natural or other causes)
- 98 retired/rehomed (53 in GAP)⁷⁴

- 4.12 Mr Murray advised the Committee that the number of greyhounds euthanased in 2013/14 and 2014/15 comprised the following:

2013/14 – 486 greyhounds

Reason for being euthanised:

⁷³ Submission 71, RSPCA, pp 2-3.

⁷⁴ Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry: Final Report, 13 March 2015, p. 27.

Due to injury/illness	36%
Not suitable for rehoming/GAP	32%
Lack of ability/unsuitable for racing	32%

Age when euthanised:

Under 1 yr	1%
Between 1yr-2yrs	34%
Between 2yrs-3yrs	35%
Between 3yrs-4yrs	21%
Between 4yrs-5yrs	4%
Between 5yrs-6yrs	1%
Older than 6 yrs	4%

2014/15 – 267 greyhounds

Reason for being euthanised:

Due to injury/illness	33%
Not suitable for rehoming/GAP	23%
Lack of ability/unsuitable for racing	44%

Age when euthanised:

Under 1 yr	1%
Between 1yr-2yrs	43%
Between 2yrs-3yrs	30%
Between 3yrs-4yrs	16%
Between 4yrs-5yrs	4%
Between 5yrs-6yrs	1%
Older than 6 yrs	5% ⁷⁵

- 4.13 The Committee notes evidence obtained in August 2016 indicating that between 1 July 2013 and 9 June 2016, 1608 Tasmanian racing greyhounds died.⁷⁶
- 4.14 The Review Report also noted that the accuracy of these figures is “reliant on those in charge of a greyhound notifying the regulator, in accordance with the Rules of Racing” and should be viewed as minimum figures.⁷⁷
- 4.15 Dr Sally-Anne Richter commented on the wastage of pups:

Part of what AVA is trying to highlight is that between four months to twelve months, the naming period, there is very little involvement of vets and also less regulation from the Government in that time period. On that note, that is also a time when a lot of greyhounds do not reach racing stage and when I looked

⁷⁵ Correspondence received from Tony Murray, Director of Racing, dated 2 March 2016.

⁷⁶ Information on the number of registered racing greyhound deaths for the period 1st July 2013 to date provided to Ms Andrea Dawkins MP under a Right to Information Application, dated 18 August 2016.

⁷⁷ *Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry: Final Report*, 13 March 2015, p. 27.

at some of the statistics, 50 per cent do not make it to racing from when they are born to when they are actually meant to be racing.

CHAIR - Do you believe they are euthanased?

Dr RICHTER - Some, potentially. I would not say all of them are euthanased. Some might be sent elsewhere. They might get re-homed. They might not be eligible, so they might enter a GAP program at a young age. I wouldn't say all of them are being euthanased, no.

CHAIR - But there is a concern there is a very high rate of wastage of pups?

Dr RICHTER - Yes, definitely.⁷⁸

- 4.16 Industry participants acknowledged the significant numbers of greyhounds being euthanased each year within the Tasmanian industry. Graeme Barber, President of the Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania, commented on the number of dogs being euthanased each year:

Mrs TAYLOR - Graeme, can you take me through the numbers of dogs. You have said you need about 200 to enter and exit the industry each year and you are saying something like there are about 80 litters a year or something. Tell me what happens to all the dogs that are bred? There is probably more than 200 out of 80 litters.

Mr BARBER - In the economic impact review for the financial year 2013-14, there were 506 greyhound pups.

Mrs TAYLOR - So tell me what happens. The 200 that exit are probably ones that go into GAP or whatever.

Mr BARBER - Or retire on the farm.

Mrs TAYLOR - But if you have 500-plus that are bred and 200 of them probably go into the industry that year, what happens to the rest?

Mr BARBER - Some die of natural causes. About 18 months to two years ago here in the south of the state we had an outbreak of Parvo that killed a number of young pups from two or three weeks of age through to probably six months. A number of breeders lost entire litters through that.

Mrs TAYLOR - We are talking about 500 dogs a year.

CHAIR - A significant number are euthanased and that hasn't been disputed.

Mr BARBER - There would be, yes.

Mrs TAYLOR - As pups?

⁷⁸ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 2.

Mr BARBER - Not as young pups. How old is a pup?

Mrs TAYLOR - You have talked about the first three months.

Mr BARBER - From 12 months of age onwards there would be a considerable number of dogs that were euthanased, yes.

CHAIR - Do you think they were all euthanased by veterinarians?

Mr BARBER - Yes. Now, yes.

CHAIR - I guess I need to ask how can you be sure of that?

Mr BARBER - It is a requirement under the licence now. That changed probably about three or four years ago. Before that you could humanely euthanase the dogs yourself, but that changed and it's now regulated under the rules of racing that a dog must be euthanased by a qualified veterinarian. The only exception to that rule is if a dog has been seriously and extremely injured and you're not able to get hold of a vet. It might be 10 p.m. or something like that. If that is the case, the person who euthanases that dog now must put in a statutory declaration to Racing Services to say how the dog was euthanased, why it was euthanased and when. Record keeping in the industry up until four or five years ago about where dogs went was very lax.⁷⁹

- 4.17 Others within the industry considered that the rate of 'wastage' within the greyhound industry was less than that in the pet dog industry. Dr Kim Barrett commented:

CHAIR - How much of a challenge do you think the amount of wastage in the industry is for the industry?

Dr BARRETT - More so than it was five years ago because it is out there in the public domain now. There is probably less wastage in the greyhound industry than there would be in the pet dog industry.

Mrs TAYLOR - Really?

Dr BARRETT - The figures from RSPCA Australia and what you see are quite concerning and if that is a societal impact of the value of pets as disposable commodities, I don't know.⁸⁰

Committee findings:

- 4.18 The Committee finds the wastage rate of healthy greyhounds in Tasmania is unacceptable.

⁷⁹ Graeme Barber, Transcript of evidence, 30 June pp 31-32

⁸⁰ Dr Kim Barrett, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 22

- 4.19 The Committee finds wastage rates are likely to be higher than reported.

Overbreeding

- 4.20 The Committee heard there is a direct link between the volume of greyhounds bred and 'wastage' rates and that the number of greyhounds bred each year needed to be reduced. Scott Parker, CEO of Greyhounds Australasia (GA), commented in evidence before the Committee:

The restriction on breeding is really a first stab at sending a significant message to the industry that all breeding decisions must be properly considered. The facts are that there are around 3 800 people engaged in breeding actively around the country today, defined as any person that has bred at least one litter in the past three years, and 80 per cent of those 3 800 have only bred one or two litters, so the vast majority of breeding activity is going on in a manner that the industry will find very hard to put a cap on. In other words, the restriction we brought in to say no more than three litters before a controlling body and veterinary approval is much more about sending a signal at the start of the breeding process that you had better be careful who and what you're breeding with rather than getting to a stage where, 'I'd really like to have another go with X and Y but now I need to fill in some paperwork and get controlling body approval and get a vet certificate to say it is a healthy thing or not to be doing.'

It is really about sending a signal now, today, that you had better be careful who you are mating with because under-performing greyhounds are quite clearly contributing to the challenge of reducing unnecessary euthanasia, and that is the benefit as much as anything of introducing those rules. The thinking behind those rule changes goes back to May/June/July/August/September last year, so well in advance of the Four Corners program and any suggestion, certainly at controlling body level, that live baiting was an issue in the industry. It goes back well and truly before that. More recent thinking has been about how we drastically reduce the numbers of greyhounds bred that don't make it to the racetrack and how we drastically improve the number of greyhounds being adopted out through official channels such as the GAPs.

Mr VALENTINE - *It is basically putting into play measures that will see the pendulum swing further towards animal welfare as opposed to the generation of dollars. Is it fair to say that?*

Mr PARKER - *Absolutely. There are 17 levers the controlling bodies have identified as being available to them. They will not all be used in all circumstances. Clearly some states have a breeding volume that they do not require. Other states do not have an over-breeding problem perhaps in the same way as some of the larger states do and need to fill their own race cards and would probably prefer those greyhounds to be bred at volumes suitable for filling race cards by their own means rather than importing from New South Wales and Victoria in the case of Tasmania.*

Mr VALENTINE - So the development of the rules commenced before the exposure on Four Corners?

Mr PARKER - They were approved by the GA board on 21 November 2014 - correct.

Ms RATTRAY - Can you go back a step when you talked about the breeding by Tasmanian breeders with semen from Victoria and New South Wales? Are you saying we should not be breeding from New South Wales and Victoria?

Mr PARKER - I wouldn't like to speak on any individual controlling body's behalf, it is really not my role, but I can talk generally and say that the greatest volume of breeding, and frankly over-breeding, comes out of the larger states. That is where the vast majority of activity is being undertaken. Whether it be artificial or natural, that is where the dogs are being bred.

Ms RATTRAY - And Tasmania doesn't fit into that category in your view - is that correct?

Mr PARKER - No. We're breeding across the country 18 000 greyhounds a year and around about 11 000 greyhounds are required for racing every year.

Ms RATTRAY - Is it correct that there is a reduction already?

Mr PARKER - There is, absolutely.

Ms RATTRAY - I watched a little snippet of a greyhound program last week and it said there was potentially a reduction by 50 per cent this current year.

Mr PARKER - No, that wouldn't be correct.

Ms RATTRAY - What is your assessment?

Mr PARKER - It has been 50 per cent since 1975, so 36 000 greyhounds were whelped then and 18 000 last year, but we still need to do more to reduce the volume because it's the number-one issue contributing to what we call unnecessary euthanasia. For all those greyhounds that can't find a home despite everybody's genuine best attempts, or those in a minority of cases that are unsuitable for re-homing, we need to get that figure down to zero. GA and its member controlling authorities have committed to reducing unnecessary euthanasia to zero by the middle of 2020, so within the next five years. The biggest contributor to that will be reducing the number of greyhounds whelped from 18 000 to around 11 000 by the middle of 2018.⁸¹

4.21 Dr Kim Barrett considered that the quality of greyhounds bred was directly related to overbreeding and hence high wastage rates. In evidence before the Committee she commented:

⁸¹ Scott Parker, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 16-18

CHAIR - Kim, one of the things you talk about in here is that wastage starts from conception. How do we make sure as a community that, if we through public funding are supporting an industry, people can be confident that if puppies are born that we know exactly what happens to them over the course of their life? How does wastage start at conception?

Dr BARRETT - If you are breeding from inappropriate bitches that are not of good standard and good genetics - and I know nothing about that in terms of racing - going to a good stud dog that has raced truly throughout his career, not enhanced by any drugs. Say a mainland dog had been live-baited and reached the top-collar races, to me that dog is not a good example to be used as a stud dog because you are not breeding truly. Similarly, if drugs or cobalt or whatever had been used on that dog and then they go to stud, I don't think that is true for the industry. You want to be breeding from the best to start with, so you are hopefully improving the gene pool. Good nutrition and socialisation. The New South Wales greyhound report, that welfare report from the Working Dog Alliance, will explain it much better than I can. Socialisation, breaking in, training well, performing well, and not having heaps of dogs, so there is not more dogs than you need to sustain an industry.

.....

... It is what's happening at the moment. A greyhound bitch now is only allowed three litters in her life unless she can prove she needs more. They have to prove that the bitch is good enough to breed. If she has non-performing litters, they will not register the litters. If they do not register the litters, they are not going to breed from the litters. Because of the lack of confidence in the industry, I think directly stemming from the Four Corners report, the numbers are going to naturally drop anyway over the next two to three to four years, until things rise again. It has been a huge wake-up call and I imagine the wastage losses over the next two to three years will be much less than before. Then it has to be sustainable long term, I think.

.....

Mr VALENTINE - Do you have any concern about individual greyhounds and the number of litters they have? Do you ever see greyhounds coming in whelped, whatever the term is, that are having too many that concern you? There is no regulation around that I presume.

Dr BARRETT - People do not breed more than two litters from a bitch who is not producing winners.

Mr VALENTINE - But if they are producing winners?

Dr BARRETT - They will keep going.

Mr VALENTINE - Is there a limit you think that should be set on any particular bitch?

Dr BARRETT - There is three set and then you have to get a veterinary certificate of health to go to the next one. It depends at what age they breed,

if they are starting breeding at five years of age after they have been racing for four years, they are not going to have that, you would be insane to have that many. Often if you have a really good bitch they might pull them out and start breeding them at three years of age then they may have the capacity to have four, it just depends.

Mr VALENTINE - You have to assess that?

Dr BARRETT - On an individual basis I should imagine.⁸²

- 4.22 The RSPCA also considered there was an issue with the quality of breeding which resulted in high wastage rates. In evidence before the Committee representatives from the RSPCA commented:

Ms NORRIS - ... A high initial wastage rate of 50 per cent is very significant because it means there is a quality problem in the breeding - the selection of the breeding animals, and the way in which greyhounds are reared - the conditions under which they are reared. There are problems with the training methods as well. The strategies would have to address quantity and quality.

You could create breeding limitations, like litter limitations, for example. You would also need to significantly improve practices - doing things like introducing mandatory socialisation of puppies, for example.

Ms WILLIAMSON - When I have spoken to people in the industry they are targeted at the moment on the number. They have to have a breeding program that gives them at least 600 puppies a year at the moment and they don't need anywhere near that number of dogs to race. What Jade is saying is exactly right, they need to move their target away from a quantitative number and move it to a quality standard because at the moment they are being targeted on how many puppies they produce every year.

Mr BACON - How does that take effect? Is it an incentive?

Ms WILLIAMSON - As I understand, Tasracing has to run what they call a successful breeding program where they encourage the breeders to breed. I don't know who incentivises whom but I know at the moment they have to produce at least 600 puppies a year and there is no way 600 will go on to race in Tasmania.

CHAIR - Caroline, is that number in the public domain anywhere?

Ms WILLIAMSON - I don't know, I couldn't tell you that. They have to report how many puppies are born and named each year. I don't know if they have to say how many are born but they certainly have to say how many are named. Just going back to the initial question and Jade's answer, they really need to move their target to a qualitative measure rather than a quantitative measure.

⁸² Dr Kim Barrett, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 32-34.

Ms NORRIS - One way of doing that is placing a litter limit based on the success rate of the breeder and owner. What are the success rates of the rehoming rates for that particular breeder and only permit further breeding where they can show a high success rate, so a high naming rate, a high starting rate, and where they can demonstrate they have rehomed their greyhounds as a pet. In our view, each and every greyhound born in Australia once they leave the racing industry should become a companion pet, whether they ever race or not.⁸³

- 4.23 Tasracing stated that overbreeding is not a significant issue in Tasmania. In its submission, it noted that reported breeding numbers in Tasmania have been relatively stable over the past five years:

*The report prepared by the Chief Veterinary Officer and the Director of Racing identifies that the number of whelpings in Tasmania has been 617, 608 and 694 in 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14 respectively. From a historical perspective the numbers have been relatively stable at between 550-650 per annum for the last five years.*⁸⁴

- 4.24 In evidence before the Committee, Dr Forbes considered that wastage rates in Tasmania was not due to overbreeding as the State was in fact a net importer of dogs:

Mr VALENTINE - We heard from Greyhounds Australasia that there are 18 000 pups being born - 11 000 required by the industry, so obviously a very significant gap there and the issue with demand and the higher rates of euthanasia as a result. How does that sit in Tasmania? What is our demand for the numbers of dogs required for racing as opposed to the number born in the state? I am sure it sits somewhere, and we have probably even heard it, but I would like to get your perspective on what that balance is and how possible it is to get to that ideal zero euthanasia?

Dr FORBES - There are approximately 600 dogs bred in the state. There is a racing population of approximately 1 000 at any one time, so you can see we are a net importer of dogs in this state.

Mr BACON - Is it 1 000 you need every year?

Dr FORBES - Yes, 1 000 that would participate in the races we have scheduled. We have 157 race meetings per annum and those dogs would then compete about 12 000 times - so there are 12 000 starters during the course of the year. We are a net importer of dogs. In terms of overbreeding, that is not a challenge we have in Tasmania.⁸⁵

- 4.25 Similar comments were made by members of the Launceston Greyhound Racing Club who commented that with the new rules

⁸³ RSPCA, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 50-51

⁸⁴ Submission 36, Tasracing, p 4.

⁸⁵ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 44-45

being introduced to reduce the level of breeding there may not be enough greyhounds bred in Tasmania to sustain the industry:

Ms CUTHBERTSON -... the numbers are down 50 per cent. In two years' time that is going to be a real problem.

Mr NEWSON - There might not be an industry.

Ms CUTHBERTSON - Yes, you might not have to worry about it because there won't be one.

Mr NEWSON - There might not be an industry because there will be no dogs to race.

CHAIR - Is that a serious concern of the industry in relation to breeding rules?

Ms CUTHBERTSON - Yes.

CHAIR - What is the issue there? The information that we received from Tasracing was that there is a certain number of dogs that needed to be bred in order for the industry to be self sustaining. I thought, correct me if I am wrong, it was about 500 a year. What was it?

.....

Ms CUTHBERTSON - It was 1 000, and we only breed 600.

CHAIR - We only breed 600 now, you are saying?

Ms CUTHBERTSON - In the last year it was 600.

Mr VALENTINE - In Tasmania?

Ms CUTHBERTSON - In Tasmania.

CHAIR - Are you saying that is not enough to sustain the industry?

Ms CUTHBERTSON - That is what he is saying. I do not know. That is what –

CHAIR - Who is saying?

Ms CUTHBERTSON - Eliot.

CHAIR - Eliot Forbes.

Ms CUTHBERTSON - That was his numbers. I did not know that before then.

.....

Ms CUTHBERTSON - Did he not say we need 1 000 dogs to have a racing industry in Tasmania? We only breed 600, so the rest come from the mainland.

CHAIR - Even with 600, it does seem like a lot of dogs being bred each year. Can you explain why that might lead to industry decline?

Mr NEWSON - One of those dogs might not make it. There is a lot of natural wastage along the way. Dogs die. Dogs get injured, break legs. They are euthanised for those reasons. Some dogs do not make the grade. It always used to be said, one in 10 would win a race. What is probably going to happen now with these declining numbers being bred - one of these dogs where a lot of people will say, 'I will not have that dog because it is not to a certain standard' - those dogs now will get a chance.⁸⁶

4.26 The Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania also considered that breeding was being conducted responsibly in Tasmania given the expense involved in breeding greyhounds:

There are two large breeders of greyhounds in Tasmania, one family in North West Tasmania who breed about twenty five percent of all registered litters and a Southern based breeder who is responsible for approximately a further twenty five percent of litters. The remaining breeding over the State is made up of small breeders who breed either one or two litters per season.

Breeding and rearing a litter of greyhounds is an expensive exercise. Stud dog fees range from around \$1,000.00 per service up to as much as \$10,000.00. Most breeders now use frozen semen implants which allow access to stud dogs around the world. The down side of using frozen semen is that it has around about a 95% success rate for pregnancies and also generally produces larger litters, anything up to 10 to 12 pups, but mostly around 6 to 8.

Veterinary costs when breeding include frozen implant, regular blood tests, and possible caesarean section with an all up cost of about \$1,500.00. The litters are usually reared with the mother up to three months of age. The cost of feeding the mother and pups again usually runs out to about a further \$1,500.00.

When the pups attain the age of 3 months they are weaned from the mother and reared separately. At this point they must be immunized and implanted with a microchip at a cost of \$50.00 per week per pup. The costs of rearing a pup from this point on is around \$50.00 per week per pup. Forty weeks @ \$50.00 equals around \$2,000.00 per pup. To get a litter of six pups to 12 months point has cost the breeder around \$15,000.00 plus the service fee for the stud dog (anything from a further \$1,000 to \$10,000).

The next point in the life of a young greyhound is educating to race (referred to as breaking in). The education process takes anything from four to six weeks, depending upon the aptitude of the dog. Cost of breaking in is usually \$100.00 per week per dog (litter of six costs about \$1,440.00 for a four week period).

⁸⁶ John Newson and Karlene Cuthbertson, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, pp 20 -22

After break-in the dogs are then trained at the race track and given between one and two trial runs per week. The usual cost of this event called pre-training is around \$70.00 per pup per week. Pre-training process takes around 6 to 8 weeks.

By this time a pup has reached the age of around 16 to 18 months and is then put into full training. Trainers have different cost arrangements with owners so it is difficult to provide accurate information to the Committee for this particular event.

Suffice to say that the breeding and rearing of a greyhound pup is an expensive event, so therefore breeders do take seriously the evaluation process of providing a good mating with their bitch when selecting a stud dog.

There are around 800 racing stock currently in Tasmania. With the end of career age at about 4 years there is a requirement for around 25% (200) dogs to enter and exit this stock figure per year.⁸⁷

Committee finding:

- 4.27 The Committee finds there is a direct link between the number of greyhounds bred and wastage rates.

Tracking of greyhounds

- 4.28 The Committee heard the real level of wastage is unknown due to the lack of transparency in the number of greyhounds bred which are destroyed before being named. Tony Murray noted the main area of concern regarding the tracking of greyhounds is the time between a greyhound being registered at four months and when it is named at twelve months:

Mr VALENTINE - You made some comment on attachment B, the breeding data. It seemed you found some of the figures in that attachment alarming. I was wondering if you might point out which ones were the main concern to you.

Mr MURRAY - It is the relationship between the greyhounds that are registered through to the greyhounds that are named. That is where the main wastage occurs, and that is why I say that the ability of the greyhound is linked to its longevity. You have a significant breakdown from the time a greyhound is registered, which is at four months, through when a greyhound is named, which is generally twelve months. That is the main area. If you looked at the unnamed deceased greyhounds, that means people register their greyhounds; they then assess their ability; if their ability is not significant enough for them, quite often the greyhounds are euthanised before they are named.

⁸⁷ Submission 26, Greyhound, Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania, pp 3-4.

Mr VALENTINE - There seems to be some really dramatic differences from one year to the other in percentage terms. I did the percentages of some of these. With regard to greyhounds named, raced greyhounds and other, the percentage is 94.7 per cent in 2013-14, and in 2012 was 51.6 per cent. I am trying to understand -.

Mr MURRAY - It is just the age of the greyhounds. When you are tracking them through, the first year and now, coming up to four years old, whereas the last year is considerably younger so they have not had the chance to assess their ability yet. It is basically a -

Mrs RYLAH - A time issue.

Mr MURRAY - Yes.

Mr VALENTINE - Litter registrations seem to be quite dramatically different. With named and unnamed litter registrations in 2011-12, the unnamed were 46.8 per cent. In 2013-14, it is 90.9 per cent. What is the reasoning behind that?

Mr MURRAY - Again that is a timing issue.

CHAIR - How sure can we be in Tasmania, given the systems that are in place and the data collection that is happening, that we know what happens to a greyhound pup from the moment it is born through to the end of its life? How much track do we have of that animal? The RSPCA has raised the concern that we don't know what happens to a lot of these animals.

Mr MURRAY - The grey area - or the black hole, if you like - is from the time they are registered at four months to the time they are named at 12 months. That is the area we need to be addressing. Quite often people might give their greyhound to a friend to rear them in their backyard or on their property, or whatever. We need to be able to track where those greyhounds are at all times. That is the one area we have to concentrate on.⁸⁸

4.29 Scott Parker, CEO of Greyhounds Australasia, also considered there needs to be improved tracking of greyhounds from whelping through to retirement:

CHAIR - Can you confirm to the Committee that of the 18 000 estimated pups born nationally last year, if 11 000 then go on to race, what happens to the 7 000 pups who do not go on to race?

Mr PARKER - I would love to know. It is a significant challenge for the industry that it does not know. A significant contributor to the challenge we are facing is a matter of culture and that through history participants have not respected the role of controlling authorities in things such as generating data from the participants to ensure it has enough information at hand to make good decisions. It is a significant failing from the industry that across the country we

⁸⁸ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 54-5.

only know the destination of 40 per cent of greyhounds that are unnamed - the 7 000 - and the up to 11 000 greyhounds that retire every year. We don't know where 60 per cent of them end up; we can only guess. We know that about 700-odd go into a breeding program. We know this year for example there is likely to be around 1 300 adopted out through controlling body GAP programs. We know that plenty of others reside on the properties of trainers, owners, friends of trainers and owners, and many others are adopted out through unaffiliated programs. However, it is a significant industry failing that it does not know individually where either unnamed or retired greyhounds end up. It is a significant failing and one the industry must get on top of as soon as possible.

CHAIR - When you say an animal has been unnamed, does that mean not only does it not race but it is not registered anywhere?

Mr PARKER - It can't be registered to race unless it is named.

CHAIR - Is it more likely that an unnamed greyhound would have been euthanased somewhere along its life course from whelping through to whenever it meets its end?

Mr PARKER - I think the unfortunate reality is that when the greyhound reaches the age of about 12 months, it has gone through enough hands for a decision to be made as to whether this greyhound is capable of having a racing career. At that stage, it either needs to be named as one of the preparatory stages of racing - and that incurs some costs - or it isn't named and it has an uncertain future.

CHAIR - Can you confirm that the understanding of Greyhounds Australasia is that - and it is difficult because there is no tracking of these dogs with any consistency - unnamed dogs are more likely to be euthanased?

Mr PARKER - It is hard to say when it is more likely. If it is, it would be marginal because there are so many being retired every year. Unfortunately, that is a larger group but still a significant number of unnecessary euthanasias are coming out of that group as well.

CHAIR - Animals Australia estimates that each year in the country around 10 000 greyhounds are euthanased? What is Greyhounds Australasia's estimates given we know 7 000 pups are unnamed and that you don't know where 60 per cent of greyhounds end up?

Mr PARKER - Did you say Animals Australia said 10 000 per year?

CHAIR - Their estimate is 10 000 - and I think that has been supported broadly by the RSPCA. I have had other higher estimates put to me but they are the official ones.

Mr PARKER - I have certainly heard a lot higher than that from other animal welfare rights groups. The figure of 20 000 greyhounds is not right; there are

18 000 or less being whelped every year for a start. I think 10 000 sounds like a reasonable estimate.

CHAIR - Of euthanasias each year?

Mr PARKER - Correct.⁸⁹

- 4.30 Recommendation 19 of the Review Report provides for a Rule of Racing to be in place making it a requirement that:

... at all times (from whelping onwards) a greyhound must be in the possession of, and under the ownership, care and control of a licensed person.

- 4.31 Dr Andrewartha advised the Committee that this recommendation was aimed at providing a solution to the information gap between being microchipped and named:

Dr ANDREWARTHA - Dogs, during breeding and when they have come into training, currently have to be under control of a registered establishment. One of the recommendations in the report is to make sure that throughout their life, until they are retired out of racing, dogs should be on a registered establishment. That solves where dogs are potentially going to face that first breaking-in stage; it will be on a premise that is known to racing services and where they can do inspections. That is your whole-of-life tracing a dog. That also fits in with tracing of dogs that have gone to the mainland and come back.⁹⁰

- 4.32 The Animal Justice Party (AJP), considered:

Statistics are not reliably collected nor reported by the industry. There is no traceable information on the breeding and fate of greyhounds who are not named. There is also limited and unreliable data collected on dogs who do race with regard to their injuries/death, retirement/rehoming.

There should be lifetime tracking of all greyhounds born, irrespective of whether or not they are named.

The AJP proposes that a central database be established, that is accessible to the authorities and made available to the public upon request. The database should track dogs from birth to death. It should also detail all injuries, and euthanasia so that dogs cannot simply go missing.

It is further recommended that there must be legislated identification and lifetime registration requirements for all greyhounds bred for the industry.⁹¹

- 4.33 The Animal Welfare League of Australia also expressed concern about the lack of transparency in the numbers of greyhounds bred, injured

⁸⁹ Scott Parker, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, p 20-21

⁹⁰ Dr Rod Andrewartha, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 71

⁹¹ Submission 3, Animal Justice Party, p. 4.

and euthanased which it considered indicated a lack of accountability within the industry for animal welfare:

...the lack of access to reliable, independently verified figures on wastage, breeding and rate of injuries and deaths sustained on the track has serious ramifications for transparency and accountability within this industry.⁹²

- 4.34 The Animal Welfare League also commented that registration and identification requirements could be strengthened to enable all greyhounds to be tracked through life:

Registrations and ID requirements applying to other breeds of dogs should be rigorously applied to greyhounds. This would enable animal welfare authorities to more effectively monitor welfare standards in the GR industry. Enforcement agencies need a reliable and practical way of knowing who exactly owns greyhounds, where exactly the greyhounds are kept, when they are born and when and how they die.

Up to date and well managed registration and ID documentation for all greyhounds from birth through to their final location would assist animal welfare authorities to inspect and prosecute in relation to any unlawful killing, neglect or cruelty by greyhound owners and track the numbers of dogs being rehomed or euthanased. In addition, greyhound owners should be required to report litter numbers at birth (independently verified), to guard against early culling. Enforcement should be pro-active and penalties imposed for failing to micro-chip and register greyhounds.⁹³

- 4.35 The RSPCA considered the data that is compiled should be more specific. Jade Norris, Scientific Officer of the RSPCA commented:

CHAIR - *We have formal figures here of the number of dogs put down in 2013-14, which is 486 dogs. Do you want to articulate a little bit the RSPCA's view on the rates of euthanasia from birth through to the premature end of their lives?*

Ms NORRIS - *The available statistics to us were in the Tasmanian report. They actually do mention that these should be taken as minimum numbers. Until they do an audit of all the facilities, the actual number of dogs born is unknown because it relies on the participants reporting. There could be animals not being captured by the system.*

We could see even in the available statistics that the initial waste rates were very high. About 50 per cent of the puppies born in the 2011-2012 cohort were never named. That includes unnamed and deceased prior to registration at four months. It is about 50 per cent unnamed. We consider that to be a very high wastage rate. We also found that most of those dogs are now deceased. We queried what 'deceased' meant, because the statistics are not specific enough.

⁹² Submission 4, Animal Welfare League Australia, p. 1.

⁹³ *Ibid*, p. 2.

There is a difference between dying from a natural cause or being euthanased. We have requested that that data be more specific. Then we also looked at the euthanasia rates, which in the RSPCA's view are unacceptably high, and we compared those to the re-homing rates, which we also consider to be unacceptably low.⁹⁴

- 4.36 Emma Haswell also commented on the lack of transparency noting that in her experience of rehoming greyhounds, she had been contacted on very few occasions by racing authorities about the whereabouts of the dogs:

Mrs RYLAH - *In the second section of your submission, you say that 'for the hundreds of dogs Brightside have taken over the years, we have been contacted on very few occasions by racing services to confirm the whereabouts of the dogs'. Seeing Brightside has taken ownership of that dog, whose responsibility, under the current regulations you are working under, is it to tell Racing Services? Or is for Racing Services to find out where the dog is?*

Ms HASWELL - *It is for Racing Services to find out where the dog is. On one occasion I said, 'I am a bit disappointed about the number of dogs you are following through with'. They said, 'Would you be interested in getting back to them on every dog you take?'. I said, 'No, because I am one person who works seven days a week and 18 hours a day. I do not have the resources to be getting back to you all the time'. It is their job. They run the industry; they exploit dogs; they have to be accountable for them. I am just picking up the mess at the end of the day and re-homing the dogs. It is their jobs to do that.*

Mrs RYLAH - *There is no transfer of ownership that goes to anywhere?*

Ms HASWELL - *I received a dog the other day and a trainer sent me a form where I had to fill out Brightside Farm Sanctuary, Emma Haswell, for re-homing and then send it back to him. I don't know what the others do, or what they fill out. There is a trainer called Michael Sherriff and I take all his dogs; he is the reason I get so many dogs. He is fabulous. His greyhounds are always easy to cat-train. I love working with him. Even though he is a greyhound trainer, he is a good person. They always check up on his dogs. Last time I said to them, 'There is another six or seven trainers I get dogs from and you have never called me about any of those'. She admitted it was their job to do it but she said, 'Maybe they haven't put their forms in'. I thought that it was up to them to put the form in to say the dog has gone. How many dogs don't get a form put in?*

Mrs RYLAH - *The data seems to be an issue that we are coming across in a number of submissions - how to get verifiable data so we know how many dogs there are, what is happening, and all those things. At the moment it seems there is a lack of quality data.*

Ms HASWELL - *Yes. The other thing that concerned me - and in this month I have taken about 25 - the six that came were siblings and three of them never*

⁹⁴ Jade Norris, RSPCA, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 49-50

race-trained or trialled. They were not named. I don't think they even had an ear brand. I wonder how many other greyhounds are born like that. They were little and they were not big enough; they were really timid, so they were not worth training. They would not chase anything. Are they in these figures? They are not; they don't exist. How many others get bred?

Mrs RYLAH - Were they vaccinated?

Ms HASWELL - I had no history on them at all. What concerns me is that if we are saying 500 greyhounds are killed in Tasmania every year - they are your government or industry statistics - we say we need to know how many litters are born, what the average litter size is and whether there is a discrepancy there in the number of dogs because it concerns me that they need to get their euthanasia under control.⁹⁵

4.37 However, some industry participants considered that there was a certain level of transparency in the numbers of greyhounds bred as breeders are required to notify the Office of Racing Integrity of the birth of the litter. Graeme Barber commented on the level of data available in relation to greyhounds born through to rehoming:

Ms RATTRAY - I want to talk about Racing Services and their role. We have heard some evidence that nobody seems to have the records, but you're telling me that Racing Services would have the records about a particular dog and when they go into a program like GAP or when they go into a program like Brightside?

Mr BARBER - Not so much Brightside, but certainly GAP. As I said, in the last couple of years the requirements on owners and trainers to keep appropriate records and inform Racing Services of the movement and location of greyhounds has increased to the level where it should have been some years ago. If I am a breeder and I want to breed a litter I have to have the bitch DNA fingerprinted and put on the Australian database before I can breed with her. Once the mating has occurred with the stud dog, the stud master must fill in a form and inform AGRA of the breeding, the date, the sire, the bitch and all the details about that.

Mr VALENTINE - How long after the births do you have to do that?

Mr BARBER - This is before the births, this is at the service. After the birth the breeder has 14 days to notify Racing Services of the birth of the litter. Then after that each pup must be vaccinated with C3 vaccination by a veterinarian, they have to be implanted with a microchip and ear-branded in one ear with a tattoo of that particular number.

Mrs TAYLOR - That is for every pup?

⁹⁵ Emma Haswell, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 22-23

Mr BARBER - Yes, and that has to be done by three months of age and those papers then sent to Racing Services, otherwise that litter can't be registered and the dogs can't race.⁹⁶

- 4.38 It was noted by the Australian Veterinary Association that vets are required to supply paperwork to Racing Services on all pups that are microchipped and branded. In evidence before the Committee Dr Sally-Anne Richter noted:

Mrs RYLAH - My question goes back to the subject we were talking about - about pups. You said vets are involved - I assume when they get their distemper injections and micro-chipping, et cetera. How difficult would it be for you to keep statistics and provide statistics to Tasracing, or to RST, on the number of pups that are micro-chipped or immunised, or whatever?

Dr RICHTER - Sure. There are documents we fill in that then get submitted to Racing Services Tasmania based on when they get micro-chipped and branded. There are certain microchips that have to be implanted. That paperwork is usually signed by the veterinarian who does it and then it gets sent to Racing Services Tasmania.

Mrs RYLAH - Is that only for named dogs or is that for all dogs?

Dr RICHTER - That is for all pups.⁹⁷

- 4.39 The Committee also heard that the data available in relation to the wastage rates of Tasmanian greyhounds may be influenced by a significant number of greyhounds brought over from interstate. Dr Kim Barrett commented:

*I think there was some issue about dogs coming in from interstate, like the wastage type situation from second-class interstate dogs coming in and ending their racing careers here rather than the Tasmanian-bred ones. I don't know if you could tease that data out. I think the losses from zero to 12 months would be negligible. The 18-month period is the key area because no-one wants to call it quits on a puppy up to 15 months of age. That is where your big investment is in money terms.*⁹⁸

- 4.40 Emma Haswell also noted that many of the animals she rehomes come from Victoria:

Ms HASWELL - ...I get a lot of Victorian dogs. Tasmanian trainers take Victorian dogs that are too slow, so a number of the dogs I get are Victorian dogs. I have had bitches between the age of seven and eleven-and-a-half years old that were still being used for breeding.

⁹⁶ Graeme Barber, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 32-33

⁹⁷ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 5-6

⁹⁸ Dr Kim Barrett, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 28-29

CHAIR - Why do Tasmanian trainers take Victorian dogs that are a bit slow?

Ms HASWELL - I think our dogs are slower, so I guess they think those Victorian dogs can have another chance. I've always wondered, too, whether those dogs are included in the Tasmanian statistics of how many dogs we are killing because a fairly reasonable percentage of the dogs I get are from Victoria.⁹⁹

Committee finding:

- 4.41 The Committee finds that a lack of regulation and resourcing has resulted in incomplete data on industry-bred greyhounds from birth to death, and that this is hampering an accurate understanding of the number and type of injuries and premature deaths.

Recommendation 6: That the Government support the Office of Racing Integrity and Tasracing's stated commitment to Greyhounds Australasia's "Towards Zero Euthanasia"¹⁰⁰ framework and to actively monitor progress towards this goal.

Recommendation 7: That the Office of Racing Integrity develop and maintain a comprehensive database to enable all greyhounds whelped in Tasmania, or imported, for the racing industry to be tracked at all stages of life.

Recommendation 8: That the Government implement, as a matter of priority, Recommendation 19 of the Review Report: Create a rule of racing that at all times (from whelping onwards) a greyhound must be in the possession of, and under the ownership, care and control of a licensed person.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ Emma Haswell, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 17

¹⁰⁰ See submission 37, Greyhounds Australasia.

¹⁰¹ Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry Final Report, 13 March 2015.

5 DRAINING

5.1 This Chapter considers the issue of ‘draining’. Draining is a term used to describe the process of extracting blood from a greyhound that will be subsequently euthanased. The practice has contributed to the increasing community concern about welfare issues in the greyhound racing industry.

5.2 The Launceston Greyhound Racing Club considered that the terminology of ‘draining’ resulted in a misconception of the practice:

It is understood that some veterinary surgeons collect blood from greyhounds because of its usefulness in veterinary practices.

It is understood that blood from greyhounds has properties which make it useful for transfusions in other canine breeds.

It is NOT the case that greyhounds are ever “drained”, by veterinary surgeons, of their blood!

This is a most unfortunate misconception.¹⁰²

5.3 Mr Newson confirmed that greyhound blood was compatible with most other dogs:

... People did not realise the greyhound's blood is compatible to about 95 per cent of any other dog.¹⁰³

5.4 Other industry participants expressed the view that the procedure was beneficial to other dogs. The Hobart Greyhound Racing Club commented:

The questions that are pertinent to blood extraction from greyhounds to supply the blood bank for injured dogs or those having operations would need to be asked of veterinarians, it is not something that trainers are often asked and some trainers did not know that this took place. It might be that blood extraction is not regularly done in this State.¹⁰⁴

5.5 The Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania also noted that such blood donation treats domestic pets under various circumstances:

¹⁰² Submission 28, Launceston Greyhound Racing Club, p 7.

¹⁰³ John Newson, Transcript of evidence, p. 24.

¹⁰⁴ Submission 46, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, p 3.

*The Association has reached an assumption that this matter refers to Veterinarians removing the blood from a greyhound prior to euthanasia. The Association has no evidence to offer the Committee on this matter but makes a general comment that animal blood products, especially dogs, are required in Veterinary Centres to treat domestic pets under various circumstances.*¹⁰⁵

- 5.6 The Committee heard from many experts that the act of extracting blood from greyhounds is not an animal welfare issue. Biosecurity Tasmania commented:

*... that provided the animal is rendered insensible prior to exsanguination then there is not animal welfare concern.*¹⁰⁶

- 5.7 Dr Rod Andrewartha noted that there are no animal welfare issues associated with draining in the manner it is conducted in Tasmania:

*Because Biosecurity Tasmania is responsible for management of the Animal Welfare Act, it is done in a way that there is no pain or distress to the dog. Therefore, there is no concern from the Animal Welfare Act perspective*¹⁰⁷

- 5.8 The RSPCA considered there is a need to review the practice of non-recoverable blood collection from unwanted greyhounds. In its submission it recommended:

*A comprehensive review of outcomes for Tasmanian greyhounds including an investigation of whether non-recoverable blood collection from unwanted greyhounds at veterinary clinics and transfer to universities and medical research facilities are potential outcomes currently occurring in Tasmania. Strategies must be implemented to address this issue and protect the welfare of greyhounds. For example, to reduce the incidence of non-recoverable blood collection from greyhounds the underlying causes of greyhound overbreeding and wastage must be addressed to reduce the number of unwanted greyhounds presented for euthanasia. In addition, alternative blood supply chains (that do not involve euthanasia) must be urgently expended such as recoverable blood collection from suitable, healthy owned 'donor' pet dogs (including pet greyhounds) under close supervision and at appropriate intervals to ensure the welfare of the dogs.*¹⁰⁸

- 5.9 Dr Sally-Anne Richter commented that from a veterinary perspective, if a dog donates blood humanely, it is not a welfare concern:

Mr GAFFNEY - Sally, you mentioned in your submission about blood donating. We have had other vets quite offended by the use of the word 'draining'. It would be good if you made some comment because there is good justification for using a greyhound's blood in the proper way. Could you explain that for us

¹⁰⁵ Submission 26, Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania, p 6.

¹⁰⁶ Submission 1, Biosecurity Tasmania, p. 2.

¹⁰⁷ Dr Rod Andrewartha, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 67

¹⁰⁸ Submission 71, RSPCA, p 8.

a little more? It is an important one to get off the table because most people see that as a cruel practice and it really is not.

Dr RICHTER - Yes. If an animal presented for euthanasia is free of disease, which is the other big area, the AVA sees it as not abnormal or a terrible practice if that animal donates blood humanely. To donate blood humanely, the animal is anaesthetised, intubated and put under anaesthetic and completely unaware of what is happening. At that stage it wouldn't be a draining, as so called, it would be a specific amount of blood that is collected. Usually it is around 350 ml for one bag and at the most it would be two bags of 350 ml each. It would not be draining until that dog has no blood left. At the point of filling those bags, that animal would then be euthanased humanely, so it would be given an overdose of anaesthetic.

Mr GAFFNEY - The general public see or read that and think it is a nasty practice, but all the vets that have sent submissions to us and even people who are not vets say it is a well-regulated and a proper ethical practice that actually helps other animals as well.

Dr RICHTER - Yes, it does. Having the blood there definitely helps. If another animal comes in injured or in shock or has lost a lot of blood, we can use that. Most greyhounds are what we call universal donors, so their blood can be given to a lot of different other dogs. In terms of its use, it needs to be clarified to the public that it is done humanely so the animal is unaware, it does not feel any pain, and that is the most important thing.¹⁰⁹

5.10 John Newson also used a different term for 'draining':

...I was reading about the draining of greyhounds. I wouldn't really call it draining, I would call it blood collection. It is not really draining. It does give people there is the perception the dog is on a drip and his blood is taken out until he falls onto the ground. It is not that.

5.11 Despite there being no animal welfare concerns raised by industry in regard to draining, it was clear that the industry considered the issue to be one of community concern. Dr Eliot Forbes noted that dogs in the Greyhound Adoption Program (GAP) are not subject to draining as there is a perception issue:

Mr GAFFNEY - ... Why don't you allow dogs in the GAP to be involved in that draining practice?

... ..

Dr FORBES - What you have presented is a very rational and reasonable understanding of the situation. Unfortunately not everybody across the community can take such a mature outlook. It is very easy to present the collection of blood for effectively saving lives in a very negative way and from a perception of managing public relations we made a decision that that was not something we chose to be involved with. However I can certainly see why the

¹⁰⁹ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015 pp 10-11.

veterinarians who do the practice require it and likewise people across the community, whether they are greyhounds or any other dog for that matter, allowing the veterinarians to use the blood for that purpose. Certainly we have no objection to that.

Mr BACON - Do you know if it happens in other states or has the same PR decision been made across states as well?

Dr FORBES - I think it is similar around the country. I don't know for sure but my suspicion is that it is.

....

I think it is about managing community expectations as to how the dogs are handled once they are into the GAP.¹¹⁰

Committee findings:

- 5.12 The Committee finds 'draining' is a misunderstood term for blood collection and this misunderstanding raises community concern about the greyhound industry.
- 5.13 The Committee notes that greyhound blood products are used in veterinary procedures for all other dog breeds.
- 5.14 The Committee notes that reducing wastage rates will reduce the number of greyhounds made available for draining/blood collection.

¹¹⁰ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 29-30

6 WELFARE STANDARDS AND INITIATIVES

- 6.1 Evidence presented to the inquiry indicated there are a range of welfare issues additional to live baiting, wastage and draining within the Tasmanian greyhound racing industry. This Chapter considers such issues, which include housing conditions, injuries sustained through racing and the use of illegal substances. Further, it discusses a range of initiatives that the industry has implemented to improve animal welfare standards.

Welfare Standards

- 6.2 Evidence presented indicates that generally industry participants have a high regard for the welfare of their greyhounds. John Newson, Chairman of the Launceston Greyhound Racing Club, considered that greyhounds were a valuable asset and therefore are well cared for by their owners:

CHAIR - *If we talk more broadly, would you agree there are some issues with animal welfare standards amongst some of the players in the greyhound industry in Tasmania?*

Mr NEWSON - *I don't think so, no. It would be very minimal if there is. People have invested a lot of money to breed a litter of pups. Before you get the pups on the ground it's probably going to cost you up to \$5 000 and it's a lot of money to waste if you're not going to look after them properly. Maybe some of these people might want more education in animal welfare, but that's my personal opinion.¹¹¹*

- 6.3 Similar comments were made by Dr Kim Barrett:

Mr VALENTINE - *How often in your experience do you come across a greyhound that you have concerns about with its welfare and the way it is being looked after at the trainer's or owner's property?*

Dr BARRETT - *Rarely. I would check 80 dogs on race night. There are the gold-standard dogs that you could eat your dinner off their coats, and there are others that are slightly woolly, not quite as beautiful, but they're all well fed, well cared for, flea-free, immunised.*

Mr VALENTINE - *What would you look for, the dog exhibiting stress perhaps? Is there a particular thing you look for?*

Dr BARRETT - *I suppose you would look for ribs, activity, light in their eyes.*

¹¹¹ John Newson, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, p 10.

CHAIR - Cowering behaviours?

Dr BARRETT - No, they behave happily all the time. Greyhounds are positive, happy dogs.

...

Dr BARRETT - Some are more social than others. I had a GAP dog in last week that when you walked in the room it immediately interacted with you, but a lot of the race dogs don't do that. That is the transition you have to make from the race dogs to the pet dogs, so that you walk in a room and they come to you - though a lot of the pet dogs we see at work don't do that either. Because race dogs have to be within a kilo of their previous race weight, you don't see unkempt race dogs because they wouldn't make the grade. You can't have a dog that is down 1.1 kilos because the trainer is fined and they are scratched from the race. So it's in the trainer's best interest to present a dog within that weight range because that is its peak capacity to race.¹¹²

Housing

- 6.4 Housing standards is an issue that raised welfare concerns. Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO of Tasracing, commented on the housing standards, including exercise requirements that are in place in Tasmania for greyhounds. He noted that as working dogs such standards may not be in line with community expectations for a family pet:

CHAIR - We have had some concerns raised with us about how greyhounds are kept and there is a rule of racing around kennels, which is at the back of your submission. I note that the objective of the policy is to outline the recommended standard for kennels for greyhounds, but there is nothing in here that talks about a minimum size of a kennel, or bedding or some of those more animal welfare comfort issues about animal husbandry. I was wondering if you could talk about, first of all, why there is no minimum size for greyhound cages?

Dr FORBES - There is a further document that sits behind the policy, which is a guidelines document. It states that portable crates and cages are not acceptable; there are minimum kennel areas; whelping areas should be of six metres square with a minimum width of a metre and a minimum kennel height of 1.5 metres. We have categorisations for whelping pups, young dogs and then for rearing and boarding kennels as well; so there are minimum standards there.

Mr VALENTINE - Do they need bedding as well?

Dr FORBES - I do not have the full guidelines with me, but there are quite weighty documents behind that. However, there are two aspects to this as well. The community's expectation may be that dogs are kept in conditions

¹¹² Dr Kim Barrett, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 26-27

like the family pet. However, these are working dogs and many working dogs, whether they are police dogs, military dogs, or –

Mr VALENTINE - Farm dogs.

Dr FORBES - Yes, farm dogs or hunting hounds in some states; they are all kept in very different conditions. They are not exactly aligned with how people perceive a family poodle might be sitting next to the fire. That said, coming back to my earlier point, dogs are athletes and they need to perform an athletic function on the track and if they are not kept in appropriate conditions, then they will not be able to do that job.

CHAIR - Is there anything then in the rules of racing or the guidelines that are attached to it that prescribe a certain amount of daily exercise for a racing greyhound or a greyhound that has been trained to race?

Dr FORBES - I think we specify that they have to have appropriate exercise within the guidelines.

CHAIR - What would that be on a daily basis?

Dr FORBES - I don't have that to hand right now, but there is an expectation there that it will be appropriate for the dog, for its age, for its level of activity and probably its personality as well. However, at the end of the day, the policing and inspection of kennels is a function of Racing Services Tasmania.

CHAIR - I understand that, but Tasracing writes the rules. At some level, Tasracing is responsible for ensuring that the rules are followed.

Dr FORBES - There is a family of policies and guidelines; some of them are from Racing Services and some are Tasracing's. So there is a cooperative arrangement between that. Again, how they choose to implement a rule or interpret a rule may be the way that they have their own internal policy. Whether they view appropriate exercise as being an hour or two hours, I do not know.¹¹³

6.5 The RSPCA commented in their submission about inadequate housing conditions:

Poor housing conditions and the lack of environmental enrichment is another key animal welfare issue for many greyhounds. Greyhounds are often kept in small, barren, single-dog kennels without environmental enrichment.

Dogs are not well adapted for life in kennel environments; most find kennel life challenging and many experience compromised welfare. Many greyhounds were neither bred nor raised in kennels and for these dogs the transition from rearing properties to small barren kennels is especially stressful. Research has shown that many working dogs exhibit high levels of physiological stress in

¹¹³ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 36-37

response to kenneling. Furthermore, these dogs tend to perform poorly during training, establishing links between welfare and working ability (performance).

There are approximately 210 greyhound kennels in Tasmania. Kennelling should be avoided where ever possible however, where kennelling is unavoidable significant changes must be made to the way in which greyhounds are kenneled including best practice habituation protocols to minimize any stress involved.¹¹⁴

- 6.6 In evidence before the Committee the RSPCA considered that the standards for housing as outlined in Tasmanian policy and manuals for the greyhound industry are inadequate, as they do not include requirements for environmental enrichment and accordingly do not reflect best practice:

Ms NORRIS - In our submission we talked about inadequate housing conditions and a lack of environmental enrichment. We know kennelling is a very common way to house greyhounds. We also know based on contemporary best practice standards that kennelling is not the best way to house dogs. In fact a lot of working dogs who have been studied exhibit a lot of stress when they are in a kennel environment and this can be related to a lack of environmental enrichment.

Mr VALENTINE - Are you talking about farm dogs when you say workings dogs?

Ms NORRIS - Yes. Farm dogs or military dogs can be kept in kennels as well so there is international research looking at different dogs kept in kennel environment and how that can produce high physiological stress in those animals which compromises their welfare but also there are links between poor welfare and stress in a kennelling environment and poor performance. We talk about reducing wastage rates and this also relates to the environment in which they are kept because if you're a stressed dog or have poor welfare the research shows that performance levels might be affected by that as well.

Mr BACON - Is there a role in education for the industry around those things?

Ms NORRIS - We think education is part of it but also having enforceable standards in place that are specific to greyhounds about how you should house them.

Ms RATTRAY - What are you suggesting, then? Can you give me some indication of what you are suggesting? If you don't want them in a kennel but you need them secure, what do they do? Do they roam or what?

Ms NORRIS - Because we have just talked about how eventually we want them to become companion animals and pets, in an ideal situation you would have them in a housing situation that complements the environment in which they are going to be living when they retire. That would be the ideal situation. We raised the inadequate housing conditions and lack of enrichment because we

¹¹⁴ Submission 71, RSPCA, p 9.

have also looked at the available information from the industry and some of the documents that the Tasmanian industry produce like manuals on how you keep greyhounds and how to house them. We looked at those in close detail and could see they were deficient. For example, they do not even mention environmental enrichment which is a key welfare issue for housing dogs.

Ms NEIL - That is things to do in the kennel. If you were sitting in a kennel for hours and hours and hours on end with nothing to do –

Ms RATTRAY - As most dogs do.

Ms NEIL - If they are in a kennel, yes. There is an animal choice there as well. It is quite different if you are a dog in a family environment and you choose to do nothing to being a dog in a kennel where you have nothing to do.

.....

Mr BACON - You think they can be improved?

Ms NORRIS - Yes, they don't reflect best practice contemporary standards.¹¹⁵

6.7 On a similar note, Dr Sally-Anne Richter noted that while having standards in place for housing was necessary, providing for greater socialisation of greyhound pups in their housing environment would assist in improving rehoming rates:

CHAIR - Does the Australian Veterinary Association have any concerns about the way greyhounds are kept and the conditions in some kennels and the standards that are in place?

Dr RICHTER - The standards in place are good. We are happy that there are standards. That is the most important thing. That there are standards and guidelines that can be followed by the greyhound industry and by trainers and breeders alike. The AVA has also raised socialisation as one of the big things which might help in terms of re-homing at the time of retirement. Socialisation usually happens amongst the litter. It does not necessarily happen with other dogs, say differing breeds of dogs, other people that might come to the property, or children, and things like that. That is one area they have highlighted as a way that could improve the socialisation of the dogs that might improve their chances later on of being re-homed. That is one other area that they put.

In terms of the other standards, they are in agreement with what Greyhounds Australasia puts forward on their website and they have got a standard of welfare guidelines that are followed. On that note, though, they would like to see maintenance of that, or regulation of that, so that you are visiting properties to inspect and see that all of those are being carried out.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ RSPCA, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 51-53

¹¹⁶ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 9

- 6.8 Rick Campbell, Chair of the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee, considered that the standards for greyhounds should be no different to the standards for other dog breeds:

Mr VALENTINE - My main question was going to be with respect to the way greyhounds are housed. One thing that came to light through evidence was that with young greyhounds, enthusiastic pups or just past the puppy stage, in some cases they don't give them blankets to sleep on because they rip them up and take them all over the yard. They basically sleep on boards. It is a simple thing but I wondered whether that is a welfare issue or not, in your opinion.

Mr CAMPBELL - Certainly those sort of things need to be considered. Some of the recommendations the committee made in relation to commercial dog breeders could quite easily be extended. There is no reason greyhounds shouldn't be considered in the same light. You have to consider the housing of dogs in general. We don't have to single out greyhounds, we need to consider them all. If you apply a standard to dog breeders who are breeding poodles or labradors it's just another breed of dog, isn't it? The way they're managed and housed should be the same for them as any other breed of dog.¹¹⁷

- 6.9 The RSPCA noted that while the majority of greyhound kennels met the standards set by regulatory authorities, the condition of many kennels for greyhounds in Tasmania are below best practice:

Mr McGINTY - Sure. I was glad that Jade mentioned best practice. Where the bar is set legally, unfortunately best practice is not relevant. We have seen on many occasions, whether it is greyhounds or hunting dogs, they are confined all day for a week or more in between hunts or races.

Ms RATTRAY - A week or more?

Mr McGINTY - For hunting dogs, yes, for sure. Our burden of proof is reliant upon veterinary advice to prove a level of pain or suffering to the animal. Whilst a dog is on a 1.5 metre chain tethered to a small, old, partially holed wooden box half-full with dirt, we would not, in my experience, be able to get a vet to formally suggest that that animal was suffering and therefore we would not progress that case.

Ms RATTRAY - We're not talking about the same thing here, though, are we?

Mr McGINTY - It is the same with the greyhounds. If they are kennelled for long periods of time in a dry, dirty environment with no enrichment, no toys, no sort of bedding, whilst a vet would not suggest that was formally suffering to a level of court, I would definitely not consider that best practice. I don't have my dogs like that. My dogs have blankets, for example.

¹¹⁷ Rick Campbell, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, pp 3-4

Ms RATTRAY - But if Racing Services Tasmania do the checks on the kennels where the greyhounds are - and that is what I am interested in today - if they found a dog in that situation there would not be a kennel licence. Is that correct?

Mr McGINTY - I don't know what their powers are in relation to those offences. They ideally can and do call us if they come across a welfare issue.

Ms RATTRAY - How many of those calls have you had for the RSPCA from Racing Services Tasmania about the condition of premises for greyhounds in Tasmania?

Mr McGINTY - I don't have the numbers here but if I was to suggest, it would be low.

Ms NEIL - What we need to be clear about what is allowable under a manual that is produced by Greyhound Racing Tasmania or Australasia, what the law says and what is best practice and all those things are different. We are saying, with contemporary animal welfare science, we know dogs require more stimulation and being in a barren pen with nothing to do, perhaps they may have a pen mate, they may not and with no or minimal bedding, that is not a good environment in which –

Ms RATTRAY - We don't know that, do we? There is not any evidence of that.

Ms NEIL - That would be a fairly standard kennel environment as what you saw on Four Corners, as a kennel environment that was brand new that was indoors, that was a kennel has wire, that has a dog that is fed and watered. It would be very difficult to suggest they were not meeting their legal obligation, but it doesn't mean that it is best practice. What we are talking about is best practice kennelling and housing for dogs doesn't include a barren, small space. We can provide you with some more background if you would like, outside. I know we are short of time.

CHAIR - Paul, can you describe what you have seen when you have gone out to inspect a greyhound kennel?

Mr McGINTY - Sure. I will finish off something that Heather was saying. When the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee put forward recommendations in relation to the Animal Welfare Act Amendment Bill recently, one of them was in relation to mental suffering of an animal. That did not go through in the bill. Other states have words like, mental suffering, stress, psychological suffering, whereas in Tasmania it is physical. These examples that we are talking about here would be, in my opinion, why the recommendation was put through, that mental suffering be included in the legislation.

To answer your question. Of the premises I have been to, the high majority of them are dry. The enclosure the dogs are in are either a kennel area or a race area or a fenced off yard or one of those long training tracks. Most of them, if not all of them, have been dry. Dirt and dust covered virtually all of it, including the inside of any kind of kennel. There is often various bones or

*carcasses or partial carcasses of some sort of animal in or near the vicinity and there is rarely any soft or grassy area, it is normally barren. I have not seen any sort of bedding and I have seen anything like that. Best practice is very different to a legal standard. That is where we hit the hurdle.*¹¹⁸

- 6.10 Dr Rod Andrewartha also noted he had seen kennels of a poor standard when undertaking the Review of animal welfare arrangements in the Tasmanian greyhound racing industry:

Mrs TAYLOR - *We have heard a number of people give evidence to say that they are kept in very small cages, on concrete, and that there is a terrible, overpowering smell of ammonia and stuff like that. If you were on an announced visit, obviously, it is not the same as an unannounced visit. Would you have said that they were not good welfare standards? I am not trying to lead you here. I want to know what you saw.*

Dr ANDREWARTHA - *I have not had any clinical dealings with a greyhound kennel since the 1980s. One of the kennels we saw during the review was of about that standard. Let us just say there was significant room for improvement and the Racing Services steward was working with them on those improvements. Yes, it could be better.*

As for the other kennels - yes, they were big. There are a lot of dogs. If you have got a lot of dogs you do have quite pungent aromas. However, in general I was quite happy with the standard the dogs were kept in. They could have done with a lick of paint and all that sort of stuff, but the dogs generally were warm. As for bedding, if you give a big dog bedding they usually shred it up. In most cases, you would be looking at a wooden platform or something like that rather than bedding necessarily.

In one of the facilities I saw - and this is the one the steward was working with - I thought when we do bring in animal welfare standards, that probably is sub-standard and is not up to the standard of the guidelines for the racing industry and they are working with them. The others were. It is an animal industry.

Mrs TAYLOR - *How did the Racing Services person get on to this one that needs improvement?*

Dr ANDREWARTHA - *I understand that they have now got a steward who is not involved in race days and she is trying to get round all the kennels. I think they have got 50 per cent of the kennels done in the last 12 months. They are going round and inspecting them, looking for the standard the dogs are kept under and looking for improvements.*¹¹⁹

- 6.11 Dr Andrewartha also commented:

Mr VALENTINE - *You went out and visited the facilities and some were less ideal than others. Can you give us an understanding as to how the level of care is*

¹¹⁸ RSPCA, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 51-54

¹¹⁹ Dr Rod Andrewartha, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 69-70

compared to, say, a working dog on a farm? I know you have had experience on farms.

Dr ANDREWARTHA - Better than some, worse than some.

Mr VALENTINE - What do you find on farms, for instance, compared to this?

Dr ANDREWARTHA - Again, farms vary completely. Probably a better comparison would be look at the pound - the RSPCA. If you go into a dog shelter or a pound you will see dogs in quite often a damp environment because it has just been hosed out usually. It is concrete, it looks barren, it's noisy, it smells of dog urine and they are not a pleasant place. That is just the environment if you have a lot of dogs housed.

Mr VALENTINE - Do they have bedding?

CHAIR - They do have bedding.

Dr ANDREWARTHA - Some have bedding. Again, some of the bigger dogs will pull it out and just keep pulling it out.

Mr VALENTINE - Is that because of some stress-related thing or just their habit?

Dr ANDREWARTHA - Could be boredom or could be stress-related. Some of the facilities I have seen with greyhounds in them are as good or better than I would expect to see at RSPCA at Mornington. What I am trying to emphasise here is that a dog kept in that sort of environment is quite different to the dog in your backyard. It is noisier, smellier and everything else than the dog in the backyard.

Mr VALENTINE - With the RSPCA they might be there, you would hope, for a shorter period of time.

Dr ANDREWARTHA - Some of them are in there quite a long time.

Mr VALENTINE - Some are. I was interested in getting some comparison between the industry and working dogs, which are a similar sort of thing, kept for a purpose as opposed to befriending.

Dr ANDREWARTHA - They are in a confined area but it is not as if the dog is just locked in that space and that is the only area it gets to exercise. It gets out of that space to exercise. If you talk to somebody who has a greyhound as a pet, they spend an awful long time sleeping. They do get out. Using your working dog analogy, if the dog is not being used that day, it is either left on the chain or left in the pen.¹²⁰

¹²⁰ Dr Rod Andrewartha Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, 72-73

6.12 Emma Haswell also commented on the poor standards of some of the kennels she had seen through her rehoming work noting that in a number of kennels basic cleanliness was lacking:

Ms RATTRAY - You have mentioned the welfare of the animals. You say that you have visited pens where the ammonia levels are high?

Ms HASWELL - Yes.

Ms RATTRAY - How often do you visit greyhound training sites?

Ms HASWELL - I have probably been to five trainers and of three of them the dogs are in ammonia levels that I can hardly breathe.

.....

Ms HASWELL - I took a greyhound last week that had so many fleas on it the vet could not spay it. They were all over its stomach. I took it straight to the vet. I picked it up and took it straight to the vet, which I don't normally do but I had so many and I was on the way past and I had appointments. That dog - they treated it for fleas and three days later it still had too many fleas to be desexed. That is quite common - getting dogs with heavy flea burdens. And ammonia levels are sometimes through the roof. That is no way to keep a dog.¹²¹

6.13 The Committee heard evidence indicating that while trainers are complying with the minimum standards for housing of greyhounds, the housing conditions probably did not reflect best practice as outlined by the RSPCA. Anthony Bullock commented on the conditions of his kennels:

Mr BULLOCK - They are all about 1 m by 2 m and all have 80 m runs off groups of them. We have about 10 runs for the dogs and they all go out in lots of three or four, all with American muzzles on. That's the golden rule, otherwise one gets hurt. It only takes a crow to drop a bone in the yard and you've got carnage on your hands.

Mr VALENTINE - In those kennels, do you have mats they sleep on or do they have their own mats that come with them?

Mr BULLOCK - When we start off and break them in, they sleep on boards, off the ground because of cleanliness, so you can wash out underneath them. They all sleep that far off the ground. You start off with the board straightaway because when you get them to a new place, they wreck everything - they tear the carpet up and drag jumpers around - because they are used to running free virtually for 12 months and all of a sudden you've locked them up in a 2 x 1 kennel. As they progress, they get carpet and

¹²¹ Emma Haswell, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 24-25

jumpers. The good old race dogs get foam beds, doonas and so on because they don't wreck them. It's no good giving a pup a doona because two days later it's in the yard and is a mess.

Mr VALENTINE - They have access to water?

Mr BULLOCK - Yes, 24 hours a day.

Mr VALENTINE - What sort of feeding regime do you do?

Mr BULLOCK - I feed them bread, horsemeat, beef, kibble, the whole lot.

Mr VALENTINE - So they get a range of food?

Mr BULLOCK - Yes. It depends on what sort of area. We cook up three times a week so they get a mixture of that as well.¹²²

- 6.14 Some industry participants refuted claims of below standard housing conditions. June Phillips commented that from her experience in the industry, kennels and housing conditions for greyhounds were of an excellent standard and that if conditions were not up to standard Racing Services would pick it up on inspection:

Mrs RYLAH - June, we had some questions yesterday and some discussion regarding the standard of kennels. There were some suggestions that a concrete-based small area is where many greyhounds are housed. Could you compare how greyhounds are usually housed to pounds and other places where dogs are kept en masse for long periods? Is it as good as or poorer than?

Ms PHILLIPS - I have two views on this. To me, you can have all the beautiful kennels in the world, but if your dogs are not happy and socialised - they can have coats on and everything is clean and they're fed properly, but I would rather see them in an old kennel with a bed and a coat and happy and contented and warm. It would be nice if they were all on couches but that is not how it is ever going to be with racing greyhounds. It is how well they are looked after more than what their facilities are. You can have the nicest facilities and have them filthy dirty; or you can have the oldest in the world and have them clean and tidy and everything nice.

Mr VALENTINE - I think the observation is about bare concrete as opposed to a bed or –

Ms PHILLIPS - Well, they all have to have beds.

Mrs RYLAH - Do they?

Ms PHILLIPS - Yes. They do not sleep on cement. They have a bed up off the ground.

¹²² Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 7-8.

Mrs RYLAH - What does the bed consist of?

Ms PHILLIPS - Ours are all the hammock beds and then they have a sponge on top of that. When they tear that up, they get another one.

Mr VALENTINE - Which they do often, or not?

Ms PHILLIPS - Some do. Some don't.

Mr VALENTINE - It varies with the temperament of the dog.

Ms PHILLIPS - Yes, it certainly does. They have a half sleeping bag on top of that. That is only because it is easy to wash, put in the dryer and give back to the dogs. They have clean coats on once a week and they have new bedding when they need it.

CHAIR - That is for your dogs, June. Is that standard, do you think?

Ms PHILLIPS - I think it is standard. You go to someone's greyhound place and you are ducking under blankets and dog coats and –
...

Mr VALENTINE - ...I think it was indicated yesterday that there may be just wooden platforms.

Ms PHILLIPS - No. The stewards would pick that up, if they did not have proper bedding.

Mr VALENTINE - That is something that Racing Services would –

Ms PHILLIPS - Yes, they would pick that up straight away if they did not have proper bedding.

CHAIR - The Tasracing rules of racing on kennels says, 'The objective of this policy is to outline the recommended standards for kennels for greyhounds' - so it talks about locating the kennels away from excessive noise or pollution. It does not set a particular minimum size for a kennel, and talks about the ease of cleaning, feeding and watering. It does not actually prescribe a particular type of bedding for the dogs, as far as I can see. I do not know if you –

Ms PHILLIPS - I have never given that any thought because I do not know of anyone that does not have proper bedding and coats for their greyhounds. You are not going to put a dog on bare boards and then get up and expect it to win a race. That is what they want it to do - win a race. They want it to be comfortable.¹²³

6.15 Mrs Phillips also commented on the exercise afforded to most greyhounds:

¹²³ June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 9-10

Mr GAFFNEY - When you have a dog, I will say 'in work', in racing, would that be the same kennel that you would have if the dog was not being raced at the moment? If a dog is racing, you would be training that dog daily. How many times a week would they be actually out exercising?

Ms PHILLIPS - Twice a day, yes.

Mr GAFFNEY - If a dog was not in racing form and you were not entering it in a race, would it still get a chance to exercise on a daily basis?

Ms PHILLIPS - Yes, all dogs. We have big areas as well with kennels. We only have one stud dog now and he lies around in the sun all day. When the racing dogs go up and down he is about 300 metres away, but he will go up and down as well.

.....

Mr GAFFNEY - We have heard that there are some breeders or owner-trainers in the state who have a number of dogs. They might have 40 or 50 dogs in their kennel, would they have to exercise those dogs every day? It would be very time-consuming.

Ms PHILLIPS - Yes, it is a full-time job. That is twice a day and you will find anyone with in excess of 20 or 30 dogs has helpers; there is someone else helping them do it. A lot of them have exercise machines for them as well.¹²⁴

Committee findings:

- 6.16 The Committee received evidence from animal welfare agencies, including the RSPCA, that standards set for the greyhound industry do not meet best practice for the welfare of dogs.
- 6.17 The Committee finds that while generally housing of greyhounds in the Tasmanian racing industry meets the standards as outlined in policies and guidelines, evidence suggests compliance with standards can be inconsistent.

Recommendation 9: That the Office of Racing Integrity undertake a review of the standards, guidelines and policies in place for the housing and rearing of greyhounds to consider how best welfare practice requirements can be improved and enforced.

Racing Injuries

- 6.18 The Committee heard that the level of injuries sustained by greyhounds through racing is an issue of concern. Track design and

¹²⁴ June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, p 11.

racing conditions are linked to injuries and rates of euthanasia. Concerns were also raised about the consistency of reporting injuries.

6.19 The RSPCA outlined the types of injuries sustained by greyhounds during races and why racing injuries are a major welfare concern:

Injuries are a major animal welfare issue for greyhounds as they cause pain, suffering and distress to affected animals. Injuries are common in greyhound racing and are a major cause of wastage. Various types of injuries are reported including serious bone fractures and other musculoskeletal injuries. Other types of injuries such as hypoxic fits (seizures caused by a lack of oxygen) have also been reported.

Collisions between dogs are regularly reported and the first turn of the race track appears to be a common site for accidents to occur. Many of the injuries sustained necessitate a suspension from racing. Injuries can also be of a very serious nature leading to death on the track or euthanasia at the track such as broken backs or necks.¹²⁵

6.20 In evidence before the Committee the RSPCA commented on the level of race injuries and the link to wastage rates:

Mr VALENTINE - *I would just ask a question about injuries suffered by greyhounds. You make a statement in your submission that 'while injury statistics are not published for all tracks, based on the available industry figures the RSPCA estimates that more than 600 greyhounds are injured every month during races across Australia'. Do you have any comment on how prevalent that is in Tasmania? Do you have any statistics of any sort?*

.....

Ms NORRIS -... *In terms of Tas industry stats, there are some in the Tasmanian report. I think they are on page 9, but that does provide some injury statistics. We did raise in our submission that there appears to be a higher injury rate in Devonport compared to Hobart and Launceston. We suggested that that be investigated to find out what factors are contributing to that difference. Obviously, the track designs or the track surfaces are different. If we can minimise the injury rates, that will then reduce the wastage rates as well. Injuries are a pretty key animal welfare issue.*

In terms of other injuries, they are not recorded. I am not aware of any training injuries that are being recorded by RST, for example, and whether or not that information would be used or published, or when they get injured during trialling. It would be more comprehensive to have injuries in training, trialling and racing.

Mr GAFFNEY - *Some people would say that greyhounds love to run. They like to race and chase things. My dad has hounds and they chase things as well when they go hunting. Often at the end of a hunt, they will come back with sore feet and they have lost a little bit of weight because that is the nature of*

¹²⁵ Submission 71, RSPCA, p 6.

what they have been doing. Some people could say that that is an injured dog because of its feet or whatever, but that is what it has been doing. If an animal is going flat out at full pace, there is a greater chance that it is going to do something to a muscle or whatever. When you say 'injury' I am getting the impression that the dog is limping back with a broken foot. So what is the extent of the injury? An injury might mean that it has just twinged something and two days later it is fine. Is there a category?

Ms NORRIS - Sure. In terms of the Tasmanian statistics availability it just says that they are injured. It also includes data about how many are euthanased and it includes a few stats on hypoxia cramp, which is a type of injury. When we look nationally, for example in New South Wales, the steward's reports are much more specific. They will include leg fractures, broken tails, dislocated toes, muscle injuries and soft tissue injuries like lacerations. Some of those injuries like ankle fractures are very serious and often career-ending.

It would be great if Tasmania could publish the specific injury types so that we have more information about the magnitude of certain types of fractures. We have had cases in New South Wales where dogs have broken their backs, broken their necks and also died immediately post-race, and that suggests physical over-exertion. I think there is a difference between the racing contest where an animal is being raced on a particular track design and a particular surface, compared to a dog running around in a park, for example.

Mr VALENTINE - With respect to hypoxia, over-exertion, are you suggesting there that in fact they not be raced as often? I think that is mentioned in your submission?

Ms NORRIS - I think our main recommendation was to go into that and examine exactly how many cases are occurring and what are the predisposing factors - whether there are multi-factorial factors involved like genetics, whether some dogs might be more predisposed, and whether it is related to training, frequency of racing, or rest periods between races.

.....

... we are just focussing on the animal welfare issues here, which is that hypoxia cramp is a serious type of injury where animals can collapse and actually die. We have highlighted that as a particular example in our recommendations to be looked at, because it is a welfare issue. It also relates to wastage. Injuries and wastage levels are very closely linked.¹²⁶

6.21 Tasracing stated in its submission to the inquiry that the safety of greyhounds on the race track is paramount, race tracks and racing infrastructure are routinely maintained and improvements made to protect dogs from injury:

The provision of appropriate infrastructure to ensure greyhounds are as safe as possible when training or racing is an important consideration for Tasracing. It

¹²⁶ Jade Norris, RSPCA, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 48-49

maintains racing tracks and infrastructure in Tasmania, preparing tracks for racing and training to exacting, professional standards.

Safety rails are fixtures attached to the lure rail which help protect dogs from injuring themselves during a race. It is best practice to have safety rails installed and Tasracing has now completed the installation of safety rails at all racing venues in the state.

Tasracing and the Greyhound Reference Group agreed that a loop arm lure would be introduced for all races and trials at all three tracks (Hobart, Launceston and Devonport) for the welfare of greyhounds. The loop arm is safer for greyhounds as it has the ability to pass over the top of a fallen greyhound and will not injure it.

Work has been completed on equipment required for each track to ensure uniformity in the height of the lure at each racing centre (Launceston operates a cable system while Hobart and Devonport operates a bramich system). The loop arm is scheduled to be introduced for all races from 3 August 2015. Tasracing sends curators to national conferences to ensure they are “up to date” with best practices for race track preparation.

Emergency procedures have recently been developed for Launceston in the event of a greyhound becoming stationary or prone on the track or running back into the oncoming field. The procedure requires a steward and a retrieval assistant (runback attendant) to work together in conjunction with the Chairman of Stewards.¹²⁷

- 6.22 Tasracing stated that during 2013/14 the injury rate for medium to major injuries in Tasmania was 0.75 per cent of all starters and that it monitored all injuries to ensure there were no underlying trends in the injuries being sustained:

RST report on racing injuries at race meetings and Tasracing monitors these reports to ensure that it is aware of any unusual incidents and to assist in the detection of any underlying trends in incident rates.

There are inherent risks in racing that need to be considered and applied when considering these numbers.

Of 12,336 starters in Tasmania in 2013/14, 14 dogs were humanely euthanised on track. This equates to 0.1 per cent of starters. Further, the medium or major injuries to greyhounds is just 0.75 per cent of all starters.

A veterinary surgeon is required to attend all race meetings (the race meeting does not proceed unless a vet is on course) to provide regulatory and emergency first aid duties.

¹²⁷ Submission 36, Tasracing, p 12.

Any greyhound found by the veterinary surgeon to have suffered an injury is stood down for a period of time deemed appropriate by the vet to ensure the greyhound recovers from that injury.

All injuries are recorded and reported on a monthly basis. These reports are reviewed by Tasracing's assets team to ensure track surfaces or the infrastructure the team maintains is not contributing to greyhound injury.

GA is considering a rule amendment that, if agreed, will require any greyhound that has not competed for more than six months to pass a vet exam and compete in a trial before being eligible to nominate for a race.¹²⁸

- 6.23 While the rate of medium to major injuries sustained through racing was 0.75 per cent of all starters in 2013/14, the Review Report noted that on average 1.49 dogs were injured in Hobart per meet, 1.50 in Launceston and 2.28 in Devonport in 2014:

GREYHOUND TRACK INJURIES¹²⁹

1 January – 31 December 2014

SUMMARY	Hobart	per meet	Launceston	per meet	Devonport	per meet
Meetings	55		52		50	
Injured	82	1.49	78	1.50	114	2.28
Eithanised	4	0.07	5	0.10	5	0.10
Hypoxia/Cramp	2	0.04	6	0.12	4	0.08
Illness	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.02

- 6.24 The RSPCA noted the injury rate at Devonport was significantly higher than the State average and should be investigated:

*Track design and surfaces can influence the types and rates of injuries suffered. The Tasmanian report included some track injury data which showed that there is a higher injury rate in Devonport compared to Launceston and Hobart and factors contributing to this difference should be investigated.*¹³⁰

- 6.25 When asked about the higher rates of injury in Devonport, Dr Eliot Forbes considered that while the Devonport track had a higher rate of injuries, such injuries were of a minor nature and may be due to different reporting standards of the stewards:

Mr GAFFNEY - My second question is to do with injury statistics. I am not sure if you know about Devonport. It says that RST reported race injuries at race meetings and Tasracing monitors these reports to ensure it is aware of any unusual incidents and to assist in the detection of any underlying trends and incident rates. I am wondering whether the rate of 2.28 dogs, which percentage-wise is markedly higher than both Launceston and Hobart per

¹²⁸ *Ibid*, pp. 12-13.

¹²⁹ Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry: Final Report, 13 March 2015, 28.

¹³⁰ Submission 71, RSPCA, p 6.

injury per meet, is consistent over a number of years or it was just, I am going to say a bad year, a year that the statistics were higher. Is that an issue with the Devonport track on injuries per dog or is it something that you have been monitoring that you could inform the committee about?

Dr FORBES - *There is an on-course veterinarian to address any dog that suffers an injury during a race day and a race meeting can't take place unless the veterinarian is there. The responsibility for reporting to the industry sits with stewards and they collate the data at Racing Services Tasmania. We are aware that this has been reported in that way but you need to go deeper into the data to understand the drivers behind that. We classify injuries in three ways and if a dog is injured they get a stand-down period that is determined by the veterinarian at the time. That stand-down period can be less than 10 days, 10-30 days or greater than 30 days. Hence, we look at the injuries as being minor, medium and major. The injuries that are higher at Devonport are in the minor category, not in the medium or major category. The reasons for that I am not sure right now but it could be something as innocuous as the on-course veterinarian tending to report more minor scratches than the veterinarians at the other tracks do. There could be some human factors and reporting approaches as well as a consideration as to what the infrastructure is doing.*

If it was in the major injuries it would be more of a concern. The information I have is that there were no major injuries at Devonport in 2013-14, the year before there were four and the year before that there were three. It bounces up and down. However, there is not a massive increase of major injuries and that would be something that would be of concern.

Mr GAFFNEY - *From the bare statistics, we have a 33 per cent increase. There have been suggestions that the track at Devonport may be substandard or the lighting may not be the best - that is why they have gone to daytime meets and that sort of thing. Is it part of your regulatory role to make sure that all the tracks are up to standard, whether it is harness racing, thoroughbred or whatever? If that was a concern, how do you assess that to see whether it is the track itself that could be the problem? You say they are only minor, but percentage-wise it is still quite high.*

Dr FORBES - *As a percentage, it is not high. We are talking about having nearly 4 000 starters at that track in the course of any one year. When you have no injuries, it is not very high. In answer to your question, there are a few things you have raised. The reason why the Devonport track races during the day is simply a broadcast agreement. In terms of fitting every race meeting across Australia across three codes of racing around a week, that is the slot that Sky Channel has made available to us. It has been that way for many years. That is the reason why those meetings are conducted during the day.¹³¹*

6.26 Dr Forbes also advised the Committee that maintenance of the Devonport track was the responsibility of the Club as they owned the racetrack:

¹³¹ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 30-31

... In terms of the track surface itself, we race at the Devonport Showgrounds. The responsibility for preparing that track sits with the Devonport Racing Club. However, we do communicate with them. We assist them and provide expert advice.

CHAIR - Can I get some verification there? The responsibility for preparing the track is one thing, but isn't the maintenance of the asset Tasracing's responsibility?

Dr FORBES - At most venues, except for the Devonport Showgrounds. That is both for the Devonport Harness Club as well as for the Greyhound Club. We provide a maintenance grant to both of those clubs and they run the tractors; they do the maintenance and they do the preparation.

CHAIR - It is their asset and they own the asset?

Mrs RYLAH - It is privately owned?

Dr FORBES - It is actually owned by the Devonport Show Society. It is leased by ourselves and we provide it to the clubs to run their meets. Then we provide a maintenance grant to them. If they need assistance in any regard, we provide that. We have also taken their track curator and we send our track curators away to national conferences from time to time in order to keep up with best standards. We have included the Devonport curator in that as well.¹³²

- 6.27 The Committee heard that the difference in the way injuries are reported is a problem across Australia and does not allow for comparisons across States which could highlight areas of concern. Scott Parker commented on the need to have consistency:

Mr GAFFNEY - The racing committee you have that is responsible for advising the GA board on all matters including the race calendar, prize money and funding policies, a parameter of that committee is not the actual safety and security of tracks across the states. If you are trying to have a national approach to an industry - and you have mentioned that it is different data collection - is there an aim to have states consistently use a similar approach to the measurement of that so you have some across-the-board national indicators?

Mr PARKER - There has been on the radar since before I came a national injury database objective but it has not seen the light of day, given the other priorities that have emerged since I have taken over. The answer to that is absolutely yes, it is one of the fundamental aspects of national unity that we need to get right. Sometimes you are talking about ensuring you have the right qualifications on course in a minority of cases to take the data. In other cases we have two systems operating out there and getting those systems to talk appropriately nationally has been something of a challenge and has been on the backburner as we have been tackling non-injury type issues. Having said

¹³² Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, p 31

that, our work to the end of last year identified that injuries to greyhounds was the equal second highest risk to us in so far as external stakeholders were concerned - at least, animal rights groups and social welfare groups. In November and December we were told through our research that that was a risk. Of course, along came allegations and evidence of live baiting and we have subsequently been focused on it.¹³³

- 6.28 The Committee also heard that track design was a contributing factor to greyhound injuries during races. Lisa White, President of Friends of the Hound, a greyhound rescue group in New South Wales, commented:

The big issue a lot of people don't realise is the injuries. If welfare is at the core of this industry, why do we have round greyhound tracks, why do they run in a circle? If you speak to any vet and ask them what sort of strain it would put on a dog to run at that speed in a circle and around a bend, they would tell you about the injuries they sustain. With a bend in a racetrack with eight dogs running 70 kilometres an hour in a pack together, of course you are going to get injuries. These dogs bump into each other, they knock each other, they go flying into the rails. Dogs are injured and killed on these tracks.¹³⁴

- 6.29 Dr Rod Andrewartha noted anecdotal evidence that fewer injuries are sustained on straight tracks:

Mr GAFFNEY - *I know it is Australia-wide, but I am still worried about the injuries when the dogs race around the track. They have anywhere between 8 to 10 dogs in a race, depending if they can fill all the boxes. Has there ever been any consideration whether that is a lot of dogs running around a tight track? It would seem to me there would be a greater chance for knocking into one another if you have more dogs in a race.*

Dr ANDREWARTHA - *It is the corner rather than the number of dogs. This is not my field so I am speaking on anecdotal evidence, but they seem to get less injuries on a straight track than a track with a corner on it. All human athletes get injuries, running, playing football or whatever. There will be a certain level of injury. By a good track design and things you can minimise the injury. You have to expect there will always be some.¹³⁵*

- 6.30 Dr Kim Barrett noted that track design was always a concern:

Mr GAFFNEY - *... Some statistics showed the Devonport track has more injuries - not serious ones, but the number was higher than for Launceston and Hobart. It was mentioned it might have been the course design or the track design and the guys mentioned last night there was one corner. Have you guys discussed that or has that been an issue?*

¹³³ Scott Parker, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, p 23

¹³⁴ Lisa White, Transcript of evidence, p 61

¹³⁵ Dr Rod Andrewartha, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 75

Dr BARRETT - It is always a concern, all the time. If the camber of the track is out, it can be bad. The mixture of sand and gravel versus fats and clay can be an issue. It can be an issue when the weather is really dry and the track cannot get enough water on it. There are so many things involved in track design.

I remember the Launceston track had a few issues going back years and they had an expert over from Sandown to come through and look at things, and things improved much where the starting boxes are, and the safety rail. It is not my area of expertise but it is multifactorial.¹³⁶

6.31 Several other submissions received by the Committee also raised concerns about race track design and racing conditions. For example:

- A large number of racing greyhounds are injured on the track and a significant number die or are killed as a result of racing injuries. On average, between 4 to 5 dogs are killed every week on the racetrack at official meetings. Up to 200 dogs in some states will be injured each week during racing. Many more thousands are 'scratched' each year before races as a consequence of injury.

Statistics for 2013 in Victoria alone, indicate that there were 84 dogs euthanized as result of racing injuries, 82 suffered fractures but were not killed and 3012 were injured. RSPCA estimates are that as many as 600 dogs may be injured each month throughout Australia, on racetracks.

In the 2014 NSW parliamentary report, data collected by animal welfare groups over a two-year period revealed 36,689 injuries and 970 deaths on the track mostly due to fractures and damage to ligaments, tendons, or muscles. Although the numbers are smaller in Tasmania, given that the industry is generally smaller, any death or injury of a dog simply for the purpose of gambling is not ethically justified.

Racing is extremely physiologically stressful for the dogs, especially during hot weather. This is a significant welfare issue both on the racetrack and also during transport to and from the racetrack. The fact that dogs are raced on days that exceed 30 degree temperature, introduces another significant welfare issue.¹³⁷

- Industry statistics and outcomes for each greyhound need to be published publically to ensure true transparency about injury rates and the number of animals being bred for this industry.¹³⁸

6.32 Industry participants conceded that racing conditions and the stress involved in traveling may have a negative impact on racing greyhounds. Anthony Bullock commented:

¹³⁶ Dr Kim Barrett, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 29

¹³⁷ Submission 3, Animal Justice Party, pp.4- 5.

¹³⁸ Submission 8, Paul Whitmore, p. 1.

Mr VALENTINE - Can we talk about the trailers you carry them in and how they are separated.

Mr BULLOCK - I put mine in twos only because my dogs have been in twos all their life. The same dogs go together all the time. I have four different kennel boxes and the dogs that go out together in the one yard normally double together. My personal opinion is that they travel better; they get in the trailer and lay down and go to sleep. One on their own, and they go around and around and lose more weight. They know each other and they have muzzles on, so in my opinion they travel better. I normally take them to Hobart three or four times and trial them before I race them down there due to the learning procedure. The first time they go there they don't trial very well. The second time they go better, the third time they go better again. That's just the way it is.

Mr VALENTINE - How do you handle that trip? Do they have water on the way down?

Mr BULLOCK - No, they have no water from the time they leave and once they get there they race. I don't give mine much to drink because it goes straight through them and makes them stressed and they lose vital body fluids. I give mine limited. They get a massive drink of water with their tea when they get home, so they get rehydrated overnight.

Mr VALENTINE - So you put them in the trailer, take them down, they race -

Mr BULLOCK - Yes. The same as you saw last night. Then we load them back up.

Mr VALENTINE - They get water after the race?

Mr BULLOCK - Yes, after the race. Dogs don't drink a lot of water - only after exercise. You can put water in there all day and might not touch it for a week.¹³⁹

Committee findings:

- 6.33 The Committee finds that Tasracing has an overarching responsibility for the condition of all tracks on which racing is conducted.
- 6.34 The Committee notes the work of Greyhounds Australasia in developing a national database on injury statistics.
- 6.35 The Committee finds that track conditions and design are contributing factors in the rate and type of injuries sustained in racing.
- 6.36 The Committee finds that racing injuries contribute to both euthanasia and wastage rates.

¹³⁹ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 16-17

Recommendation 10: That Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity collect data, information and report on injuries sustained during trialling and racing.

Recommendation 11: That Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity investigate the reasons for injuries and if the design and/or condition of the track is identified as a contributing factor, improvements must be undertaken to the track.

Illegal substances

6.37 The use of illegal substances in the industry is an animal welfare concern. In its submission to the Inquiry the Animal Justice Party argued:

There has been repeated evidence of the administration of illegal substances to racing greyhounds. These practices as well as live baiting have been shown to be widespread. Illegal substances used to have included anabolic steroids, performance enhancing hormones, cocaine, amphetamines, and Viagra. These substances are injurious to the health of the dogs. They lead to suffering and potential death of the dogs to which they are administered. These practices also render races unfair. Moreover, the possession of such drugs is an offence under criminal law and prohibited drugs legislation.

.....

Breaches must attract severe penalties that will be valid and effective deterrents, including a lifetime ban and pay back of race winnings. Fines that are small in comparison to potential winnings and short-term suspensions have proven to be ineffective.¹⁴⁰

6.38 The Committee heard the use of banned or illegal substances is also an issue in Tasmania. Graeme Barber stated:

Mr VALENTINE - Over the last decade, as a window, how many trainers or owners would have been decommissioned?

Mr BARBER - I wouldn't have a clue.

Mr VALENTINE - Can you count them on one hand or is it 20?

Mr BARBER - No. It would probably be 20 over a decade. There is usually two or three a year.

Mr VALENTINE - The reasons being, you were saying, related to doping for the main part.

Mr BARBER - Yes, there were some other aspects of animal welfare.

¹⁴⁰ Submission 3, Animal Justice Party, p. 5.

Mr VALENTINE - What sort of drugs are we talking about that you are aware of?

Mr BARBER - Just recently, amphetamine.

Mr VALENTINE - So, they were uppers?

Mr BARBER - Yes, caffeine.¹⁴¹

6.39 Tony Murray, Director of Racing, confirmed the use of illegal substances continued to be an issue of concern within all race codes. Statistics provided to the Committee by Mr Murray indicate there has been an increased use of illegal substances with six positive swabs being detected in 2014/15 in comparison with only one for 2013/14.¹⁴²

6.40 Mr Murray expanded on the data regarding positive swabs:

CHAIR - Mr Murray, we have the correspondence from you in relation to positive swabs. Has the Office of Racing Integrity noticed any trend shift in the number of positive swabs? Has the testing regime increased or changed in any way in recent years?

Mr MURRAY - It is cyclic in terms of trends. It seems to go between codes. If you asked for this three years ago, I would have said harness was our biggest code of concern with drug usage. It moved to greyhounds in 2014-15, and thoroughbreds have been getting more in recent times. The trend is cyclic.

In terms of swabbing, we continue to try to be smarter in the way we swab. The cost of swabbing continues to increase. In the last 12 months we have been faced with having to have testing done for new substances such as cobalt and arsenic. With that comes a cost.

...

We have a couple of inquiries at the moment in relation to notifications of irregularities in relation to arsenic. The cost of swabbing - when cobalt particularly came on the scene and it was a new drug being used, the traditional racing laboratories that we use, certainly Racing Analytical in Victoria and also the laboratory in Victoria and Queensland did not have the facility to test for that so the testing had to go a laboratory in Western Australia and also in Newcastle, New South Wales.

Fortunately the laboratory we use in Victoria now is able to test for the inorganic substances such as cobalt and arsenic, but the cost has gone up. We are faced, as is any regulator, with increasing costs in trying to maintain swab levels at a reasonable level. I know in real terms our number of swabs this financial year will decrease.

¹⁴¹ Graeme Barber, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 37-38

¹⁴² Correspondence received from Tony Murray, dated 13 and 23 November 2015.

Mr VALENTINE - The cost of the swab?

Mr MURRAY - We have two types of swabs. If you want a test-all, if you like, for all substances, a blood or urine sample will cost in round figures \$194 per swab. If you test for what we call total carbon dioxide, TCO₂, which has been a problem particularly in the harness industry over the years, that is about a \$31 testing fee. I think that \$194 was, in round figures, about \$150 not long ago, probably in the last couple of years. We continue to be faced with the challenges of having to keep our levels where possible, in real terms, at least at the same level, but it is unrealistic we will be able to increase them any time soon.

To that extent, I did do - and it is on a commercial in-confidence arrangement with the testing laboratory in Victoria - about three years ago to address the increasing costs. I was able to negotiate a deal which is ongoing, which puts us in a better position than we would have been in the absence of that negotiation.

CHAIR - Tony, we are trying to understand the data we have before us. It looks like there has been an increase in positive swabs. The question to my mind is: has there been an increase in testing? Does this strike you as a spike in positive swabs, given that there was only one positive swab in the 2013-14 financial year and there were six in the 2014-15 year, and so far one in the 2015-16 year?

Mr MURRAY - It is hard to put any clarity around it. We undertake the swabbing and it is random. In a number of cases it is targeting some, but we are still limited by the number of swabs we can do. As I said before, it is cyclic across the three codes. It is disappointing with the greyhound racing in 2014-15. I cannot sit here and say this course is vital, but we did change the way we did our swabbing in the last 12 months. It was always, with greyhounds, post-race swabbing. You wait for the greyhound to compete and then you swab it after the race.

We have now started - and we have for the last 12 months - when the greyhounds come out of the kennels prior to the race, getting some samples off them, thinking that the sample may be less diluted than what it is after they exert the energy in exercise. Then again, talking to people in a couple of other jurisdictions, they brought it to my attention that some of their positives have been as a result of pre-race swabbing. Of course, with that intelligence, we implemented that.

Some of these were as a result of the pre-race swabbing but certainly not all. Does it mean that there is increased drug use in the industry? The figures would say yes. I don't necessarily have that view that there is an increased use of drugs but, of course, if we tested more we would get a lot clearer picture across the codes. It worries me, the number of positive swabs we have had across the three codes in recent years. That is for both animal and human - unfortunately there has been a number of human positives in the harnessing and thoroughbred codes in recent years and that is generally as a result of use of recreational drugs. That is a concern as well.¹⁴³

¹⁴³ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 20 November 2015, pp 7 – 9.

- 6.41 Mr Murray further commented that it is immaterial how the substances came to be in an animal as it is the responsibility of the trainer or person in charge of the animal to present it free of prohibited substances:

CHAIR - ... *Is it possible that a dog that has had, for example, amphetamine-type stimulants detected has ingested that drug through the drug use of their owner or trainer?*

Mr MURRAY - *That can well be argued by the person who has been charged as a defence. My understanding of these ones is, the levels that were recorded would not support that but in any regard, whether it is by what we would call 'passive' means or not, there are rules and people cannot present their animals with those prohibitive substances. I think that that is unlikely. Even with caffeine we have 'Oh, I had a bit of chocolate on my hand' or something like that.*

The absolute responsibility lies with the trainer or the person in charge of that animal to present it free of prohibitive substances. To be quite honest, how it got there, in our view, is -

Mrs TAYLOR - *Immaterial.*

Mr MURRAY - *Yes, immaterial to an extent. Is there an offence under the rules is what we are looking at.¹⁴⁴*

Committee findings:

- 6.42 The Committee notes the increased detection of prohibited substances in the Tasmanian greyhound racing industry.
- 6.43 The Committee notes comments of the Director of Racing regarding the increases in costs for drug tests and the regulator's diminishing capacity to undertake an effective testing regime.

Recommendation 12: That the Office of Racing Integrity undertake a review to ensure the penalties imposed for the use of prohibited substances reflect the seriousness of the offence.

Recommendation 13: That the Office of Racing Integrity be appropriately resourced in order to increase inspections of properties and strengthen its capacity to undertake effective routine swabbing.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid*, p 9.

Initiatives to improve welfare standards

- 6.44 The Committee acknowledges that a number of initiatives are being introduced by the national body, regulatory authorities and industry participants in an attempt to improve animal welfare outcomes and reduce the number of greyhounds euthanased each year. These initiatives include the introduction of tighter controls on breeding, eliminating breeding incentives, more funding for rehoming and opportunities for longer racing careers.
- 6.45 Of particular significance is the Greyhounds Australasia (GA) ‘Towards Zero Euthanasia’ framework, released in May 2015, which focuses on reducing breeding volumes and improving rehoming rates for greyhounds. In its submission to the inquiry GA commented:

‘Towards Zero Euthanasia’ describes the most significant challenge facing the greyhound racing industry and identifies the levers available to controlling bodies to significantly reduce the number of greyhounds whelped and significantly improve the number of greyhounds successfully re-homed.

It is anticipated that all controlling bodies, including Tasracing, will use a combination of the following to limit the humane euthanasia of greyhounds to circumstances where this is the last and only option:

- *Significantly increase breeding related fees and direct funds to industry adoption programs (GAP);*
- *Licence all racing greyhound service providers (whelpers, rearers, breakers, educators) and their properties, to optimise greyhound tracking;*
- *Mandate the following to secure participant licence renewal;*
- *Satisfactory completion of owner, trainer, breeder, whelper, rearer, breaker and educator education;*
- *Satisfy a compliance team audit of the licensed participant’s property;*
- *Remove Breeder Incentive Schemes and direct funds to GAP;*
- *Introduce a mandatory re-homing requirement of all owners;*
- *Remove participant fees to enter a greyhound into GAP;*
- *Establish satellite GAPs to improve owner/trainer access to the program;*
- *Engaging and redeploy current trainers to manage the satellite GAPs;*
- *Launch a national GAP to more effectively communicate the benefits of greyhound pet ownership, access to adoption opportunities, and national standards of program care and responsibility;*
- *Review current prizemoney and redistribute funds into an expanded GAP.¹⁴⁵*

Committee finding:

¹⁴⁵ Submission 37, Greyhounds Australasia, pp 4-5.

- 6.46 The Committee finds that initiatives to improve welfare standards for racing greyhounds has broad industry support.

The introduction of tighter controls on breeding

- 6.47 Greyhounds Australasia (GA) proposed changes to the national rules regarding breeding in November 2014. These rules became effective from 1 December 2015 and provide for tighter controls on breeding:

- A requirement for all brood bitches to be registered with controlling bodies as a 'breeding female' prior to being bred for the first time; and
- Female greyhounds eligible for registration must be less than 8 years of age and not had 3 or more litters, including 2 or more litters within the past 18 months.¹⁴⁶

- 6.48 In evidence before the Committee Scott Parker commented:

The restriction on breeding is really a first stab at sending a significant message to the industry that all breeding decisions must be properly considered. The facts are that there are around 3 800 people engaged in breeding actively around the country today, defined as any person that has bred at least one litter in the past three years, and 80 per cent of those 3 800 have only bred one or two litters, so the vast majority of breeding activity is going on in a manner that the industry will find very hard to put a cap on. In other words, the restriction we brought in to say no more than three litters before a controlling body and veterinary approval is much more about sending a signal at the start of the breeding process that you had better be careful who and what you're breeding with rather than getting to a stage where, 'I'd really like to have another go with X and Y but now I need to fill in some paperwork and get controlling body approval and get a vet certificate to say it is a healthy thing or not to be doing.'

It is really about sending a signal now, today, that you had better be careful who you are mating with because under-performing greyhounds are quite clearly contributing to the challenge of reducing unnecessary euthanasia, and that is the benefit as much as anything of introducing those rules.¹⁴⁷

- 6.49 Tasracing commented on the new rules to reduce breeding:

The industry has been working for some years to reduce the number of greyhounds bred while maintaining racing stocks – breeding numbers have been reduced by 50 per cent across Australia since 1975 when more than 36,000 greyhounds were whelped.

The Greyhound Australasia (GA) Board will consider new rules at the June 2015 meeting to increase the registration requirements of a breeding female and limit the number of litters a breeding female can have to three without

¹⁴⁶ Greyhounds Australasia Rules (GAR), 127(6) to (12), effective 1 December 2015.

¹⁴⁷ Scott Parker, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, p 16.

controlling body and veterinary approval. This is a significant change extending control bodies' regulatory reach into new areas, namely the breeding sector.

.....
The first phase of implementation focuses on improving immunisation rates and will assist in reducing the number of greyhounds bred that are unlikely to be suited to racing.¹⁴⁸

6.50 Tony Murray commented on the initiatives of Greyhounds Australasia noting that reducing breeding rates is a significant step forward in reducing wastage:

CHAIR - Greyhounds Australasia made a submission and presented to us. Its spokesperson, Scott Parker, acknowledged the level of wastage in the industry across the country and acknowledged that was presenting an image problem, apart from the ethics of it, for the industry. Greyhounds Australasia, we were told, is moving towards a policy of zero euthanasia in the industry. Do you think that is achievable for the greyhound racing industry? There will always be reasons that dogs are euthanised but we are talking about the wastage of dogs.

Mr MURRAY - It's an excellent goal to aim for. One would hope it is, but a realist would say 'You have a lot of work to do before you get there.' Greyhounds Australasia has introduced some breeding initiatives as at 1 August, which is what it calls a 'pink card', where a greyhound bitch can't breed any more than three litters, or a greyhound over eight years old can't breed unless they meet certain criteria. That is a substantive move forward on the breeding side of things. When I did a report for the chief vet - and previously I had started the tracking of greyhounds because I was concerned about the results I was going to find - I found that the wastage is something that must be addressed as a matter of urgency. The ability of the greyhound is absolutely linked to its longevity and, unfortunately, we have to move on from that.¹⁴⁹

6.51 Mr Murray also commented on the new breeding rules noting:

The new breeding rules are coming into place, which restrict a bitch from having more than two litters per 18 months, having any litters above age eight, or having more than three litters in total, except if approval is given under very specific requirements. Until now, there were basically no limits on the number of litters a bitch could have. Now, bitches are restricted to three in total and up to the age of eight, unless they meet certain criteria. That criteria relates to a correlation between a review of previous litters - the number of greyhounds whelped compared to the number that were named, the number that started, and the success rate of those that started. They have to meet very strict criteria before they are given approval to breed an additional litter. It is only an approval to breed one more litter and then if they want to breed again, they have to go through the same process.

CHAIR - When did those changes come into effect?

¹⁴⁸ Submission 36, Tasracing, p 5

¹⁴⁹ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 45

Mr MURRAY - Over the last couple of months, I can't tell you the date.

CHAIR - Has the breeders' bonus been dealt with?

Mr MURRAY - Yes. Obviously you asked Dr Forbes those questions because that is his jurisdiction, but the breeders' bonus was scrapped, yes. What we found, since this came in we have had, I think, five to six applications for approval to breed in excess of the limits. Each of those have met the criteria. We do that as Office of Racing Integrity, it comes under my jurisdiction as statutory officer that I approve them subject to them strictly meeting the criteria. It is working.

Mrs RYLAH - There have been successful bitches?

Mr MURRAY - The requests we have had have all met the required standards. By looking at the other side, the mere fact that people are not seeking approval with bitches that won't meet the criteria means that they understand that the limitations are now there and they cannot continue to breed unless they meet the requirements. That will have a significant positive effect, moving forward.

Mr GAFFNEY - That is a higher standard than most purebred dogs. I think it is good they are having just three litters, because it means that the person will probably spread that over a longer period of time than having two in 18 months, which is harder on the bitch.

Mr MURRAY - Yes. It also means that, as I said, in Tasmania 50 per cent of the greyhounds whelped have to have been named. Of those that are named, 80 per cent have to have started, and of those that have started, there needs to be a 50 per cent win rate. It is clearly putting the onus on the success of the bitch to give approval to breed more than three litters, whereas up until now there was no requirement whatsoever. When I say whatsoever, obviously the greyhound had to be in good health, but you could breed an unlimited number.

*The manner in which the national body in each jurisdiction has addressed the breeding wastage issue has been very strong and prompt.*¹⁵⁰

Committee findings:

- 6.52 The Committee notes the national rule to limit the total number of litters out of an individual greyhound in order to reduce wastage rates.
- 6.53 The Committee notes the National Rules regarding brood bitches; eligibility, age and litter restrictions.

Recommendation 14: That the Minister for Racing require the Office of Racing Integrity to review and report on the number of litters bred in Tasmania, five years from the introduction of the new breeding rules, to determine whether the breeding rules have reduced wastage rates.

¹⁵⁰ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 20 November 2015, pp. 18-19.

Eliminating breeding incentives

- 6.54 In addition to tighter controls on breeding being introduced, Tasracing noted that financial incentives for breeding would be eliminated with the ‘Breeder’s Bonus’ being abolished in Tasmania:

At its March 2015 meeting, the Tasracing Board agreed to abolish the payments in Tasmania for both the DNA laboratory fee for breeding females and the vaccination/microchip/rearing rebate (previously known as the Breeder’s Bonus).

The payment was originally introduced to assist breeders with the cost of vaccination of a litter when vaccination was optional and was only paid on production of vaccination certificates.

Over the years, mostly due to the compulsory vaccination of litters, it developed into a payment towards the cost of breeding and rearing a litter which was payable at the time the litter was registered with RST.

Refocusing the bonus to reward breeders whose pups make it to the racetrack had been previously discussed with the Greyhound Reference Group (with which Tasracing meets and consults regularly).¹⁵¹

- 6.55 The abolition of financial incentives for breeding is likely to be welcomed by a number of witnesses. Caroline Williamson, State Operations and Animal Care Manager with RSPCA Tasmania noted that the breeding bonus went to all breeders and so encourages overbreeding:

...I have just looked up on the computer about the breeder’s bonus, which I think is being phased out over this year, but at the moment breeders get paid \$1 300 by Racing Services Tasmania when they register a litter. I think things like that really need to be looked at in terms of why they are breeding and how many litters need to be bred, rather than blanket bonuses that go out to all the breeders.¹⁵²

- 6.56 Dr Sally-Anne Richter considered that financial incentives should be for rehoming of greyhounds rather than for breeding:

CHAIR - *Do you think one of the issues with the industry and here in Tasmania is over-breeding and what is called the breeder’s bonus, so that there are financial incentives to owners and trainers to breed a higher number of dogs?*

.....

¹⁵¹ Submission 36, Tasracing, p 5.

¹⁵² Caroline Williamson, RSPCA, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 58

Dr RICHTER - The breeding bonus can be viewed in a few different ways. One good way that is viewed is ensuring that breeders do vaccinate, microchip and look after their pups, and that is really important. Having spoken to some of the older vets within the industry, they say that 20-30 years ago Parvo virus was rampant amongst greyhound pups and now that we have vaccination a lot of that has been got rid of, so it is almost unheard of.

In terms of where we probably want that bonus to go is more to the retirement of dogs and that is where the AVA would probably prefer that money to be directed. They are in agreement with the submission from the Chief Veterinary Officer and Director of Racing that if we can move that money into retirement or rehoming and retraining of the dogs, then we might get rid of a lot of the unwanted wastage that is present.¹⁵³

6.57 Emma Haswell considered:

Mr VALENTINE - You say the breeding incentive schemes should be abolished. Can you explain a bit about that?

Ms HASWELL - Until we start having a no-kill policy with greyhounds we have to control the breeding. If we can't be re-homing them all we have to be responsible and not funding the industry to rampantly breed any greyhound and have masses of litters born and then kill hundreds of dogs, many of them that have never even raced. It seems incredible to me that we have an industry that is funded to breed when we don't have an industry that is putting back in to help re-home the dogs....¹⁵⁴

Committee finding:

- 6.58 The Committee notes the abolition of the 'breeders bonus' within the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry.

Rehoming

- 6.59 The Committee heard that rehoming rates for greyhounds is low. The RSPCA commented:

While greyhound adoption programs are a step forward, they cannot cope with the high numbers of greyhounds (more than 18,000 greyhounds born in Australia each year) moving through the system. Only a very small proportion of ex-racing greyhounds (around 1000) are adopted annually in Australia through industry greyhound adoption programs. In New South Wales for example, approximately 8,000 greyhounds are born each year in NSW. However, the Greyhound Racing NSW (GRNSW) Industry adoption program only rehomed about 52 greyhounds in 2012.

The Tasmanian Report also reveals a low rehoming rate in Tasmania. In the 2011/2012 cohort, of the 617 greyhounds whelped in Tasmania, 384 dogs are

¹⁵³ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 8-9

¹⁵⁴ Emma Haswell, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 19

reported as deceased (about 62 per cent), 33 dogs retired (about 5 per cent) and 200 dogs (about 32 per cent) are listed as still in active training/education.

In the 2013/14 racing season 121 greyhounds were reported as retired/rehomed, 62 in GAP (note this includes dogs whelped in Tasmania and dogs relocated to Tasmania). It is not clear what 'retired' refers to and whether this is synonymous with 'rehomed'. Regardless, given that 600-700 greyhounds are born each year in Tasmania and that apparently a number of greyhounds are transferred to Tasmania from other Australian states, the number rehomed in Tasmania each year is proportionately very low and that urgent action must be taken to address this problem.¹⁵⁵

6.60 The Committee also heard there are limited incentives for people to rehome their greyhounds. Emma Haswell stated:

...We have GAP, who do a wonderful job. I think in the last four years they have re-homed an average of 50 dogs a year. I think they were receiving \$60 000 a year funding; I am not sure how much it is now. In four years it is 167 dogs, \$110 surrender fee. It costs a trainer between \$40 and \$55 to euthanase a dog, and a member of the public \$120. Then you look at Brightside, who re-home more greyhounds, get no funding and charge a \$50 surrender fee.¹⁵⁶

6.61 The Committee received submissions that also referred to the high euthanasia rates and the need for increased funding for rehoming greyhounds:

- *Estimates indicate that only very small numbers of racing dogs are rehomed, and even fewer of among those who are born but don't make it to the racetrack. Dogs that do make it to the racetrack are retired (many are killed) at the young age of 2 to 4 years or earlier if they are injured while racing. Estimates are that approximately 12,000 greyhounds are 'retired' from racing in Australia each year. Of these, only between 10 and 15% will go onto breeding or will be rehomed. The remainder are killed. Only 10% (2,000) of pups born each year will live out their natural life, majority through rehoming.*

It is unfathomable that a multi-million dollar greyhound racing industry is capable of rehoming only a very small proportion of greyhounds bred for racing through their GAP program. This reveals either a lack of will and/or ability by the GAP to ensure the welfare of its dogs. This reinforces that the Tasmania racing industry should not be entrusted with a regulatory function of ensuring the welfare of animals in greyhound racing.

Greyhounds deserve care and protection. They are social animals and socialisation for young greyhounds needs to be mandatory. Rehoming programs are essential and need adequate funding so that no one greyhound is left unprotected in the future.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁵ Submission 71, RSPCA, pp 4-5.

¹⁵⁶ Emma Haswell, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 17

¹⁵⁷ Submission 7, Beryl Dix, p. 1.

- All greyhounds born into the industry deserve lifelong care and protection. Rehoming programs need to be adequately funded so every greyhound born is rehomed.¹⁵⁸
- Animals bred for racing must be looked after for the term of their natural life.¹⁵⁹
- Making sure there is adequate funding and places for greyhounds to go when they are no longer racing so they can be rehomed.¹⁶⁰

6.62 Dr Kim Barrett commented on the need for better resourcing of rehoming programs, particularly to ensure that people responsible for rehoming greyhounds are adequately trained:

Dr BARRETT - I have been practising for 34 years and I can remember a particularly horrific day in my life at the Canine Defence League in Launceston where we put down 34 dogs in one day and all of those were healthy and not ill-kempt. Society has moved on from that now, in that we are seeing less of what happened 25 or 28 years ago, so the dogs that are put down at places like the RSPCA are put down because of temperament, the fact they will not make it, the fact they are black dogs or whatever. That is what the industry has to work towards. We have seen this attitude change over 25 years.

The industry needs to be sustainable as much as it can so the dogs that have done well racing and are fit to be re-homed, should be re-homed. They have to be re-homed well because Anthony said that his niece had been injured. With re-homing, people have taken greyhounds without going through GAP and similar bad things have happened - with other fluff, not with people. The people who are running the GAP program have to get educated at TAFE to get their behaviour/welfare-type thing. Susan Gittus in this state is particularly excellent. So they know the dogs that are going to make it.

Mr VALENTINE - With respect to re-homing them, who is best placed to decide the suitability of a dog for re-homing? You are saying that the -

Dr BARRETT - In our state, Susan Gittus. I know she has done a TAFE course. She runs the umbrella of GAP. I guess there are finite numbers that go through that, but the dogs that come out of GAP have been assessed, they have been socialised, they have been fostered out to foster care before they actually get released to the people that have them. That is not to say that other things don't work, because we have re-homed little puppies that have had broken legs, for example, and they have been fine. Just occasionally you get dogs that are not properly assessed, with really strong prey drives that really can create some havoc in the community without being properly assessed.

Mr VALENTINE - How many people out there are doing re-homing, apart from Susan Gittus, that you know of?

¹⁵⁸ Submission 8, Paul Whitmore, p. 1.

¹⁵⁹ Submission 9, Leica Wagner, p. 1.

¹⁶⁰ Submission 11, Louise Willie, p. 1.

Dr BARRETT - I know a few go through Brightside. Some people will re-home them themselves privately. I have one client who has been in the industry for over 30 years who will not have their dogs in GAP or anywhere because they want to know where they have gone when they have finished racing. They would rather have them put down rather than release them into the general population. They will keep some as pets.

CHAIR - Why do you think that is? Intuitively you would think that someone who cared about dogs and loved greyhounds would want it to go to a good home rather than end its life at the age of four.

Dr BARRETT - This person would be 80-plus and it's attitudinal. For them, knowing that their dog is in a safe place, albeit not here any more, makes sense.¹⁶¹

6.63 Dr Barrett also noted the resources of GAP were limited and this also led to dogs being euthanased when they may have otherwise been rehomed:

CHAIR - You talk about a dog with a strong prey drive, and that is one reason that they are euthanised. But you must have come across dogs that are being euthanised because they are not fast enough, or they are non-performers, or they have just got old. So it is not only because they have a strong prey drive.

Dr BARRETT - Yes. Sometimes people say, 'Well, I have waited to get it in the GAP program for over six months, and I cannot wait any longer.'

CHAIR - That comes down to the resourcing of the GAP program to take on more greyhounds.¹⁶²

6.64 Scott Parker stated:

Mr VALENTINE ... Given the aim that you have to reduce breeding from 18 000 down to 11 000 which you consider to be the number of dogs that are needed in the racing industry, do you think it is sustainable for 11 000 dogs to be rehomed each year? Do you see that as something that is achievable?

Mr PARKER - I think it is going to be about 8 000, because what we are doing is taking 7 000 out of the pre-race population that do not make it to the track and adding it to the about 1 000 last year that were rehomed. We need to rehome 7 000 more than 1 000 if you like. We need to find 8 000. We have got five years to do it. Take Victoria for example, they are the leading rehoming controlling body at the moment. They did 500 last year. They are going to do in the vicinity of 800 this year under the same circumstances as they had last year notwithstanding the heightened attention to greyhounds as a breed since mid- February this year.

¹⁶¹ Dr Kim Barrett, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 22-23.

¹⁶² *Ibid*, p 24

We are talking about rolling out a national program. A proposal for that idea was accepted by my board on Thursday week ago when last the GA board met on 18 June. A more comprehensive proposal needs to go together. I think that has the opportunity of improving awareness of the opportunity of the greyhound breed. I think numbers have been subdued for some time because of a poor awareness of the viability of greyhounds as a breed, whether you live on a vast rural property or in the middle of the city in a two-bedroom apartment. There are advantages to the breed that people don't understand. There has not been the sort of focus there needs to be on it. The programs have been run centrally in each controlling authority and the proposal before us is to decentralise the program. Even in the larger states you are not too far away from submitting a greyhound to the program with an opportunity to go along and assess a greyhound for your own needs. That is going to be a significant advancement on the centralised program we have at the moment. At the end of the day, if we fail to meet that challenge and we have been held accountable for failing to meet that challenge, we will tackle that as it comes. What we don't want to be is in two years' time failing to meet a target we set ourselves for today because we did not do absolutely everything we could to obtain it. If we don't obtain it only for the reason we have exhausted the total demand for greyhounds as pets, then so be it, unfortunately. At the same time we will have drastically reduced the volume being bred, that do not need to be bred, and improving the rehoming rates at the moment. At the moment that is what stakeholders, including the public, would demand of us.¹⁶³

6.65 John Newson commented:

Some dogs are not suitable to be re-housed - and that is like with any breed, you can get bad dogs. I would say that this year there have been a lot more greyhounds gone through the GAP. We are taking steps to make sure this problem goes away and we can help alleviate some of the wastage. The litters registered this year are down 50 per cent, so I would say maybe not next year but the year after, the life span of these dogs will be continued because they will need the dogs to keep on racing.¹⁶⁴

6.66 Anthony Bullock made similar comments noting:

Most of my owners like their dogs to go with the GAP. I euthanise only the dogs that I don't think will make the GAP. That is because of their temperament and their outgoing skills, as in wreckers - chewing wire, wreck their beds, dirty, whatever. I recommend them not to go to the GAP. I reckon that 30 per cent would go to GAP and the rest would be put down.¹⁶⁵

6.67 Scott Parker stated:

I would be fairly confident in saying there wouldn't be any greyhounds unsuitable for re-homing being re-homed through an official GAP program. There are at least 30 rescue-type groups around the country that undertake that work and it may be that in some instances some of those greyhounds are

¹⁶³ Scott Parker, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, p 24

¹⁶⁴ John Newson and Karlene Cuthbertson, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, pp 10-11

¹⁶⁵ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p. 6.

being re-homed that probably shouldn't that haven't gone through the rigorous testing process that a Tasracing GAP, for example, would ensure.¹⁶⁶

Greyhound Adoption Program (GAP)

6.68 The Greyhound Adoption Program (GAP) is the industry program for rehoming greyhounds. The program is funded through Tasracing. In its submission to the inquiry Tasracing noted:

Tasracing funds the Greyhound Adoption Program (GAP) in Tasmania employing a dedicated statewide coordinator.

Every dog that enters the program is temperament tested, de-sexed, wormed, de-fleaed, vaccinated, micro-chipped, teeth cleaned and nail trimmed. The dogs spend six to eight weeks with dedicated volunteer foster carers who help prepare dogs for life outside the racing kennels.

Tasracing is conscious of the need to ensure only greyhounds that will be suited as pets are placed in the community through GAP.

Tasracing staff carefully assess dogs and match dogs with prospective homes to ensure the dog has the best opportunity to lead a successful life as a pet. Each dog is rehomed with an adoption pack.

Tasracing staff remain as a support and information network for the adopting families for the life of the dog. Tasracing remains committed to ensuring that rehomed dogs are well cared for their entire life. This enduring concern for greyhound welfare is not only a responsibility but a passion for Tasracing's GAP staff.¹⁶⁷

6.69 In relation to funding Tasracing commented:

Tasracing increased funding to GAP in 2014/15 and the number of adoptions has increased as demonstrated in Table 1 below:

FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15*
28	30	23	35	56

** FY15 partial year to May 2015*

The greyhound industry provided \$100,000 from the code's funding allocation in 2014/15 for GAP. This is set to double in 2015/16. Tasracing will also review the program with a view to increasing capacity while at the same time promoting responsible greyhound ownership.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶ Scott Parker, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, p 18

¹⁶⁷ Submission 36, Tasracing, p 7.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p 7.

- 6.70 In evidence before the Committee, Dr Eliot Forbes further commented on the funding of GAP:

We increased the funding to it last year. The number of dogs that were rehomed in FY 2014 was 35; that increased with funding to 56 in the year just gone. I don't have the last month's data. As to the funding going forward, we are looking to double that funding in the coming year. That is what we have budgeted for, in order to try to increase what we are achieving to date. There is an important context here - and I think Scott from GA touched on it just before - what is the demand for greyhounds in the community? There will come a point where the demand for greyhounds as pets may begin to be reached. In saying that, we have to try to improve that demand and drive it forward. We have also been engaged with some other third parties looking at ways we can increase both capacity and demand.¹⁶⁹

- 6.71 Industry participants were supportive of GAP. The Hobart Greyhound Racing Club (HGRC) commented:

GAP – The Greyhound Industry has been adding extra financial support each year to the Greyhound Adoption Programme as the industry understands the importance of rehoming and has been in discussion with Tasracing regarding the expansion of the programme. This has been seen by participants as an important aspect of greyhound racing that the industry in this state takes responsibility for their greyhounds and that the most greyhounds as possible be rehomed. The industry also wants to be responsible in rehoming greyhounds making sure that the greyhounds are appropriately suited to their adopting family and that there is continuing support for those families and greyhounds.¹⁷⁰

- 6.72 The Hobart Greyhound Racing Club further commented:

The Greyhound Adoption Program in this state is doing a great job transforming greyhounds into couch potatoes and with further funds can do so much more, the industry trusts this program to ensure that the greyhounds going out to the community are ready and that the homes are suitable for them. A local rehoming group has on their Facebook page that they re-homed a greyhound 1 week after receiving it, this raises major concerns as the greyhound would not be de-sexed, temperament tested or properly matched to the adopting home.¹⁷¹

- 6.73 The Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania expressed their support for the program and suggested a need for increased resourcing:

The Association fully supports the GAP. Over the past two seasons the Association has made two substantial financial donations to the GAP program.

¹⁶⁹ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 31-32

¹⁷⁰ Submission 46, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, p 5.

¹⁷¹ Submission 46, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, p 6.

Currently the program is being run by a licensed greyhound trainer who is providing her own kennelling facility at her property, for approximately twenty GAP dogs. The Association would like to see TasRacing prepare a business plan to map the future of the program including a stand-alone kennelling facility, motor vehicle and trailer owned or leased by the program and adequate money available for staffing a stand-alone centre.

The biggest issue at the moment is the waiting time that owners/trainers have in getting a dog into the program. The Association understands that the current issues surround the number of external active “foster carers” available to the program.¹⁷²

6.74 In addition, the Committee received many other submissions that spoke highly of GAP:

- *When Dogs come from GAP they have all their correct records and they have been foster tested and the owners know what they are getting. And there is someone to call for follow up if you have any problems.*¹⁷³
- *I think all ex-racing dogs should be compelled to go to GAP and be tested before they are offered for adoption.*¹⁷⁴
- *I am now an owner/foster carer/parent if you will of these magnificent animals, and to that end I work by fostering, closely with GAPTAS, who are doing a sensational job in rehoming these dogs once they have finished their racing careers! Albeit with very little backup, financially and in resources from the racing authorities in Tasmania – a blight on the authorities copy book for that!!*¹⁷⁵
- *...All dogs that come into foster care through GAPTAS are spayed, come complete with a history, checklist of what is required to be passed before they are even considered for adoption!! Once adopted out they have proven to be exceptional pets and companions.*¹⁷⁶

6.75 The Committee notes that in November 2015, Tasracing released a consultation paper entitled *Strategy Development – Greyhound Adoption Programme*. Tasracing advised the Committee:

Tasracing made the decision to increase the funding available to the GAP to assist in its greyhound welfare efforts and improve the resourcing and support to the GAP co-ordinator. Animal welfare is a core priority of Tasracing, and it is an expectation of the community.

¹⁷² Submission 26, Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania, p 9.

¹⁷³ Submission 2, Sharyn Marshall, p. 2.

¹⁷⁴ *Id.*

¹⁷⁵ Submission 10, Noel Gibson, p. 1.

¹⁷⁶ *Id.*

The financial commitment in the FY16 budget for the GAP increased almost \$100,000 to \$214,000 from the actual spend in FY15. This increase is being funded from the Greyhound Code allocation budget (which includes Stakes and other racing expenses). It has enabled:

1. The purchase of a dedicated vehicle that was customized to transport greyhounds;
2. An increase in human resource levels, including the additional part-time role;
3. An increase to boarding rates that were paid to the GAP co-ordinator, to ensure the rates were aligned with key cost drivers; and
4. An allocation of funds to trial a partnership with the RSPCA for a period of 6 months. It is noted that this trial has not commenced nor has the financial negotiation been finalized. Tasracing is still in consultation with the industry regarding the proposal, in addition to considering other such proposals to assist in demand for retired greyhounds.¹⁷⁷

- 6.76 The GAP Strategy Development includes a proposal to enter into a partnership with the RSPCA:

*to host a joint pilot programme for the rehoming of greyhounds to increase greyhound adoptions and identify the community demand for greyhounds as pets.*¹⁷⁸

- 6.77 Tasracing advised the Committee about the funding arrangements for this partnership:

*At this stage, Tasracing does not intend to introduce additional levies or fees to support the GAP or other welfare initiatives, including partnerships with organisations like the RSPCA. However, it is anticipated that the continued development of GAP will require additional funding from the code allocation budget, as the number of retired dogs increases. As and when this is required is unknown at this stage but prior to making any changes, Tasracing will consult with the Greyhound Reference Group members prior to implementation. For clarity, the code allocation budget is made up of stakes monies, GAP funding, racing incentives and handlers insurance.*¹⁷⁹

Non-GAP rehoming agencies

- 6.78 The Committee recognises there are a number of individuals and organisations who offer rehoming services for industry greyhounds.

- 6.79 Brightside Farm Sanctuary noted:

Brightside Farm Sanctuary has rescued and re-homed over 300 greyhounds and has a particular interest in the welfare of greyhounds in Tasmania.

...

¹⁷⁷ Correspondence received from Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO, Tasracing, dated 5 January 2016 re: Strategy Development – Greyhound Programme.

¹⁷⁸ Tasracing, *Strategy Development – Greyhound Adoption Programme*, issued 23 November 2015.

¹⁷⁹ Correspondence received from Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO, Tasracing, dated 5 January 2016 re: Strategy Development – Greyhound Programme.

To compete with the discounted cost of euthanasia Brightside only charges \$50 for a greyhound to be surrendered into our program. Brightside has taken in over 25 greyhounds in the last month alone.¹⁸⁰

6.80 Several submissions raised concerns about animal shelters that provide rehoming services:

- These dogs that are obtained from trainers for nothing and then just sold quickly for the \$270 in the next day from so called “rescue” sanctuaries, are really not giving the public the right idea of what to expect or how to cope with a dog straight from a racing kennel, let alone if it had or hasn’t been desexed.¹⁸¹
- As a volunteer foster carer I take it upon myself to educate the general public not only about the dogs and their inherent benefits, but to the laws requiring them to be muzzled in public! A fact that a certain so called Rescue Centre fails to tell people to whom they sell dogs to.¹⁸²
- The people who “rescue” these dogs and simply turn them over to buyers are doing the dog a disservice, as these people receive these animals from irreputable sources who use inhumane methods of training. A dog, any dog who has been trained by live baiting, or even dummied up baits are potentially dangerous to the public, akin to attack/guard dogs and unfortunately there are a few organisations out there who simply turn these dogs out and of course there is an incident and it is all of the breed that comes into disrepute.¹⁸³

6.81 Dr Eliot Forbes commented:

Mr VALENTINE ...How do you regulate outside of the GAP program? Do you set any standards that individuals or organisations have to follow - some of the welfare groups that are out there? How do you manage that space?

Dr FORBES - This is a very important point and it is that anybody can set themselves up as a welfare agency or a rehoming agency and behave in an irresponsible manner if they choose to. We don't have an ability to regulate entities outside our statutory responsibilities.

Mr VALENTINE - You cannot set rules for those people to follow?

Dr FORBES - No.

CHAIR - Do you think Racing Services Tas could?

¹⁸⁰ Submission 75, Brightside Farm Sanctuary, p. 2

¹⁸¹ Submission 2, Sharyn Marshall, p. 2.

¹⁸² Submission 10, Noel Gibson, p. 1.

¹⁸³ *Id.*

Dr FORBES - No, because they are not licensed participants.

Mr VALENTINE - That is limited by what is in the Act.

Dr FORBES - It is governed by legislation. From time to time we hear very concerning stories about dogs that are surrendered to so-called sanctuaries where they are rehomed with the community but where they may not be suitable to go into a family home, or where they have been told that they have been de-sexed and in fact they are not. That is why our positive engagement with our racing participants is that the only appropriate place to place your greyhounds for adoption is with the official GAP program. I hope that the appendices make it very clear that we go through a very thorough process. The documentation we place with them is of a high calibre in terms of educating the person who is taking the dog on, and beyond that also. We almost have an ongoing and enduring helpline if those people that we place a dog with have any questions or concerns with that dog; we are there to answer the phone and help them.¹⁸⁴

6.82 Dr Forbes further commented:

Ms RATTRAY - In regard to the large commitment you would need to give to adopting a greyhound, would you believe it would be absolutely necessary that everyone who puts a greyhound out for adoption, whether it be through Brightside, the RSPCA or GAP - which I know is the preference of Tasracing - would need to have the same paperwork and requirements undertaken?

Dr FORBES - Even from some of the submissions I have read there are complaints about some of the people operating in this space, so maybe it is worthy of regulation and investigation. I was very concerned there are claims that dogs were desexed, for example, and they hadn't been done.

CHAIR - That was one single dog, but it hasn't been reinforced by anyone else. It has been acknowledged at the table here by the person the claim was made about.

Dr FORBES - One of the other aspects is we have very stringent behavioural requirements to ensure that the dogs are suitable to go to the community. It takes some weeks to do that. I have heard certain claims whereby dogs go into some sanctuaries and they are out within the community within three days. There is no way you could properly assess a dog within that time, hence I believe that is irresponsible behaviour.

Ms RATTRAY - In your paperwork it states that there should be no assessment until they have at least been in the facility for 48 hours, before even an assessment is done.

Dr FORBES - Correct. I have concerns in that area and would welcome regulation in that space.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁴ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 43-44

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid*, p 45.

Committee findings:

- 6.83 The Committee notes the good work **that** is undertaken by GAP, rescue groups and volunteer foster carers in rehoming greyhounds.
- 6.84 The Committee finds that resources for the rehoming of greyhounds need to be increased and more effectively managed to maximise the number of dogs rehomed.

Recommendation 15: That the Government commission an independent review of the Greyhound Adoption Program and other adoption services. This review is to include examination of existing funding and resources for greyhound rehoming/adoption programs as well as investigating additional mechanisms to support such programs with a view to increasing the number of greyhounds rehomed.

New Grading system

- 6.85 The Review Report recommended a number of initiatives to provide increased racing opportunities for greyhounds including:

Recommendation 7. Ensure races are programmed specifically for greyhounds with less ability and for mature age greyhounds; and

Recommendation 8: Ensure that the Grading Schedule provides further racing opportunities for greyhounds that are no longer competitive in their current grade.¹⁸⁶

- 6.86 In his submission to the inquiry, Tony Murray commented on the implementation of these recommendations noting:

The Director recently completed a review of the Grading Schedule, which addressed this recommendation, and the draft findings of the review... have been circulated to industry inviting their feedback by mid-June 2015.

It is envisaged that the revised Schedule, incorporating industry feedback where appropriate, will be finalised by the commencement of the 2015/16 greyhound racing season (commencing 1 August 2015).¹⁸⁷

- 6.87 Mr Murray provided a further update on the implementation of the new grading system in November 2015. In evidence before the Committee he noted:

...a new grading schedule came in force on 1 October. That means that greyhounds can drop back even further in grade to be more competitive.

¹⁸⁶ Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry: Final Report, 13 March 2015, p. 30.

¹⁸⁷ Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, p. 7.

*There are now races being run with greyhounds with a lesser ability and there are now races being run with more mature-aged greyhounds. The industry has embraced that. It is very much giving greyhounds with limited ability more opportunity, so that is really important.*¹⁸⁸

- 6.88 The Committee heard from a number of witnesses that the new grading system has the potential to extend the length of a greyhound's racing career and as a consequence reduce wastage. Dr Eliot Forbes noted:

Dr FORBES - ... *One of the challenges we have is trying to ensure we have enough racing opportunities for dogs of all ability. Dogs who may at the present time be deemed too slow by their owners, we have to try to create opportunities for those dogs to participate.*

Mr VALENTINE - *Are you talking about different classes of racing?*

Dr FORBES - *That is right. The grading falls under Racing Services Tasmania. The Director of Racing has undertaken a review in that regard. When he has finished his review we will be working with him and the grading schedule he devises in order to program the races. The programming is our responsibility, trying to cater for those needs of the dogs.*¹⁸⁹

- 6.89 The RSPCA also considered that steps to extend the racing career of greyhounds was a positive step to reduce wastage rates. Jade Norris, Scientific Officer, commented:

*One of the contributing factors to wastage is that dogs that are not competitive at the very high level don't have opportunities to attend race meetings and that contributes to the unwanted greyhound population. Even industry participants have suggested that they also support - I think it was in New South Wales - providing more opportunities for dogs in the slower ability categories because that would enable them to still race and not be leaving the industry so quickly.*¹⁹⁰

- 6.90 As noted by Mr Murray, the evidence received by the Committee indicates a general level of support for the new grading schedule. The Hobart Greyhound Racing Club commented:

*The grading schedule review recently produced by the Director of Racing Mr Murray has been well received by the industry and sees a significant change to grading. The 14 changes recommended have significant emphasis on animal welfare and provide further racing opportunities for greyhounds that are not as competitive as others.*¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 20 November 2015, p 22.

¹⁸⁹ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 44-45

¹⁹⁰ Jade Norris, RSPCA, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 56

¹⁹¹ Submission 46, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, p 3.

6.91 The Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania commented:

There are also three races per season called Breeder's Classic events, one at each of the three race tracks. These races are restricted to dogs that have been bred in Tasmania and have not attained the age of two years old.

*.....
On each occasion that a Tasbred dog wins a race in Tasmania a bonus of \$1000.00 on top of the stake-money is paid to the owner.*

The racing life of a greyhound is generally about two to two and a half years. There is a lot dependent on that estimation, being the greyhound has racing ability, it stays fit and healthy and does not suffer any serious injury during that time. The racing life cycle commences at around eighteen to twenty months of age and may go until the greyhound nears four years of age. There are around 800 racing stock currently in Tasmania. With the end of career age at about 4 years there is a requirement for around 25% (200) dogs to enter and exit this stock figure per year.

A huge problem with the Greyhound Racing Industry in Tasmania is the current race Grading Policy. This policy is administered by Racing Services Tasmania and is again under review. It seems that reviews of the policy have been frequent but no actual improvement has been witnessed to be able to extend the racing life of either aging greyhounds (masters or veterans events) or younger greyhounds with restricted ability. The Association would like to see the Grading Policy updated to include a Tier 3 racing system similar to Victoria.

Under our current policy a greyhound can win its first race called a Maiden race without penalty. It then enters the Grading system as a Grade Five dog on the track that it has won its first race. Once the dog wins another race on that track it is elevated to Grade Four status and then Grade Three and so on. A Grade Three greyhound after having three unplaced runs can drop back to Grade Four until it wins again. A Grade Four dog cannot drop back to Grade Five under the current policy which severely restricts the racing life of that dog.

The Association urges the Committee to recommend to the Director of Racing that the Grading Policy review be completed with haste.¹⁹²

6.92 John Newson while supportive of the new grading schedule considered that older dogs were more susceptible to injury:

We had a meeting with Mr Murray last week, and he has put forward a new grading schedule. We have been waiting for this for 18 months. We are quite pleased with what he has come up with. This will make quite a bit of difference to the longevity of a dog's racing life. There is only one problem. As a dog gets older, he is more susceptible to injury. It is like with humans. Your recovery is not as good as a young person. That could only be one of the downfalls. You might find some of these dogs now might end up with injuries. They could be life threatening. Who knows? This will definitely increase the life of the

¹⁹² Submission 26, Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania, pp 5.

greyhound. It will definitely make a difference. This has been something we have been after for 18 months.¹⁹³

6.93 However, others within the industry expressed some doubt as to whether it would reduce wastage rates. Anthony Bullock commented:

Mr GAFFNEY - We understand the different gradings of the races now. There has been a suggestion in other states that they have some races for older dogs who may have gone past their prime, but can still compete, but they do not have so many of those here in Tasmania. Is that -

Mrs RYLAH - The masters.

Mr BULLOCK - The masters? There were ups and downs for the masters. Our grading system, which is supposed to be under review, is a step-up grading system, whereas normally when you get to between three and three-and-a-half, that is when you reach the best of your performance. Then it is a decrease. There is no rule to keep going back down the grade. Therefore, in a grade 2, which is nearly a top grade, you could have four-year-old dogs in there that are not competitive, but there is nowhere for them to go to come back down. To me, having a lot of four-year old racers is not good in theory because normally they are about 80, 90, 100 starts, and they are starting to get worn out and you're flogging a dead horse, to put it bluntly.

There is just no point because the injuries take their toll. Every time they get hurt, they are another three or four lengths slower. Two months off in a greyhound's life is a long time, even to have off racing, because they do not come back quite as good as they were. You have all these things against you. As they get older, it just becomes slower and slower. Where they could run 30 before, they can run 30, 60 now, and they still get hurt worse than they did when they were young.

.....

Mrs RYLAH - So what would you consider would be the ideal way to have the older dogs - should they just retire from racing, or what would you suggest?

Mr BULLOCK - I think if it was a downgrade system where you go back to grade 5, and they could grade the dogs into a grading in a grade 5. In Victoria if you have won 10 races and you are a grade 5, you go in with the dogs that have won 10. If you have won three races and you are a grade 5, you go in with the dogs with one to three wins. The old dogs should be graded into a grade 5, where it is not a masters, but the dogs of the same amount of ability for the point of their time. If you take a dog to Hobart five weeks in a row, you are not going to take him the sixth week because you are getting past the point of, 'Where am I going?' if you keep racing them. It doesn't matter if they're old or young - you've done the best you can to there. You have to draw a line and say, 'Where do I go?'. The owner doesn't want you to keep it because he doesn't want it;

¹⁹³ John Newson, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, p 22

you don't really want to take it, so where do you end up? With an unwanted dog.¹⁹⁴

Committee finding:

- 6.94 The Committee finds the new grading schedule introduced in October 2015 is intended to extend the racing career of greyhounds.

Recommendation 16: That the Minister for Racing require the Office of Racing Integrity and Tasracing to review and report on the new grading schedule annually to determine whether it is reducing wastage rates.

Other potential welfare reforms for the industry

- 6.95 A number of submissions to the inquiry suggested a variety of other reforms that should be introduced. As noted while the RSPCA is supportive of the Review Report's recommendations, it considered that more needs to be done. In evidence before the Committee Jade Norris commented:

The RSPCA submission to this inquiry outlines a number of further recommendations and we urge the committee to consider them closely and recommend their implementation urgently. These include recommendations put forward by the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee that were not part of the final Animal Welfare Act Amendment Bill. Relevant recommendations are recommendation 3, the inclusion of mental suffering; recommendation 26, that animals kept for commercial purposes under section 16(2) include animals kept for the purpose of breeding animals for sale; and recommendation 39, that a court can order costs or bonds or the disposal of animals with any funds held in trust where a person has been charged with the relevant offence but not yet attended court and there is a risk of suffering to the animals. For broader canine welfare we also recommend that the act prohibits prong and electric collars as per recommendation 10.

.....

Live baiting is just one of the many serious animal welfare issues associated with greyhound racing requiring urgent attention. It is vital that this inquiry effectively addresses these additional animal welfare issues and that action is taken to meet increasing community expectations about the treatment of greyhounds involved in greyhound racing. There must be an expectation and formal processes in place to ensure that each individual greyhound born will become a companion pet when they leave the racing industry, whether they race or not.

This necessitates fundamental cultural change within the industry. Puppies must be socialised particularly during the critical canine socialisation period so

¹⁹⁴ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 6-7.

they are set up for success as a pet in the future. Mandatory requirements to provide adequate socialisation for all greyhounds, combined with education programs, must be implemented in Tasmania.

The alarming wastage rates revealed in the Tasmanian report for both unnamed and named greyhounds is a significant finding because it indicates there are fundamental problems in the quality of the breeding, the rearing and the training practices that currently occur in Tasmania. Unfortunately only a very small proportion of these unwanted greyhounds are re-homed, which means many of these otherwise healthy dogs are euthanased. Injuries, inadequate housing conditions and a lack of environmental enrichment are also key welfare problems that must be addressed through the implementation of enforceable standards for greyhounds at all life stages to ensure living conditions meet the physiological, behavioural and social needs for all greyhounds and that a good quality of life is provided.

While the current regulatory structure in Tasmania appears to separate commercial and integrity functions and this must be maintained, there appear to be some elements of self-regulation within the current framework. For example, Tasracing officials apparently supervise tracks. In the RSPCA's view it is inappropriate for the commercial body to take a supervisory role and these functions should be transferred to Racing Services Tasmania. RST should also have greater oversight in order to prevent policy conflicts such as the breeders bonus scheme, which exacerbates the problem of over breeding and the animal skin lure exemption, which maintains dangerous outdated practices.

It is critical that this inquiry raises the bar by providing the highest level of protection to greyhounds and other animals.¹⁹⁵

- 6.96 The RSPCA noted one potential area of reform is in relation to acknowledging mental distress in animals. The Animal Welfare Advisory Committee has previously recommended that the Animal Welfare Act be amended to acknowledge mental stress and suffering of animals. Patrick Campbell, Chair of AWAC commented:

- Yes, I think it would. Certainly in our deliberations in relation to the changes to the Animal Welfare Act, the issue of mental stress and trauma was raised. It is a difficult one to prove in people and far more in animals but there is certainly evidence of behavioural changes with things like pacing and that sort of thing. There are some things you can use. I think it was generally agreed by the committee that that was an issue and probably something we should endeavour to - it was one of our recommendations. We are having a meeting in a couple of weeks' time in October, at which some further amendments are going to be discussed and I'm sure that is one of the things that will be raised at that time.¹⁹⁶

- 6.97 Ensuring the industry is aspiring to best practice was a theme that ran throughout many submissions. Dr Kim Barrett commented:

¹⁹⁵ Jade Norris, RSPCA, Transcript of evidence 30 June 2015, pp 43-45

¹⁹⁶ Rick Campbell, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, pp 4-5.

CHAIR - ... You are talking about current practices that need changing. What do you think those practices are and how far is the industry from best practice?

Dr BARRETT - It is hard to know where to start. I suppose you could start by worming dogs regularly from that six-week period to four months and continue through. You could start by making sure poo is picked up every day in the dog yards. They are just minute things that all contribute. Socialisation, I think - whereas different trainers will disagree - so the dogs are exposed to a variety of stresses so they are more able to cope in the racing situation, that they are broken into the lead early, broken into starting boxes, having the rough and tumble in the race yards, that type of thing. Listening to some of Anthony's comments, they have to be bred to run, so they have to have a free space to run but they have to have their mates with them to learn to bump and bingle and all those things. Nutrition is another thing. There are heaps of things. Training properly, making sure they have athletic pre-training. It is like saying, how do you put an Olympic swimmer into the Olympics. There is a huge amount of background that goes on behind them.¹⁹⁷

...

The challenge for the industry is to identify what current industry practices need changing, and what are the standards at the moment, and how each area can be improved, as well as what is good and what does not need to be changed. Remember that, listening to Anthony, there is a huge knowledge base in the industry. Some of it is carried on through generations, other knowledge is new stuff, but it's there. I think all areas of the industry in Tasmania want to shift the average standard towards more excellence. On an individual dog basis, the individual greyhound, I think we should aspire to that and all having the best rearing, the best pre-training and post-racing life possible. I agree with Anthony that the reality for some dogs is that their inherent strong prey drive limits their ability to be re-homed in certain situations, but if you go back to that working dog alliance thing, that is trying to shift that so that more dogs will be fit to go there afterwards.¹⁹⁸

... ..

CHAIR - ... one of the issues that has been raised with us is about the level of education and training and best practice animal welfare standards for industry participants. In your submission you say: 'Experts in greyhound behaviour and welfare should be defining best practice and that knowledge should underpin education of industry participants and regulatory authorities.' How far do you think we are from that ideal?

Dr BARRETT - A way, but it was starting five years ago. Greyhound Victoria put out glossy brochures on rearing, breeding and training. They were 15 to 20 pages, and that was perhaps five to six years ago.

CHAIR - How would that filter through down here? Was that information available to the Tasmanian industry?

Dr BARRETT - I don't know.

¹⁹⁷ Dr Kim Barrett, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 21-22

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid*, p 20

CHAIR - What level of engagement with the industry is there on animal welfare standards?

Dr BARRETT - They are defined. Under the rules of racing there are standards and there is a publication out which you can get from the LGRC office. Now there is an audit. The trainers have to go through their training or be ticked off on what they are doing. But much more can be done. You need experts like Karen Dawson - even people like Anthony - being involved at ground roots level, and other people, to aim for best practice.

I recently was involved with a lady who is doing a research project about parasites in greyhounds in Australasia, and she had funding from Greyhounds Australasia. She took 135 faecal samples from greyhounds on the north-west coast. She also did Hunter Valley and Victoria. It will take her two months to analyse the faecal samples. She did a questionnaire for all the trainers and that showed up the ignorance or misinformation on worming programs and things like that. It is little things like that that bring feedback from that knowledge that needs to be distributed to the greyhound racing industry so they can do something like improve their worming practices. Then there are things like improving nutritional practices and improving training practices. The training methods of, say, elite swimmers or elite bike riders, how much have they changed in the last five or 10 years? It is also recovery of the animals -

CHAIR - And handling as well.

Dr BARRETT - And handling, yes.

CHAIR - Would you like to see the Office of Racing Integrity, or Tasracing, but I am assuming it would come from what used to be Racing Services Tasmania, more actively engage with trainers and owners about animal welfare standards or best practice in the industry?

Dr BARRETT - Yes, I think so. I was talking with one of the stewards one night - they were talking about kennel inspections, and going around at any time - and what he wanted was someone from the industry to go with them. I do not know how that would work - random trainers or random breeders going to other people's places. They would have some idea of what they were seeing.

CHAIR - So it is a bit like a knowledge-sharing exercise?

Dr BARRETT - Yes, but also an audit going back to the industry.¹⁹⁹

Committee findings:

- 6.98 The Committee notes that in the Review of the Animal Welfare Act, published in February 2013, the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee recommended to the Government the Act be amended to incorporate provisions that acknowledge mental suffering of animals.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid*, pp 27-28

Recommendation 17: That the Government further investigate whether provisions regarding mental suffering should be incorporated in the *Animal Welfare Act 1993*.

Education and training of participants in the industry

6.99 The need for increased education and training for industry participants in relation to welfare standards and best practice was also raised.

6.100 There are education and training programs linked to licensing requirements. In its submission to the inquiry Tasracing noted:

Tasracing has implemented a progressive industry skills program that mandates that industry participants must have nationally accredited training credentials in order to be licensed to participate in the industry.

This approach was first implemented with the thoroughbred and harness codes in recent years. It was always intended to link greyhound licensing standards to the training credentials in 2015, with participants required to demonstrate their competencies in order to be relicensed from August 2016.

With this in mind, in 2014/15 Tasracing began a process of Recognition of Prior Learning accreditation for all licensed catchers, attendants and trainers. Tasracing has appointed a training officer to coordinate this work.

Granting of licenses is directly linked to the national standard of competency for each of the units listed below.

The assessments are conducted by experienced greyhound industry participants and all assessments meet with the required Australian Quality Training Framework standard (practical demonstration, observation, questions and answers and a third party testimonial).

- *Attendants*
RGRCMN201A – Follow OHS procedures and observe environmental work practices
RGRPSG201A – Handle Greyhounds
- *Catchers*
RGRCMN201A – Follow OHS procedures and observe environmental work practices
RGRSG206A – Perform duties of greyhound catcher
- *Trainers*
RGRCMN201A – Follow OHS procedures and observe environmental work practices
RGRPSG201A – Handle Greyhounds
RGRPSG205A – Attend Greyhounds at race meetings
RGRCMN001A – Comply with the rules of racing and related protocols

Importantly, RGRPSG201A – Handle Greyhounds features elements that relate to animal safety and welfare.

Prior to the assessment, all participants are sent a Tasmanian focused greyhound booklet that is customised for each licence category.²⁰⁰

6.101 Dr Eliot Forbes commented on the level of education available to participants and noted it was subsidised by Tasracing:

Dr FORBES - There is an industry skills plan that Tasracing embarked upon when it was formed and there wasn't anything formal prior to the formation of Tasracing. We have linked minimum training standards through to licensing standards and we had a plan to roll that out progressively across industry. We started with the thoroughbred code; then the next year we did the harness code and then the next year we were supported with some Federal funding which ran out. Then we had to delay it until we tried to find some more funding for that. In the end, that did not eventuate with the change of Federal Government so Tasracing itself decided to fund the greyhound code and subsidise their costs of participation in the industry funding themselves.

CHAIR - Is this going through TasTAFE? What is the training mechanism? RTOs and TasTAFE.

Dr FORBES - I think there is another point here and that is the training is important. People do not like change particularly if they have then engaged in a practice for most of their adult life and then all of a sudden you knock on a door and say, 'You need to be accredited to do this'. Some people do not like that and they do not like that scrutiny. However, guiding an industry across the three codes through this change - and very confronting change for a lot of the older participants in our sport - is something that we have taken very seriously. We are also very cognisant of our responsibilities of trying to drive that change. The heart of this comes down to cultural change of responsible ownership of dogs or horses and making sure that the people have got the skills and the aptitude to behave in a responsible manner.²⁰¹

6.102 Industry participants were supportive of the need for mandatory education. Graeme Barber commented:

I noticed probably some three or four years ago a change in attitude - a more professional approach. Currently, all handlers - people who handle dogs for a trainer at a meeting or catch them in races - have to undertake a certified training program. It is a Certificate II level program and there are a number of different things they must have knowledge of and have some training in. That is a marvellous thing. It shows that the people who want to remain in the industry are committed to the industry and looking after their dogs the best way they can. They are committed to learning the current proper methods.

There are two levels. One is for trainers, which is level 4, and the other one is for handlers, and that is level 2. To have their licence renewed, people must

²⁰⁰ Submission 36, Tasracing, p 11.

²⁰¹ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 41-42

now get that qualification - be assessed as being able to operate to that level. As I said, that started to really bring forward the animal welfare issues surrounding greyhounds and greyhound training and retirements and injuries and treatments and all those sorts of things. Certainly, the viewing in February of the footage was just horrific and it certainly sparked a lot of comment in the industry and a lot of disgust in the industry.²⁰²

6.103 Similar views were expressed by John Newson:

Mr VALENTINE - What do you think of the idea that education is mandated at the time of people being registered as breeders? I am not just talking about greyhounds here, I am talking about any dog breeders, that there is a mandatory education program they have to go through, to make sure they understand community expectation on what is reasonable with dog welfare.

Mr NEWSON - I would probably agree with that. At the moment, with general trainers or any person to be licensed in the greyhound industry, there is now a prescribed TAFE course. 75 per cent content of that is animal welfare.

Mr VALENTINE - Is that mandatory?

Mr NEWSON - It is mandatory now to get your licence renewed, and to be licensed as a trainer, an attendant, and a catcher. An owner has to have a licence, but he does not have to do the course. There is now a TAFE course you have to do and you have to pass it before they will renew your licence.

Mr VALENTINE - Does that course deal with things such as housing of greyhounds, comfort, and all the rest of it?

Mr NEWSON - It is a lot of welfare issues. There are standards set now for kennels - the size of the kennels et cetera. There is a standard now.²⁰³

6.104 Patrick Campbell also agreed that education is important:

CHAIR - Yes. Would you agree there is also a need for education, training and engagement of greyhound owners and trainers?

Mr CAMPBELL - Absolutely. My feeling - again harking back to when I was working and trying to investigate animal cruelty issues - always was that if we had to prosecute someone we had failed because we hadn't been able to educate them prior to that point that what they were doing was inappropriate and not what the community expected. I think education is paramount and there should be programs to achieve that. This is not only in relation to greyhounds, it applies throughout the animal welfare debate.

Mr VALENTINE - On that aspect, without putting words into your mouth, do you think when a person is registered as a racing greyhound owner they should have to undertake a mandatory education process as to what is expected? Is

²⁰² Graeme Barber, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 34

²⁰³ John Newson, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, p 11.

that the way to go, so that you know everyone in the industry has that level of understanding as to what is reasonable and what is not?

Mr CAMPBELL - ... It's not rocket science, is it? It's pretty basic stuff that people need to be aware of. I don't think it does any harm for someone starting out in the industry, or even on a routine basis every few years or something like that, that they be reminded of their obligations in relation to animal welfare.²⁰⁴

6.105 The Committee heard that more targeted education was also required. Tony Murray commented:

*Once again it is easy to blame the participants but a look at some of the real issues would suggest there are many other factors in play. The first question that must be asked is what have regulators and governments done to educate the industry on changing animal welfare community expectations? Regulators can improve rules, governments can change legislation, but at what point, if any, was the industry provided proper education on the changes? It is easy to say they should have known, and perhaps they should have, but regulators and governments must bear some of the blame.*²⁰⁵

6.106 Mr Murray further commented on the need for the Office of Racing Integrity to work with the RSPCA in educating the industry:

*One of the discussions I had with the RSPCA last week was about educating the industry in relation to what their role is and what the responsibilities are under the Animal Welfare Act, as well as educating the industry about the roles - which they generally have a good understanding of. The RSPCA and we agree we need to get together to educate each other on our various roles. I think it is important for us to provide the best leadership for the industry. Together we need to understand each other's responsibilities and then we move that forward to help educate the industry as well. That is critical to moving forward.*²⁰⁶

6.107 Some industry participants also considered there was a need for improved education. The Hobart Greyhound Racing Club commented:

*...education programmes with respect to contemporary animal welfare standards, the industry have been asking for regular forums/education sessions for a long time to cover all areas but especially breeding best practice, animal welfare and any significant changes to rules, National and Local, so that Participants can have full understanding of them and the consequences that would result if broken.*²⁰⁷

6.108 Graeme Barber noted there have been improvements in both education and training programs:

²⁰⁴ Rick Campbell, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, p 3

²⁰⁵ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 36

²⁰⁶ *Ibid*, p 51.

²⁰⁷ Submission 46, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, p 5.

The training program is in its infancy and there have been a few hiccups with it.
....

TasTAFE, so they are the final accreditation and certificate issuing body that the work goes to. There have been some problems between the TasTAFE assessors and the industry training assessors, so that has been put on hold while they get that sorted out. I think they just about have it sorted and it is about to roll out again. Yes, there can be improvements, but it's a big improvement on what was there only a few years ago.²⁰⁸

Committee findings:

- 6.109 The Committee finds that owners and breeders are not required to undertake mandatory education as part of their licensing requirements.
- 6.110 The Committee notes the industry considers it is not being adequately informed when the Rules of Racing change.

Recommendation 18: That mandatory education and training on contemporary animal welfare standards and the provisions of the *Animal Welfare Act 1993* be required for all licensed participants within the greyhound industry.

Recommendation 19: That Tasracing provide timely information and ongoing education to the industry when the Rules of Racing are amended.

Export of greyhounds

- 6.111 The need for regulation relating to the export of greyhounds was raised:

- ... there is no way to protect Australian racing greyhounds once they leave the country and laws must be changed to ensure that greyhounds are not exported for racing purposes.²⁰⁹
- Stricter controls of dogs being sold overseas.²¹⁰

- 6.112 Tony Murray commented on the passport system introduced by Greyhounds Australasia:

Mrs RYLAH - In regard to greyhounds that are born and raised here that may be sent overseas, do we have any evidence of that and how are they treated in this data?

²⁰⁸ Graeme Barber, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 40.

²⁰⁹ Submission 7, Beryl Dix, p. 1. See also, submission8, Paul Whitmore, p. 1 and submission 12, Lena Bodin, p. 1.

²¹⁰ Submission 11, Louise Willie, p. 1.

Mr MURRAY - I don't know of any that have gone overseas. Greyhounds Australasia brought in a passport system a number of years ago where they have to be cleared to go overseas to race. There was a big issue with some greyhounds being exported to parts of Asia –

Mrs RYLAH - Macau.

Mr MURRAY - My understanding from Greyhounds Australasia is that that has been addressed primarily with the introduction of that system.²¹¹

Committee findings:

- 6.113 The Committee notes that an unknown number of greyhounds bred and raised in Australia are being exported to countries with unacceptable welfare standards.
- 6.114 The Committee notes Greyhounds Australasia's concern that while a passport system has been introduced for racing greyhounds, there are legal loopholes to circumvent the system.²¹²
- 6.115 The Committee is unable to ascertain if any Tasmanian greyhounds are being exported to other countries.

Recommendation 20: That the Minister for Racing engage formally with the appropriate Federal Minister(s) to address the issue of greyhound export.

Powers of stewards

6.116 The Review Report noted:

While the powers of RST stewards under the Rules of Racing are quite extensive, there remains some uncertainty regarding the circumstances in which they can undertake inspections and seize evidence, especially if it is in the private residence of a licensed person separate to their training facility.

Additionally, from time to time, stewards uncover evidence during inquiries that directly links the activities of an unlicensed person to a licensed person. Under existing legislation and Rules of Racing, a significant impediment exists with stewards not being able to require an unlicensed person to appear before

²¹¹ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 55-6.

²¹² See media statement of Greyhounds Australasia, "Greyhound Passport Scheme", undated available at:

<http://www.galtd.org.au/sites/default/files/forms-and-documents/Media%20Statement%20GA%20Passport%20Scheme.pdf> accessed 23 March 2016. See also media statement of Greyhounds Australasia 'GA confirms how it assess greyhound export applications', dated 10 December 2015, available at: <http://www.galtd.org.au/news-article/ga-confirms-how-it-assesses-greyhound-export-applications> accessed 23 March 2016.

an inquiry or to provide required evidence. This can result in an inability to successfully prosecute an offence against a licensed person.²¹³

6.117 Accordingly, the Review Report recommended:

15. Enhance the powers of entry for animal welfare officers under the Animal Welfare Act 1993 and Racing Services Tasmania Stewards, under the Rules of Racing, to ensure they are properly supported with respect to live baiting and other animal welfare issues.

16. Consider an amendment to the Racing Regulation Act 2004 to enable stewards to require unlicensed persons to appear before inquiries and provide documents if it can reasonably be determined that the person is of particular interest to an inquiry under the Rules of Racing.²¹⁴

6.118 The Animal Welfare Act was amended in June 2015 to provide animal welfare officers with greater powers of entry. While stewards have the power to enter the premises of a licensed participant at any time, the Rules of Racing have not been amended to clarify the circumstances in which they may seize evidence.

Tony Murray commented on the inspections undertaken by stewards:

Mr BACON - When stewards go to someone's property to inspect it, do they give prior notice?

Mr MURRAY - We have two types of inspection: announced and unannounced. It can vary. We have a program in place where we try to get to each kennel at least once a year. To be able to do a proper inspection of the property we require the person to be home so we can have them take us through the whole area. That is one part of it but clearly the other side of it is the unannounced inspections where we will just turn up at random. If somebody is not there we will still proceed to undertake an inspection. The one I spoke about, Mr Donaldson, with the disqualification was an unannounced inspection; no-one was home. Stewards saw a retired greyhound and they were concerned about its wellbeing. They contacted me and I contacted the RSPCA and a local vet to attend.

Mr BACON - How many would be announced and how many would be unannounced?

Mr MURRAY - I don't have the figures with me, but I think we are trending towards probably 50:50 at this stage.

Mr BACON - Is it similar in the other codes?

²¹³ Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry: Final Report, 13 March 2015, p. 41

²¹⁴ *Ibid*, p 41.

Mr MURRAY - Yes. One of the difficulties is, as I said before, it lessens some of the value of the inspection if you turn up and nobody is there. If somebody is there, you could reasonably say to them, 'Open that cupboard' and go through that. Stewards have the powers to do that, but you are hesitant, without somebody being around, to go to that level of detail. An unannounced inspection with the person home is your best case scenario, but it does cause difficulty when you turn up and there is nobody home.²¹⁵

.....

Ms COURTNEY - When your stewards go for unannounced visits or announced visits and have interaction with trainers, what type of reception do they get? We get the general impression from people that they open their arms to stewards as they arrive, but is that the impression you get from your stewards as to the attitude of trainers when they turn up?

Mr MURRAY - Ninety per cent of the time I would say the participants aren't unhappy to see the stewards. I can't give too many indications where they are invited in for tea and scones, but in all honesty I think the industry across the three codes respects the role of the stewards. They understand why they are there. Of course those with nothing to hide should welcome them to come in and undertake inspections.

Ms COURTNEY - Do your unannounced visits only occur 9 to 5 weekdays?

Mr MURRAY - No. Stewards can turn up at a property at any time.

Ms COURTNEY - Do they, though, in practice?

Mr MURRAY - They certainly do. More and more we are doing more unannounced inspections on weekends, on race day. We are going to stables and kennels on race day to ensure the animal is there and that there has been no treatment given to the animals at that time. We don't work 9 to 5. Stewards can and have turned up at properties at night. We have undertaken inspections at six o'clock in the morning quite regularly in recent times.²¹⁶

6.119 The Committee heard from industry participants about having their properties inspected. Anthony Bullock noted:

Mr BACON - When stewards come to your place do they ring beforehand and let you know they are on the way?

Mr BULLOCK - They ring at the gate because I have German shepherds at the gate.

Mr BACON - They don't let you know the day before?

Mr BULLOCK - No. They always ring at the gate and we let them straight in.

²¹⁵ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 44-45

²¹⁶ *Ibid*, p 45

Mr BACON - Has that always been the case?

Mr BULLOCK - At my place it is. I reckon I get four to six inspections a year, plus other inspections, like the day after the live baiting they lobbed there.

CHAIR - Was this the RSPCA or Racing Services Tasmania?

Mr BULLOCK - Racing Services Tasmania has been there - the day after. The Director of Racing has been there three or four weeks later. The RSPCA have never been to my place to go to my bullring.²¹⁷

6.120 Graeme Barber noted:

CHAIR - Graeme, we have heard some concerns raised by animal welfare organisations about the level of enforcement of standards in Tasmania and the number of inspections of trainers' properties and breeders' and owners' properties. As an example, when was the last time your premises was inspected?

Mr BARBER - About four months ago.

CHAIR - How regularly do you expect an inspection?

Mr BARBER - Three to four times a year.

CHAIR - Three to four times a year? We heard evidence this morning that it was about once a year. So you think it is three or four?

Mr BARBER - I have personally have had more than one visit a year.

Mr VALENTINE - Do they arrange it with you or is it ad hoc?

Mr BARBER - Sometimes they have been, but most of the time it is ad hoc.

Mr VALENTINE - Sorry, not ad hoc, but you are not notified.

Mr BARBER - Yes, it is unannounced the majority of the time.²¹⁸

6.121 June Phillips commented on her experience:

Mr VALENTINE - June, I have a question around kennel notifications and inspections by Racing Services. You say in your submission that they play a very positive role. I am interested in your experience of inspections they may have done over time. Do you think they're effective? Do they always inform you that they're coming or are they random inspections from your perspective?

Ms PHILLIPS - They are random inspections, although if I upset anyone I know I'm going to get one.

²¹⁷ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 2.

²¹⁸ Graeme Barber, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015 p 35

Mr VALENTINE - The nature of them? Can you explain what they do?

Ms PHILLIPS - They check everything out in your kennels. They go through all your medicines to see if anything is out of date. They check all the bedding. They check the dogs to see that the dogs are okay. They do a very good job.

Ms RATTRAY - Do they offer any suggestions, June, about what might be improved if there is a need?

Ms PHILLIPS - I don't think they do that to me.

Ms RATTRAY - Obviously you have top-class facilities.

Ms PHILLIPS - Yes, we have.

Mr VALENTINE - You talk about mandatory and regular checks as if they are two different types of inspections. Do you want to expand on that?

Ms PHILLIPS - No, I think they just check everyone out about twice a year. We have been checked out last racing year twice. I think they should be able to walk in anytime they like and check your kennels. If it is two weeks after the last time, if it is ten times a year, whatever they can afford to do I think they should do.

Mr VALENTINE - In your experience and with the people you know, do you think they are doing that enough or not doing it enough? Have you got a comment on that?

Ms PHILLIPS - In the last 12 months Racing Services have been doing a very good job. I am not sure that they did enough follow-up in years gone by. It's pretty hard if you've got a litter of eight pups and it's a really wet, horrible day and you've got to get in there and check them all.

Mr VALENTINE - Do they question you about your exercise regimes and things like that?

Ms PHILLIPS - No, they haven't with us. We have a 100-metre run and all our dogs go in it twice a day. I invite you all to come down and have a look. These dogs love to run. They compete and they love to run. You just open the gate, throw a fluffy toy and they will go up and down, up and down, up and down and then stand at the gate to go back to their kennel.²¹⁹

6.122 Some industry participants considered the powers of stewards were adequate. The Launceston Greyhound Racing Club commented:

²¹⁹ June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 7-8

Stewards from Racing Services Tasmania (RST) attend all racing meetings which are conducted in Tasmania and the industry is of the view that the Stewards fulfil their obligations satisfactorily.

They ensure that animal welfare standards are maintained – in contrast of course to the situation which exists with respect to domestic owners and breeders of other dogs where there is no opportunity for the imposition of such control.

So far as powers of entry, search, inspection and taking possession are concerned, it is submitted that Rules 18 and 19 of the Greyhound Australasia Rules deal sufficiently with the issue of such regulatory role and indeed provide more than adequately for the upholding of appropriate animal welfare standards and the application of the “Five Freedoms”.²²⁰

- 6.123 Others believed that the stewards needed greater powers. Anthony Bullock commented:

CHAIR - In our work and as a committee, can you advise us on what you think the industry needs to do down here to restore that level of public confidence?

Mr BULLOCK - I think the powers that be need to make the penalties so severe that it is going to be over the top. It needs to be that way. The stewards or the welfare officers now need to have more power.

CHAIR - What sort of powers would you like to see them have?

Mr BULLOCK - I want to see powers where - most people work 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. Most people work Monday to Friday. I think they should be there on a Sunday. I think they should be there - as I say, they ring my place all the time, outside the gate, but I think they need to be there at my place - instead of being there six times a year, I think they need to be there 20 times a year.²²¹

Committee findings:

- 6.124 The Committee notes the powers of animal welfare officers have been extended through recent amendments to the *Animal Welfare Act 1993*.
- 6.125 The Committee heard there is uncertainty concerning the extent of the power of stewards to seize evidence under the Rules of Racing.
- 6.126 The Committee notes the limited powers stewards have to question, obtain evidence or compel unlicensed persons to appear before an inquiry.

²²⁰ Submission 28, Launceston Greyhound Racing Club, p 8.

²²¹ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p. 13.

Recommendation 21: That the Government review the powers of stewards under the Rules of Racing and the *Animal Welfare Act 1993*: to seize evidence; to question and obtain evidence from unlicensed persons; and to compel unlicensed persons to appear before an inquiry.

Regulation of bullrings and private training tracks

- 6.127 A survey undertaken by the Director of Racing has identified 28 bullrings and 31 trial tracks in Tasmania.²²² These 31 trial tracks are effectively private training facilities situated on a trainer's private property and used substantially only by the property owner.²²³
- 6.128 The regulation of bullrings and private training tracks was raised throughout the inquiry, however there is inconsistency in the use of the terms. The Review Report commented:

... The training facility known as a bullring can be used to train a greyhound to chase a lure and has an advantage of mimicking the sound of a mechanical track lure. While bullrings are seen as a possible site where live baiting could occur, they can be used effectively with an artificial lure.

To ensure that bullrings are used in an appropriate manner, it is proposed that consideration is given to construction of bullrings at registered trial tracks so that they can be closely supervised by Tasracing staff or race club officials. A further recommendation later in the Report is that private bullrings are registered and subject to regular inspection by stewards.²²⁴

- 6.129 In addition to requiring bullrings to be registered, the Review Report recommended:

Only permit the use of bullrings by a registered person who is in charge of the property on which the bullring is located and only permit greyhounds trained by that person to utilize the facility.²²⁵

- 6.130 Dr Rod Andrewartha commented on the recommendations of the Review Report:

CHAIR - *One of the recommendations from the RSPCA, that has just given evidence, is that those private training tracks and bullrings should be prohibited. Do you have a comment to make about that?*

Dr ANDREWARTHA - *In our report to the Director of Racing we suggested they need to at least register with Racing Services. But they have got the tracks. In*

²²² Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 39-40

²²³ Correspondence from Tony Murray, dated 10 February 2016.

²²⁴ *Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry: Final Report*, 13 March 2015, p 22.

²²⁵ *Ibid*, p 24.

an ideal world, yes, I think it would be good for the dogs to be taken to a track that was under third party supervision. But some of the trainers that are training now have upwards of 100 dogs. Just the sheer logistics of moving the greyhounds backwards and forwards may make that a difficult exercise. I do not know how often they use the tracks on their properties, but there would need to be a balance between logistics and any extra confidence it would give the public and the industry.

Mr GAFFNEY - What is the main purpose of the bullring?

Dr ANDREWARTHA - A bullring is a circular track with an arm in it. It is a mechanism for training a dog to chase a lure and to jump from the box. It is a very tight circle compared to a racing track. One of the trainers who demonstrated this to us emphasised the sound. It also creates the sound of the lure. A mechanical lure on a racetrack makes quite a loud sound. That as much as anything stimulates the dogs to jump from their boxes.

Mr GAFFNEY - Your recommendation five in the final report is only to permit the use of bullrings by a registered person who is in charge of the property on which the bullring is located, and only to permit greyhounds trained by that person to utilise the facility. If I lived next door and I had a greyhound and the person down the road is a friend of mine and he has a bullring, why would you have that as a recommendation as long as they were not doing anything untoward or illegal?

Dr ANDREWARTHA - It is partly the balance, as I was just saying, between the logistics of it. If you have a trainer who is training 100 dogs and he has a bullring on his property, he can use it. But if the trainer next door wants to load the dogs up to take them there, he could just as easily load them up and take them to an authorised track under supervision.

Ms RATTRAY - He could walk them up the road though.

Dr ANDREWARTHA - He could.

Mr GAFFNEY - I found that an interesting recommendation because there would not be a lot of people in the industry who would have their own bull ring.

Dr ANDREWARTHA - If we look at the circumstances brought up by Four Corners, it was people taking dogs to somebody else's private facility. That was an issue and that is the basis behind that recommendation - so there is no option for that happening.

Mr GAFFNEY - If the bullrings were registered and inspected by greyhound racing authorities there wouldn't be such an issue, would there? Would you still stand by that recommendation?

Dr ANDREWARTHA - Yes, I would. The training tracks that are run by the various clubs - there is always an official there, be it a club official or a Tasracing

*official, attending. If somebody is taking a dog to a track other than their own track for training, it should be under the supervision of a third party.*²²⁶

- 6.131 The Committee heard that facilities such as bullrings have the potential to hide practices such as live baiting.

Emma Haswell commented:

CHAIR - *The review of arrangements for animal welfare in Tasmania says there has been no evidence found, the RSPCA says there has been no evidence found, so is gathering evidence the big difficulty?*

Ms HASWELL - *It was so hard. We have trainers - and I don't know how many - who have their own bullring, which is a corrugated iron ring in the back paddock. It is a fence in a circle and no-one can see inside there and no-one knows what goes on. I would love to ask someone why it has to be a corrugated iron fence, because the obvious answer to me is what animal can climb a corrugated fence. You can throw a possum or a rabbit or a chicken or whatever you want in there and it cannot get out. If it was just greyhounds chasing a lure, why is it always a solid circular fence? Bullrings should be banned. No property that has greyhounds on it should be allowed to have a bullring, because I cannot see why you would have to have that impenetrable barrier.*

CHAIR - *Have you been to a private bullring in Tasmania? Have you see one?*

Ms HASWELL - *I've seen one.*

CHAIR - *Where was that?*

Ms HASWELL - *That one was at Exeter, but they are fairly common. You see them when you look at properties on Google, because you see a big ring, a circular ring, and that is a bullring. For me that is one of the big issues. As long as you allow people to have a bullring they have a very easy place to –*

Mrs RYLAH - *Why would you suggest you can't have a bullring, or is it just that you shouldn't have a bullring that has an impenetrable wall?*

Ms HASWELL - *Impenetrable fence, exactly.*

Mrs RYLAH - *I can see that it could be used as a legitimate training method.*

Ms HASWELL - *Absolutely.*

Mrs RYLAH - *But the transparency of the wall and the ability if there was ever anything in there that you didn't want to have in there perchance or put in there, that it could get out.*

Ms HASWELL - *Exactly.*²²⁷

²²⁶ Dr Rod Andrewartha, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 64-66

6.132 Tony Murray commented:

...It was interesting and surprising because quite often we can go to a property, and we have in the past, and not even know that the bullring was there. It might seem strange for me to be saying that but the locations of the bullrings are far away from where the kennels are, quite in the distance, quite often covered by foliage and the landscape. The number of bullrings existing in Tasmania has been quite surprising.²²⁸

6.133 Dr Kim Barrett commented:

CHAIR - How many bullrings have you seen in Tasmania in your time? How many are you aware that exist here?

Dr BARRETT - I suppose two, which is terrible really; I must have clients with them. I have been to Anthony's place many times but I've never been down to the bullring. I have one other good client and I didn't know he had a bullring. I have been to his place about 100 times over 34 years but didn't realise there was a bullring there, because it's not in your vision.²²⁹

6.134 The Committee heard from industry participants about the location of bullrings. John Newson commented:

Mr VALENTINE - It is about bull rings and tracks, and both of you might want to comment. In terms of where these bull rings or training tracks are, are they out in the scrub - out of sight, out of mind? Are they all close to the premises of the owners?

Mr NEWSON - A lot depends on the size of the property. If you could have a track you would want to keep it away a bit from your main kennelling complex. If you put these dogs on a run, it excites and sets them all off. If they see a dog running over there and they are locked up they think they want to get out and have a go at it too.

Mr VALENTINE - They are a pack animal.

Mr NEWSON - Yes, they are a pack animal.

Mrs RYLAH - They can hear it as well.

Mr NEWSON - They can hear it. They think they should be out there too chasing their bit of some teddy fur.

Mr VALENTINE - So, the ones you know about, would they be further out and out of earshot of where the greyhounds are kept?

Mr NEWSON - Most of these facilities are on five- or 10-acre blocks. That is probably the biggest areas these fellows have.

²²⁷ Emma Haswell, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 15-16

²²⁸ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 39-40

²²⁹ Dr Kim Barrett, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 29-30

Mr VALENTINE - Not on larger holdings?

Mr NEWSON - No, most of them are only five or 10 acres these fellows would have. I would say 10 acres would be around the biggest. Rick Stamford has 20 but they have other boarding kennels. He has a bull ring there but that is right near where he houses all his dogs.

Mr VALENTINE - So that is a different scenario.

Mr NEWSON - I would say most of them are pretty remote. Some of them are away a little bit from their main kennel block because once the dogs can hear this thing going, others barking upsets the whole lot of them.²³⁰

6.135 The Committee heard there is support for private training facilities being registered and subject to random audit.

From a personal perspective John Newson commented:

CHAIR - Does it surprise you that Racing Services Tasmania - because we have had submissions that said there are no private trial tracks in Tasmania, and then RST comes to us and says, 'Well, actually there are 28 bull rings and 31 private trial tracks.'

Mr NEWSON - Yes, but they are people's private properties. By rights they are not open to the public. I, under the rules of racing, can't go and trial my greyhounds on someone's private track. That track has to be registered. That person has to have comprehensive insurance and they have to be registered with Racing Services to operate that as a public trial track. A private trial track here should really only be solely for the use of the person who owns that property.

CHAIR - Do you think those facilities should be registered - the bull rings and the private trial tracks?

Mr NEWSON - I believe that they should be registered. That is my own personal opinion. They should be registered.²³¹

Committee findings:

6.136 The Committee notes evidence that live baiting can occur in private training facilities.

6.137 The Committee notes the intention of the Office of Racing Integrity to have all training facilities registered.²³²

²³⁰ John Newson, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, pp 15-16

²³¹ *Ibid*, p 9

²³² Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 43.

Recommendation 22: That the Office of Racing Integrity progress the registration and unannounced inspections of all private training facilities as a matter of priority.

7 REGULATION AND REFORM IN THE GREYHOUND RACING INDUSTRY

- 7.1 The Tasmanian greyhound industry is regulated by two separate entities. The commercial operation of the industry is managed by Tasracing, while the integrity functions are conducted by the Office of Racing Integrity (formerly Racing Services Tasmania). This Chapter considers how the industry is regulated, both generally and in regard to animal welfare issues. It also discusses potential reforms to improve regulation of the industry.

Regulation of the Greyhound Racing Industry

- 7.2 Tasracing outlined the structure for the regulation of the greyhound industry:

Tasracing is a Tasmanian Government-owned company and the peak industry body governing the three codes of racing (thoroughbred, harness and greyhounds) in Tasmania.

It is the corporate entity that governs the racing industry in the state, providing the strategic direction and funding required to produce quality racing.

Tasracing is responsible for the following specific activities (as defined in the Racing Regulation Act 2004):

- *Provision of stakes*
- *Promoting the development of an efficient and effective horse and greyhound breeding industry*
- *Funding of clubs*
- *Media rights*
- *Management of the racing and training venues*
- *Thoroughbred handicapping*
- *Allocation of race dates and race programming (across three codes)*
- *Industry training*
- *Making rules and policies for governing the racing industry*
- *National representation on peak controlling bodies.*

Separate to Tasracing's operations, Racing Services Tasmania (RST), a division of the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment, is the integrity body for the three codes of racing (thoroughbred, harness and greyhound) in Tasmania.

The general manager of RST is appointed to the statutory role of director. RST is responsible for the following:

- *Provision of integrity services*

- Participant licensing and animal registration
- Harness handicapping and greyhound grading
- Registrations of racing clubs and bookmakers.²³³

7.3 Tasracing as a member of the board of the peak national body Greyhounds Australasia (GA) stated:

...Tasracing is the peak industry body governing the three codes of racing in the state while Racing Services Tasmania (RST), a division of the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment, is the integrity body for the three codes of racing.

The industry operates within a mature regulatory framework that includes legislation, GA national rules, local rules, local policies and local guidelines. Within this structure there is a high degree of coordination across all states to ensure the framework is consistent nationally and is updated continuously as new issues emerge.

Tasracing represents the Tasmanian industry on the board of GA and has representatives on the board's national welfare working party, the national integrity committee and the veterinary and analyst committee.²³⁴

7.4 In relation to the services provided by the Office of Racing Integrity Tony Murray, Director of Racing, advised:

The General Manager RST is appointed to the statutory role of Director of Racing with responsibility for the delivery of integrity functions across the industry, including –

- *Support and provision of advice aimed at ensuring that Government requirements and expectations are met in relation to the regulation and integrity of the racing industry in Tasmania;*
- *Registration of racing clubs;*
- *Operation of the stipendiary stewards' Panel;*
- *Licensing and registration of industry participants and racing animals, pursuant to the Rules of Racing;*
- *Representing the State and the local racing industry on national bodies and in national forums in terms of racing integrity and related matters;*
- *Handicapping for harness racing and grading for greyhound racing;*
- *Registration and regulation of bookmakers and their agents;*
- *Setting of integrity conditions applicable to Tasmanian race field information publication approvals;*
- *Administrative support for the Tasmanian Racing Appeal Board; and*
- *Administration of and monitoring compliance with legislation.*

These integrity functions are delivered by officers of RST, a division of DSG, (Based in Launceston and Hobart, as well as at various racing locations throughout the State) in close consultation with the industry's commercial

²³³ Submission 36, Tasracing, p. 1.

²³⁴ *Ibid*, p 8.

arm, Tasracing Pty Ltd, as well as racing clubs and industry representative bodies.

.....
There are a number of key areas that are considered essential for the delivery of best practice integrity. These include:

- A swabbing regime that promotes drug-free racing and is consistent with contemporary practices;
- The provision of a high-quality, skilled workforce, with particular emphasis on attracting, training and retaining stewards;
- The provision of high-level regulatory controls to ensure that those participating in the industry are fit and proper, and appropriately skilled persons;
- The ability to utilise modern integrity practices, inclusive of human resources and technology;
- The benchmarking of integrity practices and procedures with national and international racing and sports integrity jurisdictions; and
- An effective monitoring regime to ensure industry participants are compliant with the relevant Rules of Racing and policies with respect to animal welfare in the racing industry.

Confidence in racing integrity underpins its health and wellbeing. Key performance indicators such as industry participation and wagering are inextricably linked to the integrity of the industry. It is fair to say that the delivery of integrity to the racing industry, especially in view of the constantly changing wagering landscape nationally and internationally, is more challenging than ever before.²³⁵

7.5 Several submissions made comments about the regulation of the greyhound industry in Tasmania:

- The greyhound racing industry is self-regulated with very little accountability, transparency and responsibility for its actions regarding breeding, training, usage, injuries and discarding of greyhounds. The industry Greyhound Adoption Program is given significant amounts of money but rehomes fewer dogs than volunteer-based charity groups with very limited funding. In essence, the industry does very little to re-home these gentle creatures, leaving many of the unfunded welfare groups to pick up the pieces.²³⁶
- Increased resourcing to enable more rigorous operation of the independent government body/s responsible for overseeing the industry, animal welfare standards, compliance and data collection.²³⁷
- The current structure where integrity and commercial functions are separate must be maintained to avoid a conflict of interest.²³⁸

²³⁵ Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, pp 4-5.

²³⁶ Submission 3, Animal Justice Party, p 6.

²³⁷ Submission 4, Animal Welfare League Australia, p 3.

- The role of regulatory authorities should be in upholding animal welfare standards in the industry and encouraging best practice.²³⁹

Regulation of Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry

- 7.6 The Committee notes that animal welfare issues in the Tasmanian greyhound industry are regulated in accordance with legislative provisions, the rules of racing and policies of regulatory bodies.

The Review Report noted that:

*Tasmania has a body of animal welfare and control legislation comparable to its mainland counterparts, which is regularly updated and developed.*²⁴⁰

- 7.7 The following table summarises the various legislation, rules and policies:

Legislation	<i>Animal Welfare Act 1993</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Act to prevent neglect of, and cruelty to, animals, and to ensure the welfare of animals. • Administered by Biosecurity Tasmania, a division of the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment (DPIPWE). • Provides for the appointment of officers to protect and secure the welfare of animals; to advise and instruct persons with the care and charge of animals; and to investigate breaches of the legislation and take appropriate action. • It is the enabling legislation for Tasmania’s animal welfare guidelines and standards.
	<i>Animal Welfare Guidelines</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory documents approved by the Minister under the Animal Welfare Act for the education and guidance of persons involved in the care and management of animals.

²³⁸ Submission 8, Paul Whitmore, p. 1.

²³⁹ Submission 12, Lena Bodin, p. 1.

²⁴⁰ *Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry: Final Report*, 13 March 2015, p. 30.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance to the Courts regarding what constitutes acceptable care of animals.
	<i>Animal Welfare Standards</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legally binding and enforceable. • Contain specific requirements for particular species or circumstances. • The Minister has approved standards and guidelines for dogs and regulations are being drafted. The standards for dogs apply to greyhounds. However, greyhounds registered with Tasracing are exempt from additional standards for kennels and breeders.
	<i>Dog Control Act 2000</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for the control and management of dogs. • It covers issues such as microchipping, general dog control issues, dangerous dogs, restricted breeds and de-sexing. • Administered by the Local Government division of the Department of Premier and Cabinet.
	<i>Racing Regulation Act 2004</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for the better regulation of thoroughbred, harness and greyhound racing. • The Office of Racing Integrity (formerly Racing Services Tasmania) is responsible for the administration of the Act. • Provides for the appointment of the Director of Racing to regulate and control racing to ensure it is conducted with integrity. • Details the general functions and powers of Tasracing.
Rules of Racing	<i>Greyhound Australasia Rules</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Rules of Racing under the control of the peak national body and adopted by the respective jurisdictional controlling authorities (i.e. Tasracing in Tasmania). • Establish a framework to ensure compliance with industry animal welfare standards.
	<i>Tasmanian</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Made by, and directly under the

	<i>Greyhound Local Rules of Racing</i>	<p>control of Tasracing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Rules override the national rules if there is any conflict. • Rules enforced by the Office of Racing Integrity.
Welfare related publications	<i>Greyhound Policy Manual</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encompasses all policies of Tasracing, the Office of Racing Integrity and Greyhounds Australasia.
	<i>Greyhound Animal Welfare Manual</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sets out the various roles and responsibilities and obligations of industry regulators and participants.
	<i>Management & Care for each Stage in the Lifecycle of a Greyhound</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepared by Tasracing. • Covers such matters as care of greyhounds; record keeping; staff involved in the care of greyhounds; and stages in the lifecycle of a greyhound, from conception through to retirement from racing.
	<i>Recommended standards for the Care of Greyhounds</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepared by Tasracing. • Details the recommended minimum standard requirements for the permanent kennelling and housing of greyhounds.
	<i>Information for anyone interested in breeding a litter of Greyhounds</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopted by Racing Services Tasmania (now the Office of Racing Integrity); • Billed as a ‘breeder’s education package’ covers subjects such as getting started; the pregnancy; whelping the litter; and raising the litter.²⁴¹

7.8 Biosecurity Tasmania is the area within the Tasmanian Government responsible for the management of the *Animal Welfare Act 1993*. Administration of the Act is done through the Animal Biosecurity and Welfare Branch which is managed by the CVO. Compliance activities are undertaken by officers appointed under the Act which includes staff within Biosecurity Tasmania and also RSPCA inspectors:

The overall role of animal welfare is to ensure that where people use or interact with animals, this is done in a humane manner that does not result in unreasonable or unnecessary pain or suffering. This role accepts that animals

²⁴¹ *Ibid*, pp. 30-34.

*are killed for human purposes or to prevent overpopulation but requires that those animals are killed in a humane manner.*²⁴²

- 7.9 The Committee notes that from 1 July 2015, Racing Services Tasmania was rebadged the Office of Racing Integrity and was transferred from the Department of State Growth to the Department of Primary Industry, Parks, Water and the Environment (DPIPWE).

Tony Murray noted that this was a positive move:

On 25 March 2015, the Minister for Racing announced that RST would transfer from DSG to DPIPWE on 1 July 2015. The existing biosecurity and animal welfare capabilities that exist within DPIPWE align well with RST's responsibility to ensure the industry is safe, fair and credible.

*RST, as the racing regulatory body, will be able to leverage off the animal welfare and veterinary skills available within DPIPWE to achieve better animal welfare and integrity outcomes.*²⁴³

- 7.10 In relation to welfare strategies, Greyhounds Australasia (GA), the peak national industry body noted:

The Australasian greyhound industry has been focused on greyhound welfare since the establishment, in 1996, of the first industry funded greyhound adoption program in Victoria. National standards of care are considered some of the best in the world and reflect state and local government laws and regulations.

Since 1975, the number of greyhound litters whelped for racing has declined by over 50 per cent and by over 11 per cent since 2000. Despite that progress, GA accepts that there are far too many greyhounds being euthanased unnecessarily and that a significant contribution to this problem is that there are many more greyhounds being bred than are required to fill current race meeting requirements.

The industry is extremely aware that the welfare of its racing animals, before, during and after their racing careers, is of paramount importance. In May 2014, the GA Board endorsed the National Greyhound Welfare Strategy. In an historic moment, representatives from all Australian states and territories, including Tasracing, agreed on uniform standards of care, education, accountability and enforcement to ensure the best possible outcome for greyhounds at every stage of their lifecycle. The strategy is one year into its three year implementation.

Specifically, the strategy will result in:

- *Higher levels of education for trainers and breeders including a requirement for all new participants to be assessed on core competencies before obtaining or upgrading a licence;*

²⁴² Submission 1, Biosecurity Tasmania, p. 1.

²⁴³ Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, p. 10.

- Tighter controls over breeding regulation and the promotion of more responsible breeding practices;
- A requirement that all greyhounds are to be under the care of a registered participant at all times during their lifecycle, unless retired as a pet;
- Improved inspection and compliance requirements on all greyhound properties;
- A star rating system for all greyhound facilities at which greyhounds are housed during their lifecycle;
- A tiered system of trainer licence types which will stipulate how many greyhounds a trainer can train;
- Ongoing enhancements to each state's Greyhound Adoption Programs to maximise the re-homing opportunities of all retired greyhounds;
- New measures to maximise racing opportunities and ensure all greyhounds have the ability to reach their true potential.

Within the first nine months of implementation, agreement had been reached on improved greyhound vaccination and breeding controls with new national rules ready for introduction on 1 July 2015. In addition, trainer education content has been drafted, new trainer licence categories approved and preparations for licensing all owners, breeders, whelpers, rearers, breakers and educators are well advanced.²⁴⁴

- 7.11 This national approach to welfare policies is supplemented in a local context through policies and strategies of Tasracing. In its submission Tasracing commented:

Tasracing's strict animal welfare policies ensure the welfare of greyhounds (and all animals) are protected at all times when racing and training. At a national level, GA acknowledges that the greyhound racing industry is responsible for the welfare of all racing greyhounds in Australasia.

GA and its members across Australia are committed to improving the welfare of greyhounds and reducing the incidence of euthanasia by building on the significant advancements that all parties have already made. These include:

- *The introduction of mandatory micro-chipping that improves industry integrity, and facilitates more accurate tracking of individual greyhounds throughout their lifecycle.*
- *The strengthening of Greyhound Racing Rules to ensure owners are required to notify their Controlling Body when a greyhound has been retired from racing.*
- *The establishment of a dedicated GA Welfare committee which is tasked with the development, implementation and monitoring of national welfare initiatives and setting of industry benchmarks.*
- *The introduction of export guidelines that ensures Australasian greyhounds can only be exported to countries that have a standard of care and accountability comparable to that here in Australia.*
- *Reducing injury risks for racing greyhounds by prioritising capital works at racetracks.*

²⁴⁴ Submission 37, Greyhounds Australasia, p 4.

- Increasing the number of kennel inspections and penalising participants for non-compliance.
- The development in each state of a dedicated and industry resourced re-homing program for greyhounds that are no longer suited to racing.

GA and its members are now working together to ensure the welfare of greyhounds meets best practice and to reduce the incidence of euthanasia. All parties are committed to:

- Reducing the number of greyhounds bred through the expansion of responsible breeding strategies and education initiatives.
- Improved tracking mechanisms and data collection throughout the life of a greyhound to enable monitoring of both participants and greyhounds.
- Continued development of mandatory education and licensing across the racing sector.
- Mandatory education competencies linked to licensing for greyhound breeders including hobby and commercial operations.
- Licensing of participants involved in the rearing, educating and pre training of greyhounds.
- A consistent approach to the provision of veterinary services and injury reporting at race meetings to assist in development of minimum standards for track preparation and the monitoring of injury trends.
- Increased investment in greyhound adoption or re-homing programmes and the promotion of the breed outside of racing.
- Through a combined, dedicated and coordinated approach, GA and its members are committed to constant improvement in regards to the welfare outcomes for all racing greyhounds.²⁴⁵

7.12 Tasmania is a signatory to the National Greyhound Welfare Strategy. Tasracing noted:

For the past eight months (it is important to reflect on the fact that this work commenced well before the ABC's 4 Corners program was broadcast) Tasmania and all states and territories had placed a heightened focus on welfare issues and had approved a national greyhound welfare strategy to enhance animal welfare outcomes.

The three-year national strategy has strict new directives in relation to breeding, enhanced licensing standards and stronger welfare requirements for vaccination and housing.

Tasmania is a signatory to this agreement that specifically covers:

- Improving accountability for welfare outcomes.
- Reducing unsuitable breeding practices (reducing the number of pups whelped that are unlikely to make it to the track – no more than three per breeding female.)
- Not using a breeding female over the age of eight.
- Not using a breeding female three seasons in succession.

²⁴⁵ Submission 36, Tasracing, pp 9-10.

- Increasing racing opportunities for older and slower greyhounds.
- Restructuring trainer licensing to have national standards and similar education qualifications.
- Introduction of formal training qualifications through TAFE and other Registered Training Organisations (RTOs).
- Ensuring all facilities housing greyhounds meet best practice.
- Improving awareness of adoption program post-racing among industry participants and the community.

In addition to this, Tasmania has been proactive in this space for a number of years and has introduced various initiatives to enhance animal welfare outcomes including the publication, in cooperation with RST, of a comprehensive Greyhound Animal Welfare Manual.

Tasracing understands it is the first greyhound authority in Australia to produce an Animal Welfare Manual. It was first published in November 2012 and ensures that Tasmania is at the forefront of driving best practice. Importantly, the manual is regularly reviewed to ensure it remains consistent with current best practices.

Tasracing understands that RST scrutiny of participants in relation to greyhound welfare, care and control, includes:

- Drug tests at every race meeting.
- Regular inspections of greyhound kennels by stewards.
- The appointment of a compliance officer who has a strong background in animal welfare (previously employed by RSPCA as an investigator).²⁴⁶

7.13 Greyhounds Australasia reinforced Tasracing's commitment to national regulatory uniformity:

Tasracing's greyhound racing model operates quite differently from other racing jurisdictions and together with its small size, offers a unique point of view on important matters of debate within GA. With training and venues supervised by Tasracing staff or club officials, it is able to offer an educated and consistent external perspective on industry challenges while always appreciating that other jurisdictions may face significantly greater complexity in overcoming those same challenges.

The Australasian greyhound racing industry operates without borders such that a greyhound can be racing in one jurisdiction one week and another jurisdiction the next. The confidence and trust in racing authorities is optimised by participants relying on one set of rules wherever possible.

Tasracing understands the importance of generating participant support to achieve industry alignment with change including national greyhound racing rule uniformity. The Tasracing participant consultation model is one of the best in Australia and discussions within it are routinely referred to by Tasracing

²⁴⁶ *Ibid*, pp 10-11

representatives in GA forums and seen as a valuable guide to likely participant reaction to proposed change.

Tasracing always seeks to cooperate with other GA members in articulating the industry's welfare and integrity challenges and finding solutions that seek to benefit all participants, not just Tasmanian participants.

GA appreciates that Tasracing relies on the provision of resources from Racing Services Tasmania to commit to nationally consistent rules, policies and strategies and the task of negotiating the necessary outcomes with that body to enable Tasmanian greyhound racing to benefit from its controlling body's participation in the national debate on significant matters.²⁴⁷

7.14 Dr Eliot Forbes commented:

CHAIR - *I note in the submission that Tasracing talks about not having responsibility for animal welfare in Tasmania and that that is the responsibility of Racing Services Tasmania, but given that Tasracing sets the rules, do you agree that while it doesn't have the integrity oversight role and doesn't include the stewards, it does have animal welfare obligations because of the kind of work you are in, but also under the Animal Welfare Act?*

Dr FORBES - *Absolutely. We don't claim that we don't have responsibility for animal welfare. I think the fact that we have an animal welfare manual which is included in the appendix illustrates that, in addition to the rules, some of which are local but the majority of our rules are national, there is a whole framework of policies and guidelines that sit behind and fortify the rules with a particular focus on animal welfare.*

CHAIR - *In the opening of your submission, in the preamble, you talk about Tasracing being responsible for the following specific activities: provision of stakes; promoting and development of the industry; funding of clubs; media rights; management of the racing and training venues; thoroughbred handicapping; allocation of race dates and programming; industry training; making rules and policies, and national representation on peak controlling bodies. There is no mention of animal welfare responsibilities within that framework you have set out, or a corporate duty of care to be part of upholding animal welfare standards in Tasmania.*

Dr FORBES - *That is an extract and a paraphrasing from the legislation, in which the subsections go up to (u), and I am not sure it specifically references welfare in relation to RST because welfare is overlaid across both organisations. Within our own corporate plan we reference welfare multiple times because it is inherent to our responsibilities in operating any type of animal sport.²⁴⁸*

7.15 In its submission to the inquiry, the Launceston Greyhound Racing Club commented:

²⁴⁷ Submission 37, Greyhounds Australasia, p 8.

²⁴⁸ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 27-28

The organisation Greyhounds Australasia comprises representatives from jurisdictional controlling bodies in the Australian States and Territories, and New Zealand.

The Greyhound Australasia Rules are the National Rules of Racing under the control of that peak body and are adopted by the respective controlling bodies. In Tasmania, that authority is Tasracing.

At page 23 of the Report there is a reference to the Greyhound Animal Welfare Policy. One wonders whether there is a case here of too many cooks! Over governance often leads to confusion and uncertainty and particularly so where, as here for example, local Rules made by Tasracing can override the National Rules. This is referred to in the Report at page 32 as:

“inhibiting a coordinated and harmonised National approach to key issues such as animal welfare”...

Whatever that means!²⁴⁹

7.16 The Review Report recommended:

*A review of the interaction between national and local rules be undertaken, noting that national rules should prevail over any local rules and that a harmonized national approach should be adopted.*²⁵⁰

7.17 Tony Murray elaborated:

CHAIR - Tony, the conflict at times between the national rules and the local rules. Did you want to talk about that? It has come to evidence before the committee that national rules can be set and if the industry, if Tasracing, wants to get around some provision in the national rules, they will write local rules that potentially weaken animal welfare protections.

Mr MURRAY - Addressing the latter first, I have not seen any evidence of Tasracing weakening welfare. They have been quite proactive with that. Going back to the national rules versus local rules. As you know, we regulate thoroughbred, harness, and greyhounds. With thoroughbreds and harness, the national rules prevail over local rules. There is a spirit of cooperation at the national level for people to agree to national rules, even if some individual states may, at times, not agree to something. Even as late as last night - I am on the National Harness Rules Committee and we had a two-hour meeting to finalise some changes to Harness National Rules. It came to our attention that, on some of the rules, a particular state may oppose what was being put forward, but they were agreed to and will go to the AGM of Harness Racing Australia next month. I am sure they will be agreed to, and will become national rules that everyone enforces. That is the way it should work.

²⁴⁹ Submission 28, Launceston Greyhound Racing Club, p. 2.

²⁵⁰ Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry: Final Report, 13 March 2015, p 35

Then we move to greyhound racing. Greyhound racing, for whatever reason, has never been able to agree that the national rules should prevail and there should be a national approach. You make your national rules; however, states identify their individual circumstances and are able to make local rules. Where there is a conflict with the local rules and the national rules, the local rules prevail.

Mrs RYLAH - What is the stumbling block?

Mr MURRAY - It is probably the states taking an approach on a national level that they will accept that national rules need to be made. They will accept them, but at times, they may not necessarily agree with the final determination of the national rules. One of the real impediments to the industry moving forward is that they have to take a national approach on these things, and they have to be strong. There has been movement since February. I have sensed greater cooperation between the states in wanting to take the national approach to it.

Even when they have brought in some policies about restricting breeding, there is some variance in how they will apply that within the states. I do not understand why they cannot - especially in view of the fact that their whole industry is under threat and it continues to be under threat. One only has to look at some of the issues raised at the New South Wales inquiry. The counsel assisting the commissioner has basically put the industry on notice that we may or may not have a greyhound industry, or recommendations of a continuation of the greyhound industry. One would have thought that the industry, faced with its future being at risk, would get together and say, 'Enough is enough. We need to adopt a national approach.'²⁵¹

7.18 Dr Forbes commented:

CHAIR - Dr Forbes, you talked earlier about some national rules that have been prepared and set by Greyhounds Australasia following the Four Corners program on live baiting. Can you provide some more detail on those rules as they relate specifically to the issue of live baiting? Then can you tell the committee whether the state has adopted those national rules as they are, or will they be rewriting a set of local rules?

Dr FORBES - I will answer the second question first. We adopt the national rules as they are.

CHAIR - On the live baiting rules?

Dr FORBES - Yes. Where there are national rules for most matters, they are adopted in their whole form.²⁵²

7.19 Dr Forbes also commented that there had never been an issue of conflict between national and local rules:

²⁵¹ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 20 November 2015, pp 16-17.

²⁵² Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 30 November 2015, p 10.

In our letter we stated there is no difference between the three racing codes in relation to whether the local or national rules take precedence. The way that the legislation is written is that Tasracing makes or sets the rules of racing. If it is a local rule, we will write it, and if it is a national rule, we still need to approve it locally for it to be effective locally. It is possible that you could take a national rule and not approve it. However, we have never done that, so whether it takes precedence or not is actually a moot point. If you didn't want a rule for any particular reason from the national table you wouldn't write a rule that would override it. You would simply just not approve it. It's a bit of a moot point.²⁵³

- 7.20 A concern raised by Tony Murray is the Office of Racing Integrity not having direct input into the national body and the development of policies and rules for the industry:

Mr MURRAY - One of the issues I see and that has been identified with the greyhound issues is that the national body, Greyhounds Australasia, is now making a whole range of decisions about rules and policies. Tasracing is on Greyhounds Australasia, but we are not. There is a requirement that –

Ms COURTNEY - You find out second-hand.

Mr MURRAY - Yes. There is a requirement that Tasracing seeks my recommendations on any rule changes, but often it can come further down the line. If we were involved in the discussions at the national level, we could value-add it. At the moment we rely on them to provide us with information about what has been discussed. If we have an issue, we rely on them to take it back to the national body.

Our main mechanism is the chairman of stewards conference. There is an integrity group and the chairman of stewards is in there, but the decisions are made at the Greyhounds Australasia board meeting. Harness Racing Australia long ago recognised the separation of commercial and integrity in Tasmania. They allow a board member from each body, whereas Greyhounds Australasia just has one board member. At the moment it is Tasracing.

Mr BACON - Have you sought to change that or asked for a seat at the table?

Mr MURRAY - Prior to the implementation of Tasracing or in the early days, I was an alternative director. They had a director and I was the alternative director. They formed the view and said they believed that they should have both the director and the alternative director.

Mr BACON - Tasracing or greyhound racing?

Mr MURRAY - Tasracing. In the spirit of cooperation I was willing to agree to that on the basis that the communication was there. I think what has happened nationally with greyhound racing would suggest that maybe there needs to be greater involvement of the regulator. It is important we

²⁵³ *Ibid*, p 15

*understand that with other jurisdictions likely to have separate integrity bodies as we move forward, the national bodies are going to have to address this. Even the thoroughbreds are going to have to address this at some stage. I do not think we need to promote any changes at this stage because I think they will be brought upon the national bodies.*²⁵⁴

7.21 Dr Forbes advised the Committee:

Tasracing has legislative responsibility to set local rules and adopt national rules, as set out in s.11(k) of the Racing Regulation Act 2004 (Tas)(Act).

In terms of practice, the Tasracing Board approves local rules, and the adoption of national rules. It delegates responsibility to the Racing Rules & Policy Subcommittee (RR&P Committee), a Subcommittee of the Board. This Committee operates under a governance framework, with minutes and papers provided to the Tasracing Board for noting.

The RR&P Committee meets quarterly, in addition to special meetings when necessary. New or amended national and local rules are on occasions approved via an out-of-sessions paper.

The members of the RR&P Committee (for 2016) include the Chairman of Tasracing and two other Board members, Tasracing's CEO, CFO and Racing Manager attend meetings in an advisory, non-voting capacity. The Director of Racing also attends in a non-voting capacity, representing the Office of Racing Integrity.

*The presence of the Director of Racing ensures Tasracing is compliant with s.11(k) of the Act, which provides that Tasracing have regard to the recommendations of the Director, when making the "Rules of Racing".*²⁵⁵

7.22 Dr Forbes further commented:

*... where in the legislation we are required to make the rules with regard to the recommendations of the Director of Racing, the Director sits as an observer on the board's subcommittee so that he is across all matters of changes that relate to racing rules and policy.*²⁵⁶

Committee findings:

- 7.23 The Committee finds the separation of commercial and integrity functions, as exists within the Tasmanian industry, provides greater scope for improved animal welfare outcomes.
- 7.24 The Committee finds this separation currently limits the capacity of the integrity body to influence changes to the Rules of Racing, particularly at a National Level.

²⁵⁴ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 52-3

²⁵⁵ Correspondence received from Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO of Tasracing, dated 27 November 2015.

²⁵⁶ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 35-6.

- 7.25 The Committee finds the multiple layers of regulation, rules and policies is confusing, leads to uncertainty and causes tension within the industry.
- 7.26 The Committee notes that Tasracing has implemented some regulatory welfare reforms for the industry.
- 7.27 The Committee considers that the community acceptance and/or future of greyhound racing in Australia rests upon Greyhounds Australasia and authorities prioritising animal welfare in the rules, policies and practices of racing.

Recommendation 23: That the Government require Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity to reach an agreed position on rules affecting animal welfare standards. This position be presented to Greyhounds Australasia with the aim of achieving best practice in animal welfare through consistent application and improvement of national standards.

Recommendation 24: That the Government advocate for the Board of Greyhounds Australasia to be expanded to have Tasmania's separate integrity and commercial bodies equally represented on the board.

8 INDUSTRY FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

- 8.1 The terms of reference for the inquiry provide for the Committee to consider the level of State Government funding provided to the industry in Tasmania in the form of a 20 year funding deed signed in 2009. Accordingly, this chapter considers the funding agreement and concerns about the level of disparity between the racing codes. It also considers the economic impact of the industry on the Tasmanian economy, whether government subsidies are appropriate and the financial sustainability of the industry.

Sustainability

- 8.2 Tasracing noted the current funding arrangement in its submission to the inquiry:

Tasracing is funded through a \$27 million annual funding deed over 20-years. This funding arrangement was necessary as the industry has been traditionally funded from revenue from TOTE Tasmania (which was sold to the Tattersall's Group by the previous state government).

Importantly, the government of the day chose not to introduce product feed or other commercial arrangements linking the racing industry to Tattersall's unlike other states. In most states, those commercial links provide the majority of industry funding.

The funding deed provides Tasracing with its major revenue source. The balance is provided by sponsorship and other income (for example, racefield fees which is income payable to Tasracing by national wagering operators).²⁵⁷

- 8.3 In evidence before the Committee, Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO of Tasracing, commented on the financial pressure on Tasracing under the arrangement:

...The funding for Tasracing is governed by the funding deed which was put in place in 2009. It was at \$27 million at that stage and indexed at CPI minus 1 per cent. The funding deed requires Tasracing to maintain prize money, which is the main funding for the industry in real terms. Where our own funding goes down at CPI less one –

Mrs RYLAH - *How can you do it in real terms if you are minus 1 per cent for a kick-off?*

Dr FORBES - *That is our challenge. That is what has led to some of the financial pressure on Tasracing.*

²⁵⁷ Submission 36, Tasracing, p 13.

.....
Dr FORBES - We maintain stakes in real terms. We have done so since our inception in 2009. As you can imagine, it is a challenge to take that funding and share it amongst the three codes of racing in a manner which is both fair and equitable and incentivises those codes of racing to perform in a commercial manner. We have in place what we call a 'code allocation model'. That model was approved by the board last year. It was put in place for three years. What that model did at that stage was that it took the funding of last year and said that no code will go backwards in their funding, so we will maintain that. That way we will protect and preserve the economic contribution of each code of racing at that stage. Then moving forward, we take the increment, which is the CPI component, and we divided that according to a fixed basis and also a variable component, which is related to four KPIs. Those KPIs relate to wagering turnovers, the number of starters and I think the average starters per race. They are actually competing against themselves, their own performance from the year prior, rather than competing between codes. They have all got very different drivers. They have got different positioning on Sky. They have got different commercial opportunity. This provided approximately a CPI increase for each code last year. That was the model that was approved for three years.

Mrs RYLAH - Is that CPI minus 1 or is it CPI?

Dr FORBES - We are obliged to provide CPI to the industry.

Mr BACON - Is that in total what it has got to go up by CPI? But the way you divide it does not have to go up for each code by CPI. Is that –

Dr FORBES - That is correct. The funding deed doesn't direct us at the code level. However, the outcome of this code allocation model sum last year was that each code got effectively a CPI increase.

CHAIR - How much went to the greyhound racing industry of the total allocation to Tasracing?

Dr FORBES - The prize money and industry funding component is approximately \$21 million. The greyhound stakes money is about four and a half million; the harness is about six, and the thoroughbred is about \$11 million.

CHAIR - So the committee can be really clear about how the dollars move here, the greyhound racing component of Tasracing's funding is \$4.5 million in total, or are there other administrative costs or programs that are funded out of that pool as well?

Dr FORBES - I am only talking about the prize money. In terms of our allocation of nearly \$30 million last year, the balance of that we used to administer the industry. We provide for and run every training and racing venue right across the whole state, and that is probably the next most significant cost and the

labour associated with doing so. A big proportion of that is aligned to each code on a proportional basis to prepare their infrastructure.²⁵⁸

8.4 Dr Forbes also commented on the expenditure and liabilities of Tasracing noting:

CHAIR - What percentage is administrative costs and what are maintenance costs of Tasracing's funding? There is the administration of Tasracing and the codes and then there is the maintenance of facilities.

Dr FORBES - You can look at our annual report. It is fairly plain what is in the documents and it gives you an overview of our expenditure and movement. Last year prize money and industry funding - there is an industry funding component on top of the prize money, and that relates predominantly to funding for the clubs - was \$23.1 million; race day and racing expenses - the operations of the race day - were \$5.35 million. Last year there was a depreciation expense of \$3.6 million.

CHAIR - Is that depreciation on assets owned by Tasracing?

Dr FORBES - Yes, because we have long leaseholds the assets are recognised on our balance sheet and we depreciate them.

Mrs RYLAH - So you are putting that \$3.6 million into a fund?

Dr FORBES - No, that is depreciation.

CHAIR - So that is a write-off.

Mrs RYLAH - I know it's a write-off, but you are distributing \$23.1 million here. I thought you were describing \$23.1 million as the amount of cash you have that is distributed.

Dr FORBES - I am reading through the expense line because you asked how Tasracing spent its money. You are referring to capital expenditure, which is recognised on the balance sheet.

CHAIR - What is the maintenance cost?

Mrs RYLAH - You said 'depreciation'. Depreciation is on an asset, it is a write-back for tax purposes.

Dr FORBES - It is an expense item on the P&L statement.

Mrs RYLAH - Where is the cash going? You are saying you have \$23.1 million - it is a non-cash item.

²⁵⁸ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 37-38

Dr FORBES - It is a non-cash item but it is an expense item on the profit and loss. The employees were \$5.6 million, finance and leasing costs were \$1.1 million, and other expenses were \$1.3 million. Our total expenses last year were \$40.9 million.

CHAIR - Where does the gap between the \$32 million in state funding and the other \$8 million come in? Is that in licence fees and that sort of payment?

Dr FORBES - Yes, that is very important. The bulk of that comes from our racefield fees. That is the commercial mechanism by which we earn a percentage from every bet that is wagered in Australia. Our racing revenue was \$9 million last year, our government grant was \$30.1 million, interest revenue was about \$680 000, and last year we had to recognise an impairment reversal of about \$1 million.

CHAIR - What is the capex spending on maintenance?

Dr FORBES - Last year it was \$634 000.

CHAIR - What would that have been spent on?

Dr FORBES - Capital expenditure projects. We have a strategic asset management system that identifies every asset across the state for which we are responsible. We condition-score those assets and if they are fit for purposes they are 3, 4 or 5; if they are breaking or need to be replaced there is condition 1 or 2. That guides our budgeting process. If it is a condition 1 or 2, that is what this money is directed towards. The Auditor-General has already identified in previous years that there is an investment gap between our capex spend and our depreciation write-off. That is at the heart of our industry funding sustainability challenge, which we document very plainly in our annual report and we dissect that out at the end of my CEO report explaining the funding gap in the business model of Tasracing.

Mr VALENTINE - Presumably there are those occasions where infrastructure might fail and you have to come in and fix it straight away, as opposed to having it on a program. You must have funds set aside for that.

Dr FORBES - The job of managing the business is that we have to keep cash reserves to account for risks, one of which is infrastructure risk. Our biggest risk that we carry as an organisation is from workers compensation obligations for jockeys.²⁵⁹

- 8.5 In its submission, Tasracing acknowledged that efficiencies need to be found in its administrative functions to ensure that it is able to maintain its operations and the required prize money:

Effective 1 August 2015, all greyhound stakes will be paid to recipients by direct deposit rather than cash.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid*, pp 38-41.

Tasracing provides monies to the host club which then has responsibility for distributing the prize money. The current practice is for all stakes under \$1750 to be paid by the clubs in cash. Amounts greater than \$1750 are paid by the clubs by cheque.

The new direct deposit system will bring Tasmanian greyhounds in line with both the other Tasmanian codes and other national greyhound jurisdictions.

Tasracing, since its inception, has been constantly looking to streamline administrative functions after assimilating the operational functions of four different administrative entities.

This has included reducing costs, streamlining processes and improving accountability and governance mechanisms.

When electronic stakes payments begins in August 2015, it will mark the conclusion of a phased stakes payment project that began some time ago (in preparing for the greyhound phase, policy changes and process improvements began 18-months ago).

The project involved liaising and working with RST and the software developers for the national OzChase system.

The new approach will have the benefit of streamlined payments and improved work health safety outcomes.²⁶⁰

8.6 In relation to the funding split between the codes Dr Forbes commented:

Ms RATTRAY - *Can I take you back to the split for the codes and the 19 per cent or thereabouts, I think that has been the figures the greyhounds receive, and you talked about incentivising the codes. My understanding is that last year the greyhound turnover increased by 14 per cent and is on track for 10 per cent this year. If the code continues to get the same amount each year, where is the incentive for that code to do more, particularly when there is this expectation that they need to look after the welfare of the animals? Where is there incentive in that split?*

Dr FORBES - *That goes right to the heart of one of our biggest challenges, which is dividing up the money. As you can imagine, as we allocate the money across three codes of racing, everybody feels they need some more. You go back to the principles of why we are in this industry and what we are doing. We have demonstrated in our economic impact study that the racing industry provides \$103 million of gross value-add to the Tasmanian economy –*

Ms RATTRAY - *Yes, and 998 FTE employment and household income. They are significant figures, we have those and we have seen them for years. My question is, how do we encourage this code, which has animal welfare concerns on their agenda, but they are still not being rewarded for effort?*

²⁶⁰ Submission 36, Tasracing, p 16.

Dr FORBES - The point I was trying to make is that there is an equally strong lobby across the industry that they need to be recognised for the economic contribution they make and that is not always aligned with the financial return they make. It is a balance between the jobs and the economic contribution they make and their commercial return. The first code allocation model that Tasracing put in place four years ago was much more strongly aligned to performance and that resulted in a redistribution of the funding from the other two codes of racing to the greyhound code, so they received an extra \$425 000.

Ms RATTRAY - But they were starting on a pretty low base, with all due respect.

Dr FORBES - That is why the board at the time recognised their performance and increased their funding by nearly half a million dollars. In terms of the obligations of animal welfare, it goes to the heart of responsible dog ownership. If somebody is taking on a racing animal they must be prepared to look after it and they cannot use an excuse that they do not have enough money to do so because they are knowingly taking on that obligation.²⁶¹

8.7 Dr Eliot Forbes acknowledged that Tasracing had some challenges:

Ms RATTRAY - Dr Forbes, a lot of the issues that we have heard over the last day and then again from you today about the challenges in the industry, I feel sure would be in a racing review report that is sitting on a minister's desk. Were you expecting that review to become public so that we could have a broader conversation as a Tasmanian community about what is in it? Or did you think it was going to sit and be unavailable to anybody, least of all the codes?

Dr FORBES - Are you talking in a financial context?

Ms RATTRAY - In anything. We are talking about the future of racing, and greyhound racing is one of those three key planks that hold the racing industry together in Tasmania. Would you expect that that would have been available, or did you think that you were providing input into that and it was going to sit?

Dr FORBES - We have been working very closely with the shareholder ministers towards addressing a whole range of issues. The key amongst them is that sustainability challenge which I outlined.

Ms RATTRAY - So you have seen the report?

Dr FORBES - No I have not seen the report. However, the issues of sustainability for Tasracing are no secret and we have been open and transparent about those for about four years.

Ms RATTRAY - Wouldn't you expect that there are some elements in that review - given that they had had key stakeholder input - that maybe useful for

²⁶¹ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 40-41

the future of Tasracing and the whole of the industry that we need to have a discussion about?

Dr FORBES - It is clearly a matter for the Racing minister.

Ms RATTRAY - But isn't it your concern as the head of Tasracing as well?

Dr FORBES - Absolutely, and that is why we were so plain and transparent in our annual report, dissecting the noise out from the finances in relation to asset impairment and reversal. We put it in a table to show the underlying loss of Tasracing and the fact that we are exposed to risks. We are committed to fixing this and that is why we have spent considerable time and resources working with the shareholding ministers to find a solution.

Mr BACON - You said you had not seen the report, but has the minister discussed any of the recommendations with you in terms of changes to the Tasracing business model that have been suggested in the report? Or has he not discussed the report with you at all?

Dr FORBES - We have had ongoing dialogue with the minister on a regular basis and we are very keen to find a solution to address this problem. As an industry, we need to move on from the challenges in relation to funding and move into a phase of investment and growth; that is where we need to be.

Mr BACON - The biggest issue I suppose is that the funding is CPI minus one. The stakes money is just CPI. That creates an ever-growing issue for the organisation.

Dr FORBES - There is that, and in the initial funding for Tasracing in 2009 there was a funding gap of \$4 million. There was a gap at the start and we engaged with the then government at that stage identifying that and saying that that wasn't going to work. Then, as you quite rightly point out, the gap is widening on an annual basis due to this funding obligation. To date, Tasracing has soaked up all of those losses on behalf of industry because industry has always had a CPI applied to their funding.

Mr BACON - When does that capacity for Tasracing to be able to cover that gap run out?

Dr FORBES - It is very much dependent upon the risks that materialise. As I mentioned before, the biggest risk we face is in relation to workers' compensation in terms of a cash outflow. We would like to think that we could have zero injuries for jockeys, but we could have two in a day. It is a fairly random-type factor. It is hard to put a time line on it; however, we do have cash reserves of about \$8 million at the time come year-end.

CHAIR - What is Tasracing's level of debt?

Dr FORBES - We have two loans. One is a \$3 million loan. A big proportion of that was inherited and given to us by TOTE Tasmania. The second loan is about

\$10 million and relates to the building of the Spreyton racetrack. There is a capacity for that in the funding deed.

Mr VALENTINE - *How is that being addressed over time? Do you see that being paid down? What sort of rate are you going to pay that down - that \$10 million?*

Dr FORBES - *The funding deed allows for the government to provide principal and interest support while Tasracing is not able to pay the loans.*

Mr VALENTINE - *How long have they been doing that, so far? When was that loan taken out?*

Dr FORBES - *It was 2011, I believe. Going forward, if we find a substantive resolution to sustainability in partnership with the shareholders, there is no reason why we can't begin to start managing our debt in an appropriate manner.²⁶²*

8.8 A number of greyhound industry participants raised concerns about the financial sustainability of the industry under the current funding agreement and the funding split across the racing codes.

8.9 The Greyhounds Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania (GOTBA) commented:

Prior to 2009 all funding for the three codes of racing in Tasmania was provided by the "Tote". After the giveaway fire sale of our Tote by the previous government, the industry was then under funded by the 2009 deed to the tune of some \$5 to \$6 million.

The industry has then had to find the shortfall within its annual budget allocation. Wagering growth, restricted prize money increases and race field fees has enabled TasRacing to continue to meet its current financial commitments.

Industry participants however, are concerned that continued growth in wagering, which this financial year is up about 10%, may not be sustainable, and there is ongoing concern that race prize money will not increase to the required level to sustain a viable greyhound industry.²⁶³

8.10 In evidence before the Committee, Graeme Barber, President of GOTBA, considered:

Greyhound stake money has been stagnant now for over five years. The only increase of stakes in the industry is a small amount to cover CPI each year. The comparison provided by the association to the committee of racing in South Australia clearly shows that Tasmania has been left behind mainland states and is last on the list of the major players. Given an average growth in betting

²⁶² Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 42-43

²⁶³ Submission 26, Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania, pp 6-7.

turnover of around 10 per cent per annum for the last few years the greyhound industry does not receive a fair deal in the allocation of stakes. It is my personal opinion that the funding deeds set up by the previous government left the racing industry about \$6 million short of what Tasracing requires to properly fund and grow the whole of the Tasmanian racing industry.

.....
The association is of the view that greyhound racing in Tasmania is a key plank of the whole racing industry and if greyhound racing were not supported and funded by the funding deed the whole Tasmanian racing industry would be at risk of folding.²⁶⁴

8.11 Similar comments were made by John Newson:

Mr NEWSON - ... I know at our club since this report has come out, we have spent a lot of money and time this year trying to lift the perception and get through to people that we want to keep this industry and clean it up. We have to keep it going because it is an important industry. It is the flow-on effects too, out in the general public.

Mr VALENTINE - Tasracing would be in a bit of a problem. You have to give them 40 per cent of everything that comes in.

Mr NEWSON - I would say, if Greyhounds go, Tasracing would not be sustainable.²⁶⁵

8.12 The Launceston Greyhound Racing Club considered:

The level of income enjoyed by Tasracing from the greyhound racing industry is approximately on an equal footing with such income from the thoroughbred racing industry. This would suggest a near equality in the popularity of the two codes.

Increases in the popularity of the greyhound racing indeed have been a significant factor in the increase in revenue received by Tasracing. In respect of income presently received by Tasracing from the 3 codes, about 40% of total revenue comes from the greyhound industry.

In the 2013-2014 season, income received by Tasracing exceeded their budget by approximately \$1,800,000.00.

However, as to funding, the greyhound industry is the least well funded of the codes. By way of comparison, in the last financial year the division of Government funding was approximately 19% for the greyhound industry compared with 27% in relation to harness racing and 54% for thoroughbred racing.

²⁶⁴ Graeme Barber, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 27-28

²⁶⁵ John Newson, Transcript of evidence, p 23

The disparity continues to grow given, for example, that revenue from the greyhound industry has increased to date this financial year by 11%.

Funding received by each of the codes has for some years increased only at the CPI rate. However, the significant increases in income received by Tasracing, and to which the greyhound industry has contributed far more than its pro-rata share, has not resulted in any increased dividend to any of the codes.

There is thus considerable disquiet at the failure of Tasracing to use its revenue to the best benefit of the three codes, and of those three codes the greyhound industry remains the least well served.²⁶⁶

8.13 Tony Murray commented:

From a wagering perspective, the most dramatic increase in turnover over the past decade has been on greyhound racing. It has become a very popular wagering product in the modern age, with quick races and immediate outcomes that appeal to the next generation of punters. However, in most jurisdictions the level of funding to greyhound racing has fallen well behind the comparative level of turnover between the three codes. That is, the increase in turnover on greyhound racing has generally not been matched by increases in the greyhound industry's returns from the various funding agreements in place throughout Australia.²⁶⁷

8.14 Concerns were also raised that there was no financial incentive for people to stay in the industry. Graeme Barber commented:

Mrs RYLAH - Graeme, in your submission you eloquently draw the connection between the amount of prize winnings and how it has not increased and what is appearing to be perhaps the decline in the industry. The concern we have all heard in these submissions is the common concern regarding greed and using animals to fulfil that horrible human trait we have. I am wondering how you see that conundrum we are facing in terms of adequately providing for an industry and in particular, for the support of the animal welfare side of that industry, and prize money. Can you talk to that for me, please? I would be pleased to hear more.

.....
Mr BARBER - That clearly indicates for every race there are three meetings in that book, weekly meetings, and every race's prize money is there. We are racing in Tasmania for somewhere between first place of \$1 300 - that is the lower grade - up to about \$1 700, I think. Second place is about \$400 and third place is about \$200. We have three big races a year. The Hobart 1000, which is in December, has prize money of about \$80 000.

Ms RATTRAY - That is your interdominion race, if you like?

Mr BARBER - Yes, that's our top race. The Launceston Cup in Launceston is \$40 000 and the Devonport Cup is \$20 000.

²⁶⁶ Submission 28, Launceston Greyhound Racing Club, p 9.

²⁶⁷ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 36-37

Mrs RYLAH - That is total prize money for that event?

Mr BARBER - No, that is first prize money, I think. I know for Devonport and Launceston that is first place money. For Hobart I think it is \$80 000 for the winner. Unfortunately, who wins most of those races? Mainland trainers coming here with mainland dogs.

CHAIR - Do you think they've been blooded, those dogs?

Mr BARBER - I don't know but they're taking the majority of our prize money out of the state in the space of three weeks. The Launceston club have been proactive in this, though, because their cup now runs over three race meetings. There is heats, semi finals and then a final, whereas the Hobart one is just the best eight heats into the final. Launceston has been proactive in trying to keep the local people enthused. If you look at the prize money of \$ 300 it is not a great incentive to break the law to operate outside the rules of racing and put yourself in a position where you are going to be banned for life for that meagre result. People are in the industry in Tasmania really as a hobby.

Mrs RYLAH - But is it an adequate return?

Mr BARBER - No.²⁶⁸

8.15 Anthony Bullock also considered that the industry may not be financially sustainable over the long term:

Mr BACON - Do you think the industry is financially sustainable?

Mr BULLOCK - Two weeks ago I would have said yes.

Mr BACON - What do you think the change is going to do?

Mr BULLOCK - I think we've been led up the garden path in a way. If we're not sustainable, thoroughbreds and harness aren't either. I would say all three codes have to be going together, otherwise one supports the other. No-one ever gets enough stake money or funding. Our turnover is the highest of the three codes. We get less than what we put in but if we were racing for the thoroughbred money we'd have all the employment in greyhound racing. It's as simple as that. It's only that we get the lesser amount and therefore we are doing more for virtually nothing.

Ms RATTRAY - Like your case with your volunteers?

Mr BULLOCK - Yes, I would have two or three staff. It would save me going to the races - I had to get someone to come and take my dogs to Devonport because I have come here instead. I had to get a bloke to take my 17 dogs to Devonport, but if we were racing for better money we would have more staff because we could afford to pay for them. I have volunteers who like to come and pat the dogs and enjoy their day out. I also have a lot of people from Helpx

²⁶⁸ Graeme Barber, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 41-42

- they come from China and stay at my place. They all go to the races and help me with the dogs.²⁶⁹

8.16 Mr Bullock also commented:

Ms RATTRAY - Jumping back to the sustainability of the industry, it has been suggested that for most of the big races we have in Tasmania, our mainland counterparts come over and take the big dollars often and head back. Is that good to have that or should we have more general races for our own Tasmanian dogs and not as much big prize money for those key meets.

Mr BULLOCK - It is nice to win a \$75 000 race, but if we can't sustain it, it has to go. It is as simple as that because at the moment they are talking about eight races, one half-stake race, which is not going to help anyone because now you are going to have more dogs and less races. That is not going to help anyone either. As a part of the Launceston committee, we put a submission forward try to reduce the three biggest races in Tasmania and pull stake money back where there is a 10-event card for everyone to win three times a week, because more people are going to win more money to stay in the industry to keep going in the industry because you try to spread it out so everyone has a chance of winning something - rather than give \$140 000 to two people.²⁷⁰

Committee findings:

- 8.17 The Committee finds there is conflicting evidence regarding the financial arrangements of the greyhound racing industry.
- 8.18 The Committee finds the sale of TOTE, as well as past and current government funding agreements, have contributed to the financial challenges facing Tasracing and the greyhound racing industry.
- 8.19 The Committee notes there is a discrepancy between the funds raised by the greyhound industry compared to the funds allocated by Tasracing to the industry.

The economic impact of the industry

- 8.20 The Committee heard that the racing industry generally is a significant contributor to the Tasmanian economy. Tasracing commented:

The government's contribution is not only important to the industry but to the economy of the state.

An independent study (released in December 2013) to identify the benefits generated by the Tasmanian racing industry across the thoroughbred, harness and greyhound codes found it contributes \$103.1 million in real gross value to the state's economy.

²⁶⁹ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p.11

²⁷⁰ *Ibid*, p 17

It also found that regional Tasmania is responsible for generating more than \$31.5 million (30.5 per cent) of this amount in value-added contribution to Gross State Product.

The report noted that 5,571 individuals are employed or are direct participants in the Tasmanian racing industry representing a number of different categories, including owner, participant, volunteer, direct employee or horse/greyhound service provider.

The report also said that the industry was directly responsible for sustaining just under 1000 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs in the Tasmanian economy. Racing in regional Tasmania supports more than 300 of these jobs.

FTE job creation by region is Hobart 44 per cent, Launceston 25 per cent and regional Tasmania 31 per cent.

Breeders and trainers directly employ about 940 individuals to assist in various roles, including administration, track riding, stable and kennel duties.

The study found that owners invested more than \$40 million in the preparation of racehorses and greyhounds for racing, and that more than 55 per cent of this investment was made in regional areas of the state.

The research also revealed that breeders invested more than \$13 million in the production of racehorses and greyhounds for racing. More than 60 per cent of this investment was made in regional Tasmania.

Tasmania is home to 15 racing clubs that host 328 race meetings a year in Tasmania. About 800 full-time, part-time, casual and contractor employees are involved in the operation of racing at a club level.

The economic impact study provided compelling evidence that racing is deeply woven into the economic and social fabric of Tasmania, particularly in regional areas, where it is an important and vibrant contributor to those communities.

One in 10 Tasmanian residents have attended at least one thoroughbred, harness or greyhound race meeting (ABS sporting attendance survey). Racing patrons and customers spend more than \$10.5 million in relation to their investment in racing – 35 per cent of race day-related spending by racing patrons occurs off-course (retail, fashion and accommodation).

.....
The greyhound code is responsible for nearly 40 per cent of the Tasmanian racing industry's total turnover, which means it is a significant contributor to race field fees that provides a critical funding stream for Tasracing that assists it in servicing the three codes of racing.²⁷¹

8.21 The Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania commented:

²⁷¹ Submission 36, Tasracing, pp 13-15.

In November, 2013, TasRacing published a report titled “Size and Scope of the Tasmanian Racing Industry”.

In relation to the racing industry the report found that:

- The racing industry in Tasmania generates recurrent expenditure of more than \$103.4 million annually;
- Owners, trainers and breeders are responsible for more than 52% of this expenditure through their breeding, and training activities;
- Regional Tasmania is responsible for generating more than \$31.5 million in value-added contribution to Gross State Product;
- In total there are 5,571 individuals who are employed or are direct participants in the Tasmanian racing industry, with more than 47% of those in regional areas;
- The Tasmanian racing industry is responsible for sustaining just under 1,000 full time equivalent jobs with 313 of these jobs in regional Tasmania;
- Breeders invest more than \$13 million in the production of racehorses and greyhounds for racing;
- Racing patrons and customers spend more than \$10.5 million in relation to their involvement in racing.

In relation to Greyhound racing the report found that:

- \$15.6 million of recurrent expenditure was generated;
- There were 153 FTE jobs generated in the State with half of those in the north and north west;
- There are 493 participants involved in the sport;
- There are approximately 800 racing animals in the State;
- Of the 506 pups bred last year, 305 were bred in regional areas;
- 158 race meetings were held in the State which catered for race fields of 26,700 participating dogs.

The Association urges the Committee to consider these financial and employment matters when making final recommendations about the future of greyhound racing in Tasmania.²⁷²

Committee finding:

- 8.22 The Committee notes the racing industry provides employment, networking and social opportunities for Tasmanians, particularly those living in rural and regional areas.

²⁷² Submission 26, Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania, p 9-10.

Government subsidies

8.23 A number of submissions called for the cessation of Government subsidies to the racing industry and in particular the greyhound industry:

- *I think all Government sponsorship for all racing codes should be withdrawn as I believe the greed of the people involved in the industry is sufficient to keep the game going without the least bit of assistance from the Government.*²⁷³
- *The Tasmanian and other state governments should not be contributing millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to this industry, which has been exposed as being endemically cruel and corrupt. With more than 70% of taxpayers opposing this industry, governments have no ethical ground upon which to do this.*

*The AJP position is that the subsidies should be stopped immediately. Breeding incentives (as per above) and appearance fee subsidies should also be stopped.*²⁷⁴

- *There can be no social license for taxpayer funding of an industry which combines: - non-transparent processes; lack of reliable data; lack of enforceable welfare standards; lack of compliance where regulations do exist; wastage, injury and death of animals in the name of sport; gambling.*²⁷⁵

8.24 The Hobart Greyhound Racing Club commented:

There is a need to look back over the excessive amount of changes that has been made to the structure and administration of the greyhound racing industry and the racing industry as a whole as well as the political motivation behind those changes, below are some of the changes made in just 14 years.

- *2001: the Corporatisation of TAB trading as TOTE Tasmania which provided a greater certainty of funding of its earnings to the Tasmanian Racing Industry.*
- *2004: Government review of Tasmanian Racing Industry which determined to separate integrity from operations.*
- *2005: Restructure of Tasmanian Racing Industry, integrity matters moved to Racing Services Tasmania and the newly created code regulatory panels, with commercial matters remain with the Code Council and TOTE.*
- *2008: Government requests and reviews advice on options for governance structure of the Tasmanian Racing Industry.*
- *January 2009: the powers and functions in relation to governance and administration of the Tasmanian Racing Industry was removed from*

²⁷³ Submission 5, Liz Hynes, p. 1.

²⁷⁴ Submission 3, Animal Justice Party, p. 6.

²⁷⁵ Submission 4, Animal Welfare League Australia, p. 1.

TOTE and vested in the newly established Tasmanian Racing Board. The Code Councils and regulatory panels were abolished. The view of the racing industry was that the political motivation of the Labour Government was to have the necessary procedures in place to sell TOTE even though the Government assured the industry that TOTE was not for sale, and as we know TOTE was sold.

- July 2009: Tasmanian Racing Board transitioned to Tasracing Pty Ltd. As the racing industry had lost its funding from TOTE the Government signed a 20 year Funding Deed with Tasracing.
- 2011: Revised Funding Deed.

The Tasmanian Racing Industry never wanted to be funded from Consolidated Revenue and believed the Government when they said that the TOTE would not be sold, when the Government sold TOTE there was no other choice for the industry.

After the Government sold TOTE the industry's major funding was taken from them therefore the Government had a responsibility for the funding of the industry but there was not any protection for the racing industry in the sale of TOTE, there was nothing in the sale that saw any revenue from UBet (TattsBet) come to the racing industry.

The ongoing financial support by the government for the Tasmanian racing industry is supported by the contribution that the racing industry contributes to the Tasmanian economy. The Tasmanian racing industry contributes more than 103 million dollars and is directly responsible for sustaining 2,142 individuals in full time, part time, and casual positions (almost 1,000 full time equivalent jobs).²⁷⁶

Committee findings:

- 8.25 The Committee finds that without ongoing government funding the greyhound racing industry in Tasmania is financially unsustainable.
- 8.26 The Committee finds there is concern about government funding of the greyhound racing industry.
- 8.27 The Committee finds that racing participants are concerned the sale of TOTE and the associated ongoing financial arrangements have contributed to the challenges of the racing industry.
- 8.28 The Committee finds there is a community expectation that the allocation of government funds to the greyhound racing industry ensures contemporary animal welfare standards are upheld.

Recommendation 25: That the Government undertake an independent cost-benefit analysis of the Tasmanian racing codes to inform a review of the current funding model for the racing industry.

²⁷⁶ Submission 46, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, p 4.

Recommendation 26: That continued government funding of the greyhound racing industry be conditional on upholding contemporary animal welfare outcomes.

9 THE 'REVIEW REPORT'

- 9.1 Following the *Four Corners* program in February 2015, the Minister for Racing initiated the *Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry*, the Review Report.²⁷⁷
- 9.2 The focus was on live baiting and wastage issues. A number of the recommended reforms have been considered in previous chapters of this report. This section outlines the recommended reforms and industry response. It also considers the status of the Review Report's recommendations.
- 9.3 In evidence before the Committee Tony Murray, co-author of the Review Report commented:

In February 2015, the Minister for Racing, Hon Jeremy Rockliff MP, instructed the Director of Racing and the Chief Veterinary Officer (who oversees animal welfare investigation for the Government) to undertake a review of animal welfare arrangements in the greyhound racing industry to ensure there is a robust system in this State, and provide the Minister with a report, including their findings and recommendations, by 13 March 2015.

The key findings of the Director and the Chief Vet, together with their associated recommendations, are detailed in the body of the Review Report, which was tabled in Parliament on 25 March 2015. In total, there were 29 recommendations.

In undertaking their review, the Director and the Chief Vet, both statutory officers independent of the racing industry's commercial body, focused on the key areas of live baiting, the lifespan of the greyhound and compliance. This was in consideration of the limited time period available for the review to be completed (less than four weeks).

It is important to note that they found no evidence of live baiting occurring in Tasmania. Nonetheless, they did identify a number of measures the Government could take to strengthen provisions against such illegal activity.

Some of the measures recommended involve reviewing, and modifying where appropriate the Rules of Racing, licensing and registration standards and criteria, industry education programs, race programming, breeding rules and policies and funding allocations, all primarily the function of Tasracing.²⁷⁸

- 9.4 Tasracing noted:

²⁷⁷ *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry Final Report*, 13 March 2015.

²⁷⁸ Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, pp 5-6.

The Tasracing Board considered the identified report at its April meeting and committed to work with the Minister for Racing and his office on the recommendations that are relevant to Tasracing.

With that in mind, Tasracing notes that GA rules recently approved by the GA Board address the concerns of the recommendations in the report.²⁷⁹

9.5 The Hobart Greyhound Racing Club commented:

We are supportive of the 29 recommendations put forward in the report, the report points out the following and we would expect that there will be wide consultation prior to the implementation of the recommendations:

The separation of commercial and integrity functions has meant that no decision made for a commercial gain can be at the expense of integrity and animal welfare. Because of this separation the industry has been able to work with Racing Services and the Director of Racing in areas of grading and programming for older or for greyhounds with less ability to extend the greyhounds racing life.

Racing Services Tasmania have been proactive in many areas introducing rules and maintaining data records for the tracking of all greyhounds that is not being done in larger jurisdictions. It is important that this information is gathered so that policy and changes can be made on correct and relevant information.²⁸⁰

9.6 The RSPCA commented:

The RSPCA generally supports the recommendations contained in the review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry Report and commends the Government on the amendments already introduced to the Tasmanian animal welfare legislation. However, further additional action needs to be taken.²⁸¹

Status of the recommendations

9.7 This section outlines the 29 recommendations made in the Review Report and the progress that has been made towards their implementation.

Recommendation 1 of the Review Report:

Create a mandatory penalty under the Rules of Racing that any person found guilty of live baiting is disqualified from the industry for life.

9.8 The Committee heard there was industry support for a lifetime ban.

²⁷⁹ Submission 36, Tasracing, p 15.

²⁸⁰ Submission 46, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, p 5.

²⁸¹ Jade Norris, RSPCA, Transcript of evidence 30 June 2015, p 43.

John Newson, Chair of the Launceston Greyhound Racing Club commented:

Ms COURTNEY - John, if we presume for a moment that there was a person doing the wrong thing and performing illegal activity, what would you recommend the industry do to stamp it out? First of all to discover it, and then to stamp it out? We have this area of not really having the information and not knowing. What could the industry do to give the public and us confidence that it is not happening, going forward?

Mr NEWSON - It is hard to say.

Ms COURTNEY - It is tricky.

Mr NEWSON - It is a very tricky question. I know with ourselves, most people would now say if anyone gets caught doing it, it is a mandatory life ban. It you get caught, you are gone. You are not going to be back into the industry again. It would not matter how many times you appealed, you are gone.

9.9 Graeme Barber, Chair of the Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania, commented:

From my background of where I have worked for many years, all I would rely on is evidence. As you are aware, Chair, people can come along and say they have heard A, B, C, D and E, but to have factual evidence in front of them is where the burden of proof of criminal behaviour needs to be, as we have seen in the disgusting behaviour of people in Victoria and Queensland on the Four Corners program. That type of evidence is there and people have been prosecuted and put out of the industry for life, and that is what deserves to happen to those people.²⁸²

9.10 The Committee notes that while this recommendation has not been adopted, the following National Rule (GAR 86B) became effective in Tasmania on 30 April 2015:

- (1) A person who, in the opinion of the Stewards or Controlling Body-
 - (a) uses in connection with greyhound training, education or preparation to race, or racing, any live animal, animal carcass or any part of an animal whether as bait, quarry or lure, or to entice, excite or encourage a greyhound to pursue it or otherwise; or
 - (b) attempts to possess, or has possession of, or brings onto, any grounds, premises or within the boundaries of any property where greyhounds are, or are to be trained, kept or raced, any live animal, animal carcass or any part of an animal for the purpose of being, or which might reasonably be capable of being, or likely to be, used as bait, quarry or lure to entice or excite or encourage a greyhound to pursue it; or
 - (c) causes, procures, permits or allows a greyhound to pursue or attack any live animal, animal carcass or any part of an animal;
 - (d) fails to use reasonable endeavours to prevent a greyhound pursuing or attacking any live animal, animal carcass or any part of an animal; or

²⁸² Graeme Barber, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 28.

(e) is in any way directly or indirectly involved in committing, or is knowingly concerned with, such conduct as set out in (a), (b), (c), or (d) of this Rule; or (f) aids, abets, counsels or procures any person to commit such conduct as set out in (a), (b), (c) or (d) of this Rule; or (g) is convicted in any Court of an offence in relation to the use of, or having in their possession, any live animal, animal carcass or part of an animal in connection with greyhound training, education or preparation to race, or racing shall be disqualified for a period of not less than 10 years and, in addition shall be fined a sum not exceeding such amount as specified in the relevant Act or Rules, unless there is a finding that a special circumstance exists, whereupon a penalty less than the minimum penalty may be imposed.

(2) A person who witnesses conduct as set out in (1)(a), (1)(b), 1(c), or 1(d) above but fails to report that conduct to the Controlling Body as soon as reasonably practicable shall be disqualified for a period of not less than 5 years and/or fined a sum not exceeding twenty thousand (\$20,000) dollars.²⁸³

Recommendation 2 of the Review Report:

Create a rule which imposes a penalty not only on the person found guilty of live baiting, but also on any greyhound in the person's care and control.

9.11 Advice received from the Minister for Racing indicates that this recommendation has not been adopted as stewards have a range of existing powers which enable them to take action should such a matter come before them.²⁸⁴

Recommendation 3 of the Review Report:

Create an offence under the Rules of Racing for a person to keep or house on a property used for training or educating greyhounds, any small animals that could be used for live baiting.

9.12 In his submission Mr Murray, commented on the implementation of this recommendation:

A survey questionnaire has been provided to all Tasmanian registered greyhound trainers, requiring them to advise RST of the number of registered greyhounds kept on the property, the number and type of domestic animals kept on the property, and the exact location, type and usage of any bullring and/or straight track (including mechanical drag/lure) on the property.

This data will help establish how many bullrings and private training tracks exist in the State and inform the Director's strategy in the context of

²⁸³ Rules R86B of the Greyhounds Australasia Rules (GARs).

²⁸⁴ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry as at 26 April 2016.

establishing an appropriate and effective process of inspection and audit of properties that maintain such facilities.²⁸⁵

9.13 In relation to this recommendation Dr Sally-Anne Richter commented:

Ms RATTRAY - I have a follow-on question in relation to socialisation. My understanding is that there are rules around what else you can have on your property when you have a greyhound. How do you see that working? You can have other animals but they have to be registered with the association, with RST. How is that going to work?

Dr RICHTER - There is a section of the AVA designated specifically to greyhounds and they would be keen to work with Racing Services Tasmania in that area. I think it is important that the other animals on the property are microchipped and identified to avoid having issues when inspectors, if they find a pet rabbit, are not suspicious that that rabbit is just a pet and it is not being used for live baiting or something like that. It just gets rid of that cloudiness in what is going on. In terms of –

Ms RATTRAY - It would be pretty difficult, I expect, to keep a running commentary on every animal you had on and off a property, particularly rabbits. I mean, they run off, they die. They do all sorts of things.

Dr RICHTER - I suppose I am making a distinction there. Pets definitely can be microchipped and followed. There are registrations through local councils so they know which animals belong to which owners and where they come from. That in itself is already in place through the microchipping system.

Ms RATTRAY - Can you microchip a bird? I suppose you can microchip anything.

Dr RICHTER - Yes, you can tag a bird. You can put a little ring tag on a bird that would identify it.

Ms RATTRAY - Then if he drops off the perch you have to go and present him to RST to prove he's dead but he's not been eaten by the dog? These are serious issues and there is an expectation from the industry about what they are supposed to do in caring for their animals.

Dr RICHTER - We are getting away from the socialisation aspect but it is important that those dogs are socialised, within reason. You wouldn't necessarily put a chicken in with any dog because there is a chance that any dog, through instinct, would go after that chicken. That being said, if that dog has seen an animal, it should not be scared of it later in life. Aggression problems and things like that often result from a lack of experience. It is called timid fear aggression. The peak time for socialisation is between three to 12 weeks and after that, up to six months is ideal. If they don't get exposed to a lot of things in that time they can find it extremely frightening as they hit three or four and they are being asked to engage with these animals or with

²⁸⁵ Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, p 6.

people and things like that that they've never potentially had exposure to previously.²⁸⁶

9.14 Rick Campbell, Chair of the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (AWAC) considered:

Mr GAFFNEY - Rick, in the submission we received there was a section where you said - and I apologise if you have answered this before - 'It may also be appropriate to consider prohibiting ownership of any animals which could be considered prey animals, cats, rabbits, small dogs et cetera.'

Mr CAMPBELL - Yes.

Mr GAFFNEY - You also said, 'This requires some consideration as to the animals covered and the method of exemption.' As an individual I would find that one very swampy ground to touch base on because whilst there are some professional greyhound owners, a lot of the part-time owners are family people who might have a farm with chickens and cats and dogs and other animals. To say if you are a greyhound owner you would not be able to have your children experience other animals would be a fair stretch, I think. How would you see that working? How do you think the community would respond to something such as that?

Mr CAMPBELL - Mike, I think in this situation it was a case of floating an idea as a way to deal with this particular issue. One of the major concerns was the use of animals of all sorts, smaller animals that the greyhounds would chase and inevitably usually kill as a way of training them to race properly. It was suggested that this might be an approach you could take, but the issues you have just raised were raised quite strongly around the table. It was thought that it is as well to put this idea out there to get some consideration of it and thought about it, but I agree there was general consensus about the sort of scenario you outlined with someone who trains a few greyhounds and it is not their total livelihood. It's something they do as a hobby for enjoyment, the way a lot of people have bits of racehorses and a partnership arrangement where each person owns a leg. To say that because you've got a greyhound you can't have any other pets is fairly draconian. The idea was floated but it was acknowledged that it's not without problems.

Mr GAFFNEY - I was wondering whether AWAC at your next meeting would consider if they could develop that idea a bit further, something along the lines of perhaps a recommendation that if you own a greyhound or greyhounds that are in work they must be totally segregated from any other smaller animal to avoid any thought that there may be something untoward happening. I understand the idea and you acknowledge the difficulty, but a new greyhound owner might not have even thought of the fact that they have two little Pekingese pups that run around the backyard, that sort of thing. I think it has some validity in an educative sense - not to have the greyhounds housed next to the chicken coop, that sort of thing.

²⁸⁶ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 10

Mr CAMPBELL - That's right. I think a better way to deal with that sort of situation would be in guidelines and the education program rather than to try to put it into legislation. To word it in legislation in a way that's going to be acceptable and enforceable, I can see no point in having legislation that can't or will not ever be enforced. It's pointless, so we're better off to step back from the legislation and acknowledge this is a real issue and come at it from the point of view of Rob's pre-registration training program he alluded to and incorporate those sorts of ideas into that sort of program rather than trying to legislate to say, 'Because you have a greyhound you cannot have a canary'. Where do you stop? Which animals do you have to specify? All of the animals, breeds, birds and everything else? Looking at it from a guideline and training program, if somebody has a small number of dogs as a part-time interest they're still going to have to be registered with a racing authority. Once they apply for registration they go through this other program of training and awareness so you can pick up the aspect of pets and things like that at that point.

Mr GAFFNEY - Because we are coming out with a report about what this committee investigates we could highlight or recommend as a finding or something along that line. It is not a legislative requirement, it is just a comment from us that this was presented to us.

Mr CAMPBELL - Absolutely, but I was thinking if you take it the next step and say, 'Okay, what are we going to do about this? How are we going to progress this idea?', my personal opinion is we do that through an education and training program rather than try to enshrine something like that in legislation that would end up having so many holes in it it would be valueless anyway.²⁸⁷

- 9.15 The following National Rule 86C(5) became effective in Tasmania on 30 April 2015:

(5) A person shall not be in breach of Rule 86B(1)(b) where the animal is kept on or at the premises as a domesticated pet or is kept for rural or agricultural purposes with prior notification to an approval from the Controlling Body. For the purpose of this sub-rule, notification must be in the manner and form required by the Controlling Body for this exclusion to apply.

- 9.16 Advice from the Minister for Racing indicates that the Office of Racing Integrity is currently working with industry to put in place a set of standards that are consistent with the rule.²⁸⁸

Recommendation 4 of the Review Report:

Create an offence under the Rules of Racing for a person to have on a property used for training or educating greyhounds any device for the trapping of small animals.

²⁸⁷ Rick Campbell, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, pp 5-6

²⁸⁸ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry as at 26 April 2016.

9.17 Advice from the Minister for Racing indicates that no such rule will be adopted as the Office of Racing Integrity review such matters when conducting kennel inspections.²⁸⁹

Recommendation 5 of the Review Report:

Only permit the use of bullrings by a registered person who is in charge of the property on which the bullring is located and only permit greyhounds trained by that person to utilise the facility.

9.18 In evidence before the committee Mr Murray commented:

*...The first thing that I have done in relation to that recommendation is to do an audit of all bullrings and trial tracks on private property, and that has shown some interesting figures and in some ways some surprising figures. We have identified 28 bullrings and 31 trial tracks throughout the state, although some of those 31 are just small runs which are fenced. The prevalence of bullrings being 28, that is broken down to six in the north-west, 10 in the north and 12 in the south. We have undertaken an inspection of about 95 per cent of them.*²⁹⁰

9.19 Mr Murray went on to say:

...We have created an in-house profile on each of those bullrings - about their structure, what they look like, what is being used in the training of the greyhounds, who uses the property. Now that we have that profile, the next step is that I will move to registering each of those bullrings and setting up a requirement of a permanent inspection. It is also my intention to link the registration of the bullrings to a requirement to attend educational sessions. One has to think whether, with all those processes, will it be necessary to require all those people to go to a central educational property? Are we creating another potential welfare issue? Remembering that if people have litters of pups, they might have 20 or 30 pups which would have to be transported to and from the tracks. There would probably be multiple trips. Left in vehicles while others are being educated. We have to make sure we are looking at a holistic approach to this, whilst never underestimating or devaluing what we saw, and how bad and disgusting it was.

*We have to take a sensible approach to it and try and come up with a reasonable solution. Whatever regulations we put in place, people can always find a way around it. It is better to work with the people and set up some strong regulatory structures as part of moving forward with this. If we profile them all, we know exactly where they are, what they are, what they use, how they look. We know who uses them. We will now move to registration, regular inspections, and obviously, unannounced inspections at any time. We will link that to education. That is going to be a significant step. That is the next phase of the process with bullrings.*²⁹¹

²⁸⁹ Ibid.

²⁹⁰ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 39

²⁹¹ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 20 November 2015, pp 11-12.

- 9.20 Advice from the Minister for Racing indicates that this recommendation will be considered by the Director of Racing in the conditions pertaining to the registration of bullrings which will be implemented at the commencement of the 2016/17 racing season.

Recommendation 6 of the Review Report:

Investigate the construction of bullrings on registered trial tracks under the control of Tasracing, with 24/7 CCTV monitoring which is only available to Racing Services Tasmania stewards or RSPCA officers (if this recommendation is adopted, consider the banning of all private bullrings).

- 9.21 In his submission to the inquiry Mr Murray commented on the implementation of this recommendation:

Awaiting finalisation of the statistical data in relation to the prevalence of bullrings and training tracks and their use prior to progressing consultation with Tasracing.²⁹²

- 9.22 The Minister for Racing has advised that this matter was investigated by Tasracing:

Tasracing notes there are currently no trial tracks under its control.

Tasracing understands that bullrings are important training facilities for industry participants and supports their ongoing responsible use.

Tasracing gave consideration to the practicalities of bullring facilities being constructed on its venues but could not support the idea as Tasracing venues are designed for racing and trialling only.

The construction of bullrings, with CCTV, at Tasracing venues would not be practical due to the limited times they would be available for industry use outside of horse racing and trialling.

Additionally, as only one dog can be trained in a bullring at a time, one bullring per venue would not meet the demand if no other training option was available to participants and therefore this would very likely be cost prohibitive.²⁹³

Recommendation 7 and 8 of the Review Report:

Ensure races are programmed specifically for greyhounds with less ability and for mature age greyhounds.

²⁹² Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, p. 6.

²⁹³ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry* as at 26 April 2016.

Ensure that the Grading Schedule provides further racing opportunities for greyhounds that are no longer competitive in their current grade.

- 9.23 The Minister for Racing has advised that these recommendations have been implemented:

New programming policy implemented by Tasracing, effective 1 November '15 with races now programmed for older greyhounds (Masters' races) and races for greyhounds with lesser ability (non-penalty reverse order of choice selection).

The DOR [Director of Racing] conducted a review of the grading schedule with changes implemented on 1 October 2015. The primary basis for the changes was to provide enhanced racing opportunities for greyhounds with limited ability and for those which were no longer competitive in their grade.²⁹⁴

Recommendation 9 of the Review Report:

An assessment be made of funding and opportunities for greyhounds to be rehomed once they have completed their racing careers.

- 9.24 Tasracing advised the Committee of its strategic plan to increase funding to GAP and to increase the number of greyhounds rehomed through the program.²⁹⁵ The *GAP Strategy 2020 & Beyond* was officially released in July 2016.²⁹⁶
- 9.25 The Minister for Racing has further advised there will be ongoing review and strategic development to address issues surrounding future funding levels, purpose built facilities, equipment and staffing.²⁹⁷

Recommendation 10 of the Review Report:

A review of the interaction between national and local rules be undertaken, noting that national rules should prevail over any local rules and that a harmonized national approach should be adopted.

- 9.26 The Minister for Racing has advised:

Tasracing has advised that Greyhounds Australasia (GA) recently conducted an audit of States' local rules and the national rules and no conflicts were

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁵ See Tasracing, *Strategy Development – Greyhound Adoption Programme*, issued 23 November 2015.

²⁹⁶ See Tasracing *GAP Strategy 2020 & Beyond* available at: <https://tasracingcorporate.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/GAPTas-Strategy-.pdf>

²⁹⁷ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry* as at 26 April 2016.

identified in Tasmania, meaning at this time a further review is not warranted.²⁹⁸

Recommendation 11 of the Review Report:

Ensure breeding rules and policies are supported and informed by detailed statistical data and education.

- 9.27 The Committee notes this recommendation is being progressed. In his submission to the inquiry Mr Murray noted:

*There is ongoing emphasis on the collection and forensic analysis of statistical data.*²⁹⁹

- 9.28 The Minister for Racing further advised:

In December 2013 the DOR commenced the tracking of all greyhounds whelped in Tasmania from the commencement of the 2011/12 racing season. This data is updated on a regular basis.

*Tasracing advises that Greyhounds Australasia's Welfare Working Party has been implementing strategies and rules to encourage responsible breeding, including education, which is articulated in the GA National Welfare strategy.*³⁰⁰

Recommendation 12 of the Review Report:

Regularly assess breeding rules and policies to ensure they are consistent and compliant with animal welfare legislation and contemporary animal welfare standards.

- 9.29 As noted in Chapter 7 new national breeding rules and policies were introduced on 1 August 2015 limiting the number of litters that may be whelped by an individual greyhound.

- 9.30 The Minister for Racing has further advised:

*Tasracing advises that Greyhounds Australasia's Welfare Working Party has been implementing strategies and rules to encourage responsible breeding, including education, which is articulated in the GA National Welfare strategy. One of the objectives of this group is to review the rules and policies to ensure their consistency and compliance with animal welfare legislation and contemporary welfare standards.*³⁰¹

Recommendation 13 of the Review Report:

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁹ Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, p 7.

³⁰⁰ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry* as at 26 April 2016.

³⁰¹ *Ibid.*

Ensure incentives to breed are properly balanced with responsible breeding and welfare consideration.

- 9.31 As noted in Chapter 6 the ‘Breeder’s Bonus’ has ceased. The Minister for Racing has further advised:

Initiatives to fulfil Tasracing’s legislative obligations with respect to promoting the development of an efficient and effective horse and greyhound breeding industry, are regularly reviewed and assessed against responsible breeding and welfare considerations.³⁰²

Recommendation 14 of the Review Report:

Transfer current funding allocated to a Vaccination, Microchipping and Rearing Rebate (formerly referred to as a breeder’s bonus) to retirement and rehoming opportunities for greyhounds.

- 9.32 The Minister for Racing has advised:

Tasracing, in consultation with the greyhound industry, has discontinued all breeding rebates (including rebates provided for the cost of DNA testing of the breeding female).

Tasracing funds the Greyhound Adoption Program (GAP) of Tasmania which assists in the re-training and placement of retired greyhounds in the community. This funding was doubled to \$214K in 2015/16.

Tasracing acknowledges that GAP provides an important service to the industry, however, this does not diminish the requirement that owners must take life-long responsibility for their dogs.³⁰³

- 9.33 Tasracing’s GAP Strategy 2020 & Beyond, released in July 2016 indicates that the funding for GAP has increased from an annual spend of \$118,000 in 2014/15 to \$264,000 in 2015/16.³⁰⁴

Recommendation 15 of the Review Report:

Enhance the powers of entry for animal welfare officers under the Animal Welfare Act 1993 and Racing Services Tasmania stewards, under the Rules of Racing, to ensure they are properly supported with respect to live baiting and other animal welfare issues.

³⁰² *Ibid.*

³⁰³ *Ibid.*

³⁰⁴ See Tasracing GAP Strategy 2020 & Beyond available at: <https://tasracingcorporate.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/GAPTas-Strategy-.pdf>

9.34 In his submission Mr Murray noted:

Amendments to the Animal Welfare Act were passed by the Parliament on 3 June 2015.

The Director is currently undertaking a review of the relevant Rules of Racing and will make his recommendations to Tasracing with respect to amending the Rules, where appropriate.³⁰⁵

9.35 The Minister for Racing has further advised:

The amendments enhanced the powers of animal welfare officers to enter, search and inspect premises and to collect evidence of an offence, and also extended the term of imprisonment to a maximum of five years for offences such as aggravated cruelty which results in an animal's death or serious disablement.

The DOR has conducted a review of powers of the stewards. The review determined that the powers of entry for stewards and the ability to regulate licensed persons were satisfactory.³⁰⁶

Recommendation 16 of the Review Report:

Consider an amendment to the Racing Regulation Act 2004 to enable stewards to require unlicensed persons to appear before inquiries and provide documents if it can reasonably be determined that the person is of particular interest to an inquiry under the Rules of Racing.

9.36 In his submission to the inquiry Mr Murray noted:

The Director has commenced a review of the Racing Regulation Act, in consultation with key stakeholders, to determine if there is any constitutional or other legal restraint which would prevent the Parliament inserting a provision in the Racing Regulation Act, giving some suitable public officer or class of officers the power to compel any person to attend inquiries conducted pursuant to the Rules of Racing.

The Review is anticipated to be finalised prior to or shortly after the commencement of the Spring 2015 Session of Parliament. If amending the legislation is considered to be a viable proposition, the Director will make a recommendation to the Minister for the matter to be progressed.³⁰⁷

³⁰⁵ Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, p 7.

³⁰⁶ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry as at 26 April 2016.

³⁰⁷ *Ibid*, p. 7-8.

9.37 The Minister for Racing has advised this matter is being considered in relation to the regulation of unlicensed persons.³⁰⁸

Recommendation 17 of the Review Report:

Implement an industry education program with respect to contemporary animal welfare standards.

9.38 The Minister for Racing has advised:

Tasracing has already implemented a progressive industry programme for all codes of racing. Greyhound participants must complete the following requirements in order to be licensed in 2016/17:

Attendants/Catchers to complete a 2 unit skill set, comprising the following units:

*RGRCMN201A Following OHS procedures and environmental work practices
RGRPSG201A Handle Greyhounds*

Owner Trainer/Public Trainer to complete a 4 unit skill set, comprising the following units:

*RGRCMN201A Following OHS procedures and environmental work practices
RGRPSG201A Handle Greyhounds
RGRPSG205A Attend Greyhounds at meetings
RGRCMN001A Comply with the rules of racing and related protocols*

Animal Welfare is an important component of the units.

In addition, Tasracing published a Greyhound Animal Welfare Manual which is available on www.tasracing.com.au and printed copies are available at all race tracks.

The GA's National Welfare Working Party is also reviewing the requisites and education requirements for all new licensed persons and animal welfare will form part of those educational requirements.³⁰⁹

Recommendation 18 of the Review Report:

Link licensing requirements to attendance and assessment at education programs in respect of animal welfare standards.

9.39 The Minister for Racing has advised that this recommendation is currently being implemented with effect from 2016/17 racing season.³¹⁰

³⁰⁸ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry* as at 26 April 2016.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

Recommendation 19 of the Review Report:

Create a rule of racing that at all times (from whelping onwards) a greyhound must be in the possession of, and under the ownership, care and control of a licensed person.

9.40 The Minister for Racing has advised:

Tasracing progressing with GA.

GA's National Welfare Strategy has an objective that all greyhounds are to be under the care of a registered participant at all times during their lifecycle, unless retired as a pet.

The GA Welfare Working Party is developing registration and education requirements for breeders, whelpers, rearers and educators to help achieve this objective.³¹¹

Recommendation 20 of the Review Report:

Establish a requirement that all bullrings and training tracks on properties used for the training and education of greyhounds are registered by the Director of Racing.

9.41 The Minister for Racing has advised:

The DOR has completed an audit of all bullrings and private training tracks in the State. The next step in the process is the registration of all such facilities, commencing in the 2016/17 racing season.

The conditions of registration are currently being developed in consultation with key stakeholders.³¹²

Recommendation 21 of the Review Report:

Establish a process of inspection and audit of properties that have a bullring and/or training track on the property.

9.42 The Director of Racing has undertaken an audit of bullrings and private training facilities.³¹³

9.43 The Minister for Racing has also advised:

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹¹ *Ibid.*

³¹² *Ibid.*

³¹³ See comments of Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 39.

As part of the registration of all bullrings and training tracks by the DOR, a process of regular inspections by stewards, at least three times per year will be undertaken.

This will be complemented by regular unannounced inspections by stewards.³¹⁴

Recommendation 22 of the Review Report:

Consider the employment of a Racing Integrity Manager and an additional Steward Investigator to support the Director of Racing and enhance the delivery of integrity and animal welfare objectives.

9.44 Mr Murray noted in his submission:

The Review Report identified both “Governments and regulators have a significant role in animal welfare. Governments need to ensure that legislative mechanisms are in place to effectively support those charged with investigating and prosecuting potential welfare breaches. Regulators need to ensure that appropriate resources are allocated to animal welfare from policy, educational and compliance perspectives.”

The Director and Chief Vet’s review encompassed examining the role of education, training and competence of both regulators and industry participants in driving improvements in terms of animal welfare outcomes.

In recent years RST has been extremely proactive with respect to animal welfare in a number of areas, including increased stable and kennel inspections by stewards to ensure trainers have appropriate facilities to care for the well being of the animals entrusted to them, In addition, all new applicants for a trainer’s licence must have a satisfactory kennel inspection prior to being licensed by the Director.

To assist with its regulation of animal welfare issues, the Director created the position of Steward Investigator. This position was created following an internal restructure of administrative positions and reports directly to the Director. The Steward Investigator, whose major focus is on non-raceday activities, with a significant emphasis on animal welfare, is well experienced in this important area, having previously held positions with the RSCPA and DPIPWE.³¹⁵

9.45 In relation to the progress of implementing this recommendation, Mr Murray commented:

In the 2015/16 State Budget, the Treasurer announced funding for the employment of a Racing Integrity Manager (RIM) and an additional Steward

³¹⁴ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry as at 26 April 2016.

³¹⁵ Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, p. 8.

Investigator. The recruitment process for the RIM is being progressed as a matter of priority, with advertisements placed in the Tasmanian Government Gazette as well as on RST website (www.racing.tas.gov.au) and the national racing jobs website (www.racingjobs.com.au). It is anticipated that this position will be filled mid to late July 2015, and the second Steward Investigator position filled shortly thereafter.³¹⁶

9.46 In evidence before the Committee Mr Murray further advised:

*...one of the recommendations was to employ an additional steward investigator. That has occurred. That person is positioned in the south. That person has worked in Tasmania Police for, I think, in excess of 20 years. He brings significant skills, which will add to our investigative role. He is based in the south now. Previously, we had one investigator in the north. We now have one in the north and one in the south, which enables us to be on the spot and doing the unannounced inspections far more than what we could previously.*³¹⁷

9.47 The Minister for Racing advised that the Racing Integrity Manager commenced duties on 3 August 2015 and the Steward Investigator on 5 October 2015.³¹⁸

Recommendation 23 of the Review Report:

Review security and surveillance protocols and practices in place at all Tasracing-controlled racing and trialling venues.

9.48 In his submission Mr Murray commented on the implementation of this recommendation:

*The Director is consulting with Tasracing to progress.*³¹⁹

9.49 The Minister for Racing has advised:

*Tasracing regularly reviews security protocols at its racing and training venues.*³²⁰

³¹⁶ *Ibid*, p 9

³¹⁷ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, p 12.

³¹⁸ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry* as at 26 April 2016.

³¹⁹ Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, p 9.

³²⁰ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry* as at 26 April 2016.

Recommendation 24 of the Review Report:

Make it a requirement that any greyhound that travels interstate whilst still under the care and control of a Tasmanian licensed person must be notified in advance to stewards (except in the case of a greyhound travelling to fulfil an interstate racing commitment).

9.50 Mr Murray commented on the implementation of this recommendation:

To be actioned in consideration of the outcomes of the various interstate greyhound inquiries once known.³²¹

9.51 In evidence before the Committee Mr Murray outlined the reasoning behind the recommendation:

Mr VALENTINE - Recommendation 24 in your submission - I want to understand a little bit more about this. You say:

Make it a requirement that any greyhound that travels interstate while still under the care and control of a Tasmanian licensed person, must be notified in advance to stewards (except in the case of a greyhound travelling to fulfil an interstate racing commitment).

Why is that put out to the side?

Mr MURRAY - Clearly there were facilities interstate where people would send their greyhounds to be afforded live baiting. We in Tasmania would not know how many greyhounds domiciled in Tasmania were sent to those trial tracks, if any. That recommendation is: we need to know if a greyhound is being sent interstate because we will ask the question about why are you sending it there.

Quite often our greyhounds are of good quality and quite often a trainer will take it over to race on a Saturday night. We know the fields are there. We know the greyhound's gone there; the system will tell us it's gone there. We don't need to track those greyhounds.

Mr VALENTINE - Wouldn't that be the occasion where they would want to go via a live baiting site - prior to racing?

Mr MURRAY - Generally greyhounds are flown in and flown straight back out within a 24-hour period when they race interstate...

...

There is always opportunity, but the trial tracks that were seen on Four Corners were more educational tracks so I would be more concerned about a younger greyhound being educated being sent to one of those tracks. We haven't proceeded. I have spoken to Tasracing about it and it has asked me to clarify

³²¹ Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, p. 9.

why we need a rule such as that. I still think it is something we need to look at, to be able to identify the location of a greyhound at any stage.³²²

9.52 When asked if the recommendation had been endorsed by Government, Mr Murray commented:

*Yes, they have. But after that we can then consult with the key stakeholders. Because they have been endorsed does not mean we do not undertake all that and give people the opportunity to state their case. We are working through those at the moment.*³²³

9.53 Mr Murray further commented:

Mr MURRAY - Somebody who brings a greyhound into Tasmania to train has to put in a kennel notification. We get notified about that. I don't have the figures of how many come across. Generally people will send greyhounds across to Tasmania to increase their racing opportunities - they may not be competitive on the mainland.

Ms RATTRAY - So we've got good trainers?

Mr MURRAY - Yes. I can't give you any figures but they have to formally notify us and put in a kennel notification if they are bringing a greyhound across here.

Ms RATTRAY - If somebody went through all the documentation, we could find out how many we have and somehow you would track down how many were still around?

Mr MURRAY - Yes, we can do that. We do go out and do an audit - and we have started this - of all greyhound properties. The system will say a certain number of greyhounds should be there and we go and do an audit. The first part is to cleanse our data because we have been across three greyhound systems in the last eight years and a lot of the data goes missing. At the moment we are in a process of going out and doing inspections, matching our records to what greyhounds are on the property. Once we do that, we will have more of a process of audit.³²⁴

9.54 The Minister for Racing has advised:

One objective of the GA National Welfare Strategy is that all greyhounds are to be under the care of a Registered Participant at all times during their lifecycle, unless retired as a pet.

The GA Welfare Working Party is developing registration and education requirements for breeders, whelpers, rearers and educators.

³²² Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 53-4

³²³ *Id.*

³²⁴ *Ibid*, p 55

The goal of the national strategy is also to be able to identify where the greyhound is at any particular time during their lifecycle until they retire.

The DOR is keeping a watching brief on these outcomes and will further consider this recommendation in the upcoming months.³²⁵

Recommendation 25 of the Review Report:

Establish a central point of contact, that being the RSPCA, for persons with information in relation to live baiting or any greyhound animal welfare complaints. The contact details of the RSPCA to be included on all greyhound related published documents.

9.55 In his submission Mr Murray advised:

Forms, certificates and other published documents are to be redesigned as a consequence of RST's pending amalgamation with DPIPW (refer recommendation 28) and its rebranding to the Office of Racing Integrity (refer recommendation 29) on 1 July 2015 and will include reference to the RSPCA being the central point of contact.³²⁶

9.56 The Minister for Racing has further advised:

Agreed in consultation with RSPCA during review that it would be central point of contact.

The Office of Racing Integrity forwards all information received with respect to animal welfare concerns to the RSPCA, as well as conducting its own investigations on such matters, as required.³²⁷

Recommendation 26 of the Review Report:

Establish formal Memoranda of Understanding between Racing Services Tasmania, the RSPCA and Tasmania Police for the exchange of information.

9.57 In his submission Mr Murray commented on the implementation of this recommendation:

The Director has commenced dialogue with the Commissioner of Police, Darren Hine, with a formal meeting scheduled for mid-June 2015.

³²⁵ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry* as at 26 April 2016.

³²⁶ Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, p 9.

³²⁷ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry* as at 26 April 2016.

Potential agreement with the RSPCA to be considered in the context of RST's amalgamation with DPIPWE (refer recommendation 28) and the existing arrangements in place between the Department and the RSPCA.³²⁸

9.58 In evidence before the Committee Mr Murray further advised:

CHAIR - What is the latest, Tony, on the recommendation 26 about the memorandum of understanding between Racing Services Tasmania, the RSPCA and Tasmania Police for information exchange?

Mr MURRAY - With the police, I have met with the assistant commissioner. A draft MOU has been exchanged between both parties. I believe that will be signed in the next week. We have provided the RSPCA with a draft in the last - probably 10 days, and we have asked them to come back to us before the end of November. Again, the discussions we have had with the RSPCA have been very cooperative. I believe that that will be signed certainly by the end of this year as well.

I already had an agreement with the Australian Crime Commission in place, an MOU. I would confidently say that within a very short period of time I will have an MOU with the Australian Crime Commission, Tasmania Police and the RSPCA, which means it will be at the highest levels of information exchange and intelligence than ever before, and that can only be a positive for this industry across the three codes.³²⁹

9.59 The Minister for Racing has advised:

MoU between the DOR and RSPCA Tasmania established and executed by the parties on 20 January 2016.

MoU between the DOR and Tasmania Police established and executed by the parties on 16 December 2015.³³⁰

Recommendation 27 of the Review Report:

Consider the establishment of an independent, national animal welfare taskforce to consider jurisdictional findings and to make joint recommendations to state and territory Racing Ministers and Greyhound Australasia.

9.60 In his submission Mr Murray noted:

The Director raised this issue at the Government Racing Officer's meeting in Brisbane on 29 May 2015. In principle support was given for the

³²⁸ Submission 72, Tony Murray, Director of Racing, pp. 9-10

³²⁹ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 20 November 2015, p 21.

³³⁰ Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry as at 26 April 2016.

recommendation to be considered at the next Australasian Racing Ministers Conference in late 2015.³³¹

9.61 The Minister for Racing has advised:

*At the Australasian Racing Ministers' Conference conducted in November 2015, Minister Rockliff raised the issue of having a national approach to the greyhound issues and other integrity matters. It was determined to re-establish a national body of senior government racing officers to review and co-ordinate such matters.*³³²

Recommendation 28 of the Review Report:

Consider the development of an appropriate formal arrangement between the Racing Services Tasmania division of the Department of State Growth and the Biosecurity Tasmania division of the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment.

9.62 The Minister for Racing has advised:

*Racing Services Tasmania (RST) transferred from the Department of State Growth to the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment on 1 July 2015.*³³³

Recommendation 29 of the Review Report:

Rebrand Racing Services Tasmania to the Office of Racing Integrity to emphasise its role and differentiate from the commercial body, Tasracing.

9.63 Racing Services Tasmania was rebranded the Office of Racing Integrity on 1 July 2015.³³⁴

9.64 In evidence before the Committee, Mr Murray commented generally on the rebranding changes and the move to DPIPWE:

As I have said previously, the two new positions, we have moved to the Department of Primary Industries and that is working really well. We are an excellent fit in the Department of Primary Industries. Our name change, as

³³¹ Submission 72, Tony Murray, p 10.

³³² Correspondence received from Hon. Adam Brooks MP, Minister for Racing, undated re the current status of each recommendation of the *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry* as at 26 April 2016.

³³³ *Ibid.*

³³⁴ *Ibid.*

much as it might seem fairly basic, the Office of Racing Integrity has a lot more strength to it.

...

I think people are a lot more understanding of the separation. There have always been issues with people not understanding our role, what is in a name or what is in the name for us as people understand that we are delivering racing integrity and it has been really important in moving forward.³³⁵

Committee findings:

- 9.65 The Committee acknowledges the work being undertaken to implement the recommendations of the *Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry*.
- 9.66 The Committee notes evidence received from Tasmanian participants supporting a lifetime ban for any person found guilty of live baiting, which is contrary to the current position of Greyhounds Australasia.

Recommendation 27: That a lifetime ban be implemented for a person found guilty of live baiting in Tasmania.

³³⁵ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 20 November 2015, p 22.

10 FUTURE OF THE INDUSTRY

- 10.1 The evidence presented to the inquiry indicates the industry has a number of difficult challenges ahead, both in terms of its financial sustainability and its capacity to introduce animal welfare reforms to meet community expectations.
- 10.2 This Chapter considers the relationship between Tasracing, the Office of Racing Integrity and industry participants and the impact such relationships may have on animal welfare outcomes.
- 10.3 This Chapter also considers the impact of judicial decisions on the role and authority of the regulator.
- 10.4 The Chapter further highlights the challenges the industry faces with changing aspects of its culture to improve animal welfare outcomes and attract younger participants.

Relationship between Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity

- 10.5 Tasmania is the only jurisdiction in Australia that separates the commercial/operational functions (Tasracing) and integrity functions (the Office of Racing Integrity).
- 10.6 The Committee received evidence that the Tasmanian model is regarded as best practice and is being considered by other Australian jurisdictions as a possible model.

Tony Murray commented:

The reviews already completed in Victoria and Queensland have identified the need to have integrity operations separate from commercial considerations. Of course that is the model we already have in Tasmania and have had for a period of time.³³⁶

- 10.7 The Committee heard evidence that this model has advantages for improving animal welfare outcomes but it was also identified that the model has created difficulties in the relationship between Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity (previously Racing Services Tasmania). Tony Murray commented:

Mr MURRAY - The relationship can certainly be improved but it doesn't compromise an issue such as animal welfare. As soon as this occurred with the Four Corners program, the two organisations have worked very closely. I keep

³³⁶ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 20 November 2015, p 2.

referring to my opening statement but I tried to cover as much as I could. If you recall in my opening statement, after I appeared before the parliamentary committee in 2011, I said there has been consistent lobbying by the commercial body and some in the industry to respective racing ministers to merge commercial and integrity functions. This has been an ongoing issue between the two organisations, where I have been very definite that integrity should remain separate, for all the reasons I have stated. The commercial body - and it is their right to form an opinion - was of the view that due to economies of scale and other efficiencies that the two bodies could be –

CHAIR - Less of a thorn in their side potentially, too.

Mr MURRAY - That in itself - and you must understand and hopefully it is clear - would cause some discontent between the two bodies. It was an overarching position of complete difference between the two bodies. I for one was never going to waver away from a position that integrity had to be separate. The people around me, whether it be my wife or my workmates or friends, got sick of me talking about it because I was nearly obsessed by it, such was my overall desire to make sure we had the best model here in Tasmania. As I said earlier, now other jurisdictions are looking at our model. Yesterday I was in Victoria talking to the person who is making recommendations to the minister and he wanted to know about our model. I am not saying they are going to go with our model but they are obviously seeing what happens here.

It has created some discontent between the two bodies but I can assure you that when the big issues are here we work well together. My hope and my desire - and I am confident - now that the minister has openly said that integrity will stay separate I think we can put the other issues to one side and reset the relationship and move forward with both of us working very closely together, whilst respecting the boundaries of our individual statutory responsibilities. You can't have it all where we are all going to get on well and agree on everything. We have our respective statutory boundaries, which is absolutely imperative, but the relationship can improve and I am confident it will improve.³³⁷

- 10.8 Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO of Tasracing, advised the Committee that Tasracing had worked closely with the Office of Racing Integrity (previously Racing Services Tasmania) on a range of matters:

CHAIR - What is the communication like between Tasracing and Racing Services Tasmania, because we have it put to us that it is poor at best?

Dr FORBES - There are multiple levels of communication.

CHAIR - Can we talk specifically on animal welfare issues, just sticking to the terms of reference?

Dr FORBES - The animal welfare manual is provided as an appendix and you will notice right through that document that some are Tasracing policies and some

³³⁷ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 50-51.

are Racing Services Tasmania policies. We worked together extensively trying to pull all the policies we had between our two organisations into one booklet - one, as an audit exercise to make sure we have coverage; two, to make sure there is no duplication; and three, to make it accessible to users of the book. There was significant work that went into that at multiple levels through the organisation to agree to the project.

CHAIR - But is there regular high level discussion between yourself, for example, and the Director of Racing Services Tasmania senior people within the two bodies?

Dr FORBES - There is very frequent communication across a whole range of topics right through the organisation. Just through the pure creation of a race day field, for example, for any of the three codes of racing there is regular interplay between both of our staff and the creation of that day for any race day. Then on the actual race day itself there is usually interaction between both sides in an operational sense, and moving forward through to a policy and strategic view, for example, where in the legislation we are required to make the rules with regard to the recommendations of the Director of Racing, the director sits as an observer on the board's subcommittee so that he is across all matters of changes that relate to racing rules and policy.³³⁸

Committee finding:

- 10.9 The Committee notes there are reported tensions between Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity which potentially compromise efforts to improve animal welfare.

Relationship between Industry Participants and Tasracing

- 10.10 The Committee heard from industry participants there were tensions between Tasracing and the industry, including the distribution of funding between the racing codes, the level of consultation and the perceived lack of support provided to the industry, particularly in the wake of the Four Corners program.
- 10.11 Graeme Barber, President of GOTBA, stated the greyhound industry did not receive a fair share of the prize money and this created tensions with Tasracing:

Ms RATTRAY - It has been suggested that Tasracing are not always as approachable and as supportive as the industry would like it to be. Particularly they referred to education around what breeders and trainers and owners and the like might like to do. I have been around this place a while now. I think every second year when we have GBEs we hear the same message. Tasracing always defend themselves very strongly that that is not the case and I always hope that they get better at it for the next time around. How are things travelling within the industry? Do you think there is enough support from

³³⁸ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 35-36

Tasracing? - other than that they are not getting enough money, and we hear that as well.

Mr BARBER - The money is the issue.

Ms RATTRAY - You think the support is not there because the money is not there?

Mr BARBER - Yes, but I can only speak from my personal point of view. Tasracing and Dr Eliot Forbes, the CEO, chairs four quarterly meetings of what is referred to as the Greyhound Reference Group. That is made up of participants from the three racing clubs, Devonport, Launceston and Hobart and also from our association. That meets four times a year in a full-day forum and we are able to raise our particular issues with Tasracing in that forum. If we have anything else that comes up between meetings we have a greyhound liaison officer at Tasracing who we can approach for answers or input. I have had a number of meetings with Eliot Forbes outside of those meetings.

The greyhound industry doesn't - and I agree with it - think that we get a fair cut of the prize money because of our improved growth in betting turnover - and unfortunately that is what we operate on, betting turnover.

Ms RATTRAY - Which is about 40 per cent of the pool now, is that right?

Mr BARBER - No, I wish it was.

Ms RATTRAY - Your cut is only 19 per cent, but you contribute 40 per cent.

Mr BARBER - Yes, we are contributing about 40 per cent of the betting pool, you're quite right.

Ms RATTRAY - Greyhounds contribute 40 per cent and they get 19 per cent back.

Mr BARBER - Yes, so each time that we've gone to the table asking for more money there are reasons why there can't be any more money. We accept those reasons, but we're not happy about them.³³⁹

10.12 June Phillips, owner and breeder, stated:

- All Tasracing do is make the rules and the integrity arm implement them. There is no communication between them making the rules and discussion with the industry. That is from the entire industry; the majority of them feel that way.³⁴⁰

.....

³³⁹ Graeme Barber, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 39-40

³⁴⁰ June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, p 12-13

... there is no communication between the industry and Tasracing. There is just none. I would go 12 months and you would get no correspondence - nothing from them whatsoever. I do not believe they do anything for greyhound racing at all. I think they should be out there educating people on what a greyhound is so that people want a greyhound as a pet, and they don't do any of that. They leave it to the GAP program and Facebook...³⁴¹

10.13 In response Dr Forbes commented:

Dr FORBES - I met Mrs Phillips last week and she made a comment like that to me. I asked her if she was a member of a club and she said that she is a member of the Launceston Greyhound Club. It is interesting given that she lives in Hobart. She is represented at the Greyhound Reference Group by the members of the Launceston Greyhound Committee. It is up to those committee members to engage with their constituents. If there are matters that they wanted to take to them, or they might feel through normal discussions on race night that they can represent those views. We spoke to her about formal notifications of rules or policies and changes. The industry publication is called the state-wide form guide. That is the form for the races each week and it is also the primary vehicle to publish greyhound industry notices.

CHAIR - How often does that come out?

Dr FORBES - Every week. We publish all the key information there. She said, 'I do not buy this statewide form guide'. I said, 'It is also available online for free'. When you are a racing participant and a licensed person, it is your responsibility to make yourself aware of the rules and policies. As long as we have gone through a process of publishing and promulgating them in an appropriate matter. If somebody wants to put the shutters down, we cannot talk to everybody across the whole industry across the whole state. There are formal, structured consultation processes in place. If people wish to be engaged they need to talk to their representatives who attend those meetings.³⁴²

10.14 John Newson, Chairman of the Launceston Greyhound Racing Club, stated that the industry expected more support from Tasracing:

Mr GAFFNEY - Because there has been bad press, mainly because of the Four Corners program, have you thought about doing some sort of media marketing campaign to show what your property is like with the dogs you have, and how the industry runs? That it is family friendly? It might be too soon. Have you discussed how you can get out there and market greyhound racing?

Mr NEWSON - We were advised by Tasracing's media people to not say anything. We were expecting them to support the industry and they have not said a word.

CHAIR - Why do you think that is?

³⁴¹ *Ibid*, p 12

³⁴² Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 30 November 2015, pp 20-21

Mr NEWSON - They must have had some media consultant advising them. I don't know. I cannot comment on that. We were expecting them to come out and publicly support our industry, especially when the first inquiry was held. We were expecting them to make some comment on that, but we never heard anything. I don't know what goes on there. The industry has a lot of issues with Tasracing.³⁴³

- 10.15 Tasracing advised the Committee that it consulted regularly with the industry. In evidence, Dr Eliot Forbes considered he had a good working relationship with the industry:

Dr FORBES - We meet with the industry every 12 weeks and have a very structured consultation framework. I chair the meetings personally and I have that meeting with the greyhound group, the harness group, and then the thoroughbred group separately. I would hazard a guess that we do more consultation in this state than any other racing authority right across Australia.

Ms RATTRAY - What are the outcomes from that consultation? I have heard since I have been in this place - and it is a fair while now - that there is a lot of consultation, but it is the outcomes, it is what hits the ground after the consultations that interests me. I am more interested in that than I am in the process around consultation.

Dr FORBES - The process then leads to the outcomes and the outcomes are documented in the minutes. There is usually a big long list of action items for ourselves and sometimes the clubs and the attendees at the meetings to move forwards.³⁴⁴

- 10.16 Greyhounds Australasia considered the relationship between Tasracing and the industry was generally good. In evidence before the Committee, Scott Parker, CEO of Greyhounds Australasia, considered the model used by Tasracing to consult with the industry was one of the best in Australia:

Ms RATTRAY - In your submission on page 8 you say:

'Tasracing understands the importance of generating participant support to achieve industry alignment within change ... the participant consultation model is one of the best in Australia.'

We have heard to the contrary from industry players regarding that. Where did you get that information from? Is that just Tasracing telling you they are doing a good job? Where did you actually get that feedback?

Mr PARKER - I have been to one of the consultation meetings and I was impressed with the way Dr Forbes chaired it and Mr Wesley co-chaired it on that occasion, so I have seen it –

³⁴³ John Newson, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, p 14

³⁴⁴ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, p 32

.....
Ms RATTRAY - Were you at all interested or wondered why Racing Services as the integrity arm were not part of that consultation meeting, given that they have such a key role with the industry?

Mr PARKER - That was a determination of Dr Forbes and his team. No doubt the consultation with Racing Services Tasmania is occurring in other forums as required, but I could not really speak to that. From what I saw, there was a good level of engagement around the table. I understand it happens, from memory, monthly, if not –

Ms RATTRAY - It is four times a year by legislative requirement, actually.

Mr PARKER - It occurs in the middle of the state where everybody is reasonably accessible. The agenda was full. The manner that everybody undertook the discussions and the representative nature of those attending was good. I cannot speak for the veracity of all controlling bodies' consultation programs to any great extent. To an extent, I relied upon Dr Forbes' description to me of his best efforts in that regard.³⁴⁵

Committee finding:

- 10.17 The Committee finds there is a lack of effective consultation and communication with industry participants by Tasracing.

Recommendation 28: That Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity review their current communication methods to effectively engage with industry participants to improve animal welfare.

Impact of judicial decisions on the regulator's role

- 10.18 The Director of Racing made comment regarding the regulator's role:

The job of the regulator continues to be more and more difficult. Not only are they constantly seeking to identify and prosecute those persons not operating within the rules, but they are faced with an ever-changing environment where those of a mind to gain and benefit from unfair advantage continue to push the envelope to boundaries not seen previously. It is getting more and more difficult to catch those of a mind to do the wrong thing. We only need to look at the evolution of the drugs in use, synthetic drugs. The regulator forever is playing a catch-up game. It is becoming more and more difficult because people are becoming more and more smart about cover up and stay ahead of the regulator. Of course, after the regulator has done all their work, gained conclusive proof of a wrongdoing and imposed the necessary penalties, their decisions can be set aside by an appeal board until such time as a hearing is

³⁴⁵ Scott Parker, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 18-19

conducted. Even then, quite often at the appeal hearing the penalty is significantly reduced.

There are two things that can happen. A regulator has to go through a whole range of processes to prove a person guilty under the rules. They then consider the penalty. That person can appeal to an appeal board and at the stroke of a pen can be given a stay of proceedings and continue to operate within that industry until such time as the appeal is heard. Sometimes it is soon, sometimes it is quite a period of time.

.....
... decisions can be set aside by an appeal board until such time as a hearing is conducted. Even then, quite often, at the appeal hearing the penalty is significantly reduced.

Quite rightly, the decision of the regulator must be subject to an independent review. However, the question must be asked as to whether the body undertaking the review properly understands the concept of a privilege of a licence, the agreement of the licensed person to abide by the rules, and most importantly, the fact that the penalty should not only be a deterrent to those of a mind to do the wrong thing but equally as important, a recognition of those who operate within the rules and justifiably seek a level playing field.

Racing regulators strive to ensure the integrity, safety and welfare of the industry. The majority of the industry supports the regulator in achieving these outcomes. We, as regulators, must be accountable and transparent in our decision-making and we respect that our decisions can be reviewed. But as much as the industry expects the regulator to deliver outcomes consistent with high levels of integrity, safety and welfare, it is not unreasonable that the industry, the community and the regulator expect appeal boards to do the same.³⁴⁶

10.19 The Director of Racing considered a number of changes could be made to support the regulator in penalising industry participants who breach the Rules:

... Even this week in Victoria, decisions were handed down in relation to cobalt usage and one person got three years and one person got five years disqualification. They have appealed to the High Court - Beacon? I think it is - so they have been granted a stay until Tuesday until such time as consideration of their appeal is given.

So straight away, steward discipline has been ongoing for the stewards in Victoria for many, many months. They come to a decision, they disqualify the persons but it has been set aside. It is quite common. I have difficulty with it and people say that everyone is entitled to a presumption of innocence. Well, first of all, stewards do not lightly come to a decision of guilt. Whenever there is a balance there, they will always be conservative in their decision-making. They will generally be quite certain that a person is guilty. We are not talking

³⁴⁶ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 20 November 2015, pp 2-4.

about whether they are guilty of careless riding, careless driving or what would be deemed as a traffic offence in terms of the running of a race, we are talking about a drug case -

Mr BACON - Deliberate cheating.

Mr MURRAY - Deliberate cheating.

Mrs TAYLOR - And factual, you have facts to back them, you have data.

Mr MURRAY - When we reach a conclusion in those terms, it is after a great deal of investigation. People say you are entitled to a presumption of innocence. If I look at the laws of the land, it is not uncommon for a person charged with a serious offence to be refused bail. They may at a later time be found not guilty and they would have served some time in custody when they were not guilty. The same could occur in the racing industry but when you have a high-level offence and you believe that it warrants disqualification from the industry, one has to think about whether that is reasonable then to allow that person to continue on.

Mr BACON - It is only for high-level offences, like very serious ones?

Mr MURRAY - A stay can be granted under any circumstances. If a jockey is suspended on Wednesday night at the races for three race meetings when they want to ride next Wednesday they might seek a stay of proceedings to allow them to continue that activity. That is a different type of stay from a serious offence, which has resulted in disqualification. Disqualification means a person cannot undertake any activity to do with the racing industry, whatsoever. That is a most serious offence. A stay of proceedings means that decision is set aside, and you can continue to undertake whatever activity is allowed by your licence.

CHAIR - What do you think would be the mechanism for ensuring the rules of racing, the integrity of the industry, and the decisions that are made by stewards are effective? When a steward, or the integrity body, makes a decision about a serious offence, how do we make sure that it has weight and meaning in terms of animal welfare and standards for the industry? I have looked at appeal board decisions, and almost without exception, the penalties are substantially reduced, if not - in some cases - dismissed on appeal.

Mr MURRAY - We are looking at two things. The stay I was talking about - if you are talking about the penalty itself -

CHAIR - If there is a disqualification, what is the mechanism? Is it regulation? Is it the rules of racing?

Mr MURRAY - Within thoroughbreds, and to a degree, harness, they are going to minimum penalties, which is a good thing. If we find someone guilty for a particular offence listed within the rules, there is a minimum penalty. We need to move forward with that. It is a difficult thing, because that reduces the flexibility given to stewards. Some might argue it reduces the flexibility of a person who believes they are not guilty, or have been too severely penalised. It may hinder their right to a hearing where that penalty may be reduced.

I accept the fact that an independent appeal board can review all the facts of the case and can come to a different determination of the stewards. That is reasonable, as long as their reasons are in a manner that supports the facts of the case. Regulators, stewards, Australia wide - a common theme would be when we do all the work, we are looking for some support when it goes to appeal. Not to be proven right all the time, but when we have done our job well and identified a high-level integrity issue that warrants disqualification, it is not just service of deterrent to those doing the wrong thing. It is very important we state the majority of the industry are fair-minded, reasonable persons who seek a level playing field. We should not tarnish the rest of the industry by the actions of a few. But as much as it is a deterrent to those wishing to do the wrong thing, it should also be a recognition of those who are doing the right thing. People who are doing the right thing want us, as regulators, to catch - and I will use the word - those cheats, and they want us to punish them severely. Even after they serve their disqualification, we are faced with, 'Do we allow them back into the industry?' If we choose not to allow them back to the industry, they then have a right to appeal and will probably come in through the appeal mechanism.

There have been people to whom I have said 'No' for Licensing Tasmania, who have been serial offenders, who have gone to other jurisdictions to seek a licence. In whatever way, there should be more support for the regulator. It would be not only supported by industry, but by the wider community.

CHAIR - *I am trying to get to the bottom of what you mean by more support.*

Mr MURRAY - *More support could be legislative amendment in relation to stays, for example. That is one option, a stay of proceedings in serious cases.*

CHAIR - *Is that a change to the Animal Welfare Act, or a change to the racing regulations?*

Mr MURRAY - *It is a change to the regulations. That is one example. At the moment, it is at the discretion of the chairman of the board as to whether a stay is granted. Often, stewards will submit that they oppose a stay, and we are then provided a decision. The appellant is given the chance to put their case, and a decision is made. The presumption of innocence is important because an appeal board has to look at matters to determine whether the steward has it right or not. In very serious matters, if I take drug cases, the rule is absolute. You are guilty of an offence across the three codes if you present a racing animal not free of prohibited substances. It is absolute. Your discretion generally comes into what the penalty will be. If you have an absolute rule to say, if it is proven through analytical analysis by, generally, two approved laboratories, why would you allow that person to continue operating within the industry until such time³⁴⁷*

10.20 The Director of Racing also commented on the weakening of penalties issued on appeal:

³⁴⁷ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 20 November 2015, pp. 4-6.

Mrs RYLAH - I have a question in regard to the comment that you made and that I have also heard, that the stewards do a job and may find that someone is at fault according to the rules of racing. They go to the judiciary and then I think the words that were said to me were, 'The person ends up with a slap on the hand'. There is a breakdown between the racing regulations and the judiciary in terms of the significance of the penalty that is applied. Can you just confirm that that is what you are saying or do you have a different interpretation perhaps?

Mr MURRAY - That is basically what I was saying. In my opening statement I said, 'In such circumstances it does raise the question of how the regulator got it so wrong. Alternatively, one could reasonably ask whether the judicial body actually understands the expectations of participants, regulators and importantly, the wider community.' If I could take the committee through a couple of major welfare decisions in recent times. Stewards disqualified trainer Ricki Donaldson for seven years. That got reduced to two years on appeal. The current trial track –

Mr BACON - What was the offence there?

Mr MURRAY - The offence was 'an act detrimental to the industry'. The reasons for the decision are out, they are on the public record. I am a little bit hesitant because the matter is still before the courts. I don't want to go into it other than to get the outcome.

In the matter of the Carrick trial track stewards, disqualified the owner of the property for two-and-a-half years. That was reduced to one year.

In the matter of Ted Medhurst, one of our leading trainers, in terms of shooting 11 greyhounds and falsifying records, stewards disqualified him for eight years and it was reduced to three years on appeal.

CHAIR - It is interesting because when you have a look at the court judgements, without exception, from the research my office did, on appeal all the sentences were significantly reduced.

Mr MURRAY - They are the cases that have been serious welfare issues in greyhound racing. I go back to my opening statement. Either we, as stewards, regulators, did get it wrong or one might say there is a lack of understanding at that level of welfare issues. The appeal board must be independent. They are a statutory board and I ought not and I will not publicly criticise them or try to influence them. However, the facts are there in terms of the major welfare matters that have come before them over the last years.³⁴⁸

10.21 On the issue of reducing penalties, the Director of Racing noted:

Mr GAFFNEY - You alluded to the concern of a determination the stewards and the regulatory body made about somebody who may contravene the rules and regulations - like eight years, and it got dropped down to three years by the justice. So every time it was appealed there has been a substantive decrease in

³⁴⁸ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 41-42

the penalty. Surely that is a discussion that your group must have with justice about how you feel. If you guys are setting the standard at eight years, and then it is appealed and gets downgraded to three years, that is not a reflection on your industry; it is a reflection on the justice. To me that is not your concern unless you want to approach them and say, 'We do all this work and it is perceived that you are being a bit soft'. But that happens, as Cassy said before, nearly every time someone has appealed. What is your organisation going to do to chat to the justice about that area?

Mr MURRAY - There is the mandatory consultation with the appeal board - six monthly. I have raised it. At one stage I probably went too far because I said to the chairman, 'Do you see your role to tinker with penalties?', because there seemed to be more and more of that happening. It was probably inappropriate for me to say it and I backtracked a little when I said that. We have to be very careful to maintain that separation. There was a recent one which was well publicised in relation to cobalt. I was absolutely concerned about the welfare of particular horses under the care of the trainer and jockeys against whom those horses would be competing. I took the strongest action only to have it overturned by the appeal board. This is not to say they got it wrong; maybe I got it wrong. But I and our stewards will continue to send a clear message about where we believe welfare should sit and where we believe that the penalty should sit for those who offend. We are not going to be changing our decision or penalties based on what might happen in another arena. We will continue to send a message on what we believe is the penalty that fits the crime.³⁴⁹

Committee findings:

- 10.22 The Committee notes the concern raised by the Director of Racing, in relation to 'stays of proceedings' for serious offences.
- 10.23 The Committee notes the Director of Racing considers Tasmania should adopt minimum penalties for certain offences.

Recommendation 29: That the Minister for Racing instigate a review of existing penalties and appeal provisions to determine whether changes should be introduced, particularly pertaining to issues of animal welfare.

Industry culture

- 10.24 The Committee heard there are aspects of the industry that need cultural change. Dr Andrewartha commented:

...It is an industry with an older demographic and we are talking about a dog that originally was bred to chase and hunt prey. Whilst I have not heard it directly, I could accept that there would be a thinking that blooding a dog would make it run better. There is a chance that we have got a culture like that here. If they saw dogs from the mainland they thought had been blooded, running better, then yes, they would look at it. This is what we put in the

³⁴⁹ *Ibid*, pp 49-50

report, that the industry has to have the culture that this in unacceptable. You can train a dog to run on true merit by training it to an artificial lure.

It is a cultural thing. We are dealing with an older demographic where change is a little bit harder. I suspect that sort of thinking you are trying to outline is there and it is important for the industry to ensure they have a culture where that sort of thinking does not occur. They have really got to be open and transparent with the public to show that their culture would not allow that sort of thinking.³⁵⁰

10.25 Scott Parker also considered there was a need for cultural change in the industry:

CHAIR - A final question, and it comes back to the reason we have established this inquiry, how catalytic do you think the Four Corners program has been for driving some of the changes we are seeing in the industry now and some of the work Greyhounds Australasia has been doing to affect that cultural change?
.....

Mr PARKER - ... You would be aware that I was identified as a suitable spokesperson on behalf of the industry because it was considered at the time a national issue, which it ended up being. When I was interviewed for Four Corners I wasn't aware of the footage. I had seen or heard no allegations. One of our controlling authorities had asked for footage of live baiting from the program and they said, 'We've got no footage you would be interested in or need to know about'. So until I was interviewed on the Thursday before the program went to air on the Monday it was only on the Wednesday when the RSPCA and state police raided the three different properties that we understood the program was significantly about live baiting. To that point and beyond, I have been assured that none of the controlling bodies of GA had any evidence whatsoever that that existed and that was the message they felt comfortable in delivering through me.

Back to your question, when I arrived I put a paper together that there was every likelihood this industry's sustainability was under threat in much the same way as the live cattle export industry was in 2011 for failure to build this social licence to operate. The industry has said and done some good things. It has said welfare is its number one priority and has done some good things to that effect but it really did rely on its legal licence and regulatory framework supporting it to undertake the work it was primarily responsible for, and that was putting on a good show and maximising wagering returns to the government. I think I brought to their attention, and the research study supported it by the end of last year that building this social licence to operate was at least as important an objective of all our controlling bodies and it became my number one objective in my role. Lo and behold, this broke earlier in the year and we have been managing the crisis, and now we are managing a crisis recovery program particularly around zero euthanasia reducing over-breeding and vastly improving our re-homing efforts through these 17 levers that we have identified.

³⁵⁰ Dr Rod Andrewartha, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 70-71

There is absolutely no doubt that the program, with its shocking images, and not just the images but the callous attitude of some of those depicted, meant we had to sit back and say if this is representative of what is going on out there it's a disgrace and we've clearly not met the expectations of not just the public but of each other and those who were doing the right thing and sought entry into the industry. They would look at that and say, 'If that's evidence of what is going on out there, I don't want to be part of it', and the industry would be the loser for not having them involved now and in the future. It has absolutely heightened awareness on welfare generally, but more particularly getting down to the tin tacks of what the problems are, acknowledging them publicly and privately, and going about improvement in a systematic way. Everyone would love to say that within three months the problems will be solved but unfortunately that is just not achievable. Some of these things are ingrained culturally, some require inquiries such as this to run its course and recommend change that Tasracing or Racing Services Tasmania will be receptive to and accept.

The same problem has existed in Queensland and Victoria where they have only just had recommendations released and in part are still waiting on government responses, and then there is the New South Wales situation where an inquiry has only just started. We have been working around those impediments to urgent change, but I set out on page 7 of my submission that 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 is a systematic way of going about a crisis recovery effort focused primarily around reducing over-breeding and improving re-homing performance while at the same time ensuring we are absolutely transparent in what we are trying to achieve and how we are going about achieving it.

Having groups such as Animals Australia keeps us honest. We are duty bound to publish the results of our efforts at regular intervals and have groups such as Animals Australia comment on it as part of hopefully an agreement we can reach with them on what are satisfactory achievements towards zero euthanasia over the next five years.³⁵¹

10.26 June Phillips, owner and breeder, commented:

Mrs RYLAH - How many dogs would you have bred, June?

Ms PHILLIPS - We usually breed one litter about every two years.

Mrs RYLAH - About 120?

Ms PHILLIPS - Yes, possibly 120.

Mrs RYLAH - Do you sell the dogs?

Ms PHILLIPS - No, we keep and race our own and then we put them into GAP. I started GAP in Australia, with my husband and VIP Pet Foods, and half a dozen vets gave me money to insure it. I think I was paying \$100 to have the dogs

³⁵¹ Scott Parker, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 24-26

desexed. This is while I was still chairman of greyhounds because I was also deputy chair of Greyhounds Australasia and I would get up and start talking about animal welfare and there were 15 men and me.

CHAIR - Good on you, June.

Ms PHILLIPS - I would start talking about welfare and they would put it to the bottom of the agenda every single time, every year. In the end I got really angry one day. I can still remember it. I stood up and screamed at them all and they listened and started talking about welfare because this was always going to happen.

Mrs RYLAH - When was that? When did that occur?

Ms PHILLIPS - This was about 2002 or 2003 that we started changing things.

CHAIR - What were some of your animal welfare issues at the time that made you feel so passionately about change?

Ms PHILLIPS - I have always felt passionately about greyhounds. A percentage of people don't feel they're a pet as well. To me you can have a greyhound get off the couch and go out to the track and win a race, but you get a lot of the older generation who believe that you don't pat them, but gradually that is changing and it has to change. There has to be the care of the greyhound first. It has to be paramount.³⁵²

Committee findings:

- 10.27 The Committee finds there is heightened concern within the community for animal welfare and this concern has also been recognised within the industry.
- 10.28 The Committee finds there has been an improvement in both regulation and animal welfare standards adopted by Tasracing and supported by the industry.
- 10.29 The Committee finds that ongoing cultural change within the industry is required to improve animal welfare outcomes.

Community expectations

- 10.30 The Committee heard that one of the challenges facing the industry is ensuring that it meets community expectations. Tony Murray commented:

Greyhound racing has traditionally been viewed as the most affordable racing code with comparatively low set-up, breeding, rearing and training costs. One would think that such a model would lend itself to a high level of participation

³⁵² June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 2-3

and attract the next generation of enthusiasts; however, nothing can be further from the truth. The average age of greyhound participants in Tasmania is: a public trainer, 58; an owner-trainer, 56, an attendant, 51; an owner-attendant, 47; a catcher, 45; an owner, 50; and a syndicate member, 46. These figures clearly demonstrate that the industry has not been replenishing and as such it has long-term participants, many of whom have been in the industry for decades. The majority of the participants are genuine, caring people with a love for their animals, but many of the current participants were involved in the industry at a time when animal welfare was spoken about but not necessarily acted upon. Quite rightly, general community expectations with regard to animal welfare have developed and matured. However, unfortunately, we now have an industry that due largely to its demographic is often not meeting those community expectations.³⁵³

10.31 Dr Sally-Anne Richter commented:

CHAIR - The review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry final report makes this statement:
'The panel believes that no level of regulation or compliance inspection could absolutely ensure that live baiting was not occurring. The motivation to make sure it does not occur must come from the industry participants and there must be a degree of self-regulation.'

Do you have a comment to make on that statement?

Dr RICHTER - We always have rules and regulations in place and, unfortunately, we are all human and there is always a chance someone will break those rules. It is important the regulations continue to improve and look out for those things, and the AVA supports that. It is a changing industry. The community's perception of animal welfare is changing constantly and it is important the industry moves with that perception and ensures it is doing the best practices for the greyhounds involved.³⁵⁴

10.32 Research conducted by Greyhounds Australasia (GA) in 2014 identified reputational risk to the industry regarding animal welfare:

GA understands the value of having not just a legal licence to operate but also a social licence to operate.

GA's recent leadership in the critical areas of greyhound welfare and industry integrity stems from the Board's commitment to expanding its influence from its traditional areas of annual national rule changes, greyhound naming, DNA kit distribution, frozen semen insemination database management and production of the industry's stud book.

In the second half of 2014, before the Four Corners program "Making a Killing" aired, GA researched internal and external stakeholder perceptions of the

³⁵³ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 36

³⁵⁴ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 11

Australasian greyhound industry and identified the most significant issues facing the industry based on the gap that existed between stakeholder expectations of industry performance and their perception of industry performance.

The research identified that there were two contributors to reputation risk to the industry – the technical risks (or hazards) and the outrage (or emotional reaction) to industry events. The hazards were the tangible evidence of welfare and integrity measures such as the quality of kennels, compliance regimes, the drug testing program, licensing policies and the design of race tracks. The research identified that the industry was reasonably well advanced in identifying and managing these hazards. The research found that the industry was less well advanced in its capacity to identify and manage the outrage triggers. It found that stakeholders had, and were likely to have, very significant and negative emotional responses to a perceived lack of industry representativeness, trust and certainty.

Dr Forbes was one of nine GA Directors interviewed for this study.

GA Directors identified the following as the industry's key issues:

1. Disposal of pre-raced racing greyhounds
2. Disposal of retired greyhounds
3. Perception of race fixing/doping
4. Injuries to greyhounds
5. Perception of criminal activity
6. Exports of Australian greyhounds

10.33 There was a strong community response to the ABC's *Four Corners* program which aired in February 2015. GA further commented:

GA Directors did not identify live baiting as in the top six industry issues and the Board and management were deeply shocked when evidence to the contrary emerged.

Highly involved external stakeholders (animal rights and welfare groups and social welfare groups) identified the following as the industry's key issues:

1. Perceptions of race fixing/doping
2. Injuries to greyhounds
3. Disposal of pre-raced greyhounds
4. Disposal of retired greyhounds

Animal rights and welfare groups did not identify live baiting in its top four industry issues.

The community identified the following as the industry's key issues:

1. Responsible gambling
2. Disposal of pre-raced greyhounds
3. Training conditions
4. Living conditions

The community did not identify live baiting in its top four issues.

Animal welfare was identified as by far the most significant industry issue with the potential for animal rights and welfare groups driving negative reputation for the industry through triggering moral outrage in the public over issues such as the volume or methods used to discard dogs.

GA Directors believed that the biggest gaps between its expectations of itself and how it rated its performance were on the issues of disposal of pre-raced greyhounds, the disposal of retired greyhounds and the exportation of Australian greyhounds.

Those external stakeholders most highly involved in the industry believed that we were furthest away from meeting their expectations on the matters of export and living conditions. These stakeholders believed the industry should be attaining perfect or near perfect performance on both these matters.

The community had relatively low expectations of the industry in comparison with the industry's own expectation and those of highly involved animal welfare, animal rights and social welfare groups. The biggest gaps were on the issues of disposal of pre-raced greyhounds and export.

The study, completed in December 2014, noted the potential for community shock and significant outrage if NGOs successfully targeted the industry and highlighted certain facts with graphic images in the way that occurred with live export.

The absence of live baiting as a significant issue for the industry to manage may be put down to a lack of evidence that the practice existed both from within controlling bodies (as reflected in the responses of the GA Directors who are either controlling body Chairs or CEOs) and outside the industry including those most highly involved in our future – the animal rights and welfare groups.

Building on this research, and on the back of evidence that live baiting exists, or has recently existed, in the industry, GA has helped controlling bodies plan their industry recovery strategy designed to restore public and government confidence and build its social licence to operate. The key components of those plans are:

1. Changing the industry culture to one of respect (for all animals, authority and each other)
2. Committing to a significant program of reform that eradicates live baiting and eliminates the unnecessary euthanasia of greyhounds
3. Building credibility (by generating reform agreements with our most significant critics)
4. Establishing and committing to a national industry vision
5. Aligning industry participants on the case for change
6. Improving transparency (by publishing animal welfare performance against metrics agreed to by those same critics and government)

7. Keeping the public and governments informed of progress.³⁵⁵

10.34 In evidence before the Committee, Scott Parker commented on the dilemma facing the industry:

Generally, the national industry accepts that it has not met community expectations on the key issue of animal welfare, despite efforts over many years to improve welfare performance. Notably, since 1975, the number of greyhounds whelped has reduced substantially by 50 per cent, from over 36 000 to about 18 000 currently. Starting with Victoria in 1998, the Greyhound Adoption Program is now in all states and territories bar the ACT, which has formally undertaken re-homing activities.

Despite those efforts and the efforts as recently as last May where the GA board, on behalf of all controlling authorities, adopted a national greyhound welfare strategy, implementing eight key strategies over three years, each to contribute to a further national improvement in greyhound welfare outcomes, and despite a significant research study into what the industry needed to do to build its social licence to operate, it still accepts there is a dilemma in both achieving welfare outcomes that are acceptable to the community and an industry that meets its wagering commitments and its commitments to all other stakeholders. It has accepted that challenge both before and particularly after the Four Corners episode that is the cause of us meeting here today.³⁵⁶

10.35 Tasracing also acknowledged the need for the industry to meet community expectations:

...the industry nationally acknowledges that it has failed to keep pace with changing community expectations.

Tasracing and GA appreciates the legitimate community concerns on the issue. Importantly, the industry has accepted responsibility for solving this problem.

Tasracing recognises that there will always be a diversity of views in the community as they relate to greyhound racing and breeding. For example, some sectors of the community will view greyhounds as working dogs, bred for a purpose, like police dogs, sniffer dogs, guide dogs or hunting hounds. They are not pets but, if for any reason they are not suitable for the purpose for which they were bred, they are excluded from the industry.

By contrast, some members of the community reject the use of any animal for man-made purposes including livestock for production, beasts of burden, working or entertainment animals.

The greyhound racing and breeding industry must ensure that its practices broadly match community expectations, and at all times ensure that these

³⁵⁵ Submission 37, Greyhounds Australasia, pp 5-7.

³⁵⁶ Scott Parker, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 15-16

*practices are lawful, respectful and maintain the dignity of the animals in the sport.*³⁵⁷

- 10.36 Tony Murray considered that industry participants are only part of the solution in meeting community expectations:

*... The Four Corners program has catapulted the greyhound industry into the public view. It is the outcry from the general community which has quite rightly questioned the relevance of greyhound racing in modern society and whether the industry can at any time in the future meet reasonable community expectations in relation to the welfare of the animal. I have deliberately used the terminology 'at any time in the future' because there is no doubt whatsoever that currently industry behaviour and community expectations are a considerable distance apart. It is easy to form the view that greyhound participants are to blame for the current situation. Such a conclusion is, however, flawed as participants are only part of the puzzle. As well as participants, regulators, commercial bodies, governments, wagering operators, appeal boards and courts must also shoulder some of the blame.*³⁵⁸

Committee findings:

- 10.37 The Committee finds the industry has acknowledged it has not kept pace with changing community expectations.
- 10.38 The Committee notes the community expects the greyhound racing industry to continue to monitor and improve animal welfare outcomes.
- 10.39 The Committee notes the important role played by not only industry participants but also entities such as regulators, commercial bodies, governments, wagering operators, appeal boards and courts in achieving ongoing reform.

Recommendation 30: That the Government establish standards and identify benchmarks for improving animal welfare outcomes to be reported in Tasracing's annual report.

Attracting young participants

- 10.40 The Committee also heard that one of the challenges facing the industry and its long term sustainability is the need to attract young participants. Graeme Barber commented:

Mr GAFFNEY - *I wanted a little more information about the profile of the industry itself and where it is going. There were 493 participants involved in the sport in 2013. Is that just owners, trainers, breeders or is that people at the track, the officials or is it just the industry itself?*

³⁵⁷ Submission 36, Tasracing, p 6.

³⁵⁸ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 36

Mr BARBER - No, it's people in the industry itself. It is owners, trainers, breeders, handlers, et cetera

Mr GAFFNEY - The demographics of that group - we have heard about elderly people who have been interested in greyhounds for a long time. Is there a younger contingent coming through? I am trying to get an understanding of where the industry is going? Is it fading out or is there youth coming through to sustain it?

Mr BARBER - That is a very good point. The demography of owners, trainers and breeders age wise - there are a number of older people in the industry. I am talking about a number of people in their 80s that are still active participants in the industry. How many young people do we have coming through? Not enough, in my opinion.

We have a number of young people coming into ownership of greyhounds, whether it be in syndicates or outright ownership. We have Thursday night meetings at the race track and a number of different groups come along and use it as a social activity and a fundraising event. We see a number of young people there and it is great to see them turn up to the races, but generally the training group is an ageing group. There does not seem to be the financial incentive for younger people to outlay the funds required.

To be a trainer nowadays - it is difficult to train out of a backyard in suburbia where you are only allowed to have two dogs. You need a property of some acreage. I am on a property of seven acres and I have spent too much money setting up infrastructure for the industry, but it is my hobby and passion and that is why I do it. What sort of return have I got on my investment? It is a hobby. Younger people probably don't have the support or someone behind them to properly set up for the industry.³⁵⁹

10.41 Anthony Bullock noted:

...The biggest thing in Tasmania is that we are probably the weakest state in numbers of people and dogs, whereas Victoria has 30 tracks and thousands of trainers. We only have 100 trainers.

CHAIR - About 100 in Tasmania?

Mr BULLOCK - Maximum, and getting older and older. I am probably the third or fourth youngest and I am 50.

CHAIR - Do you think there is a generational shift in the industry in Tasmania, so you are seeing fewer people going into it, which is also another issue around its viability?

Mr BULLOCK - It is because the owners are not worried about the dog. The trainers are worried about the dog. The owners are only worried about a good dog. The trainer is worried about all his dogs. You have a different split. You

³⁵⁹ Graeme Barber, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, 33-34

can get 20-year-olds to buy a dog but you will not get 20-year-olds to train a dog. My partner and I spend 100 hours a week each.

CHAIR - I think it was Graeme Barber who said that it is not a business that you go into if you want to make a lot of money, and for some people it's a hobby. Would you agree with that?

Mr BULLOCK - Definitely. Probably 90 per cent of the trainers in Tasmania breed to race and to own their own dogs. There are only probably three trainers in the state that have their own dogs and take other people's dogs. I am one of them...³⁶⁰

10.42 Concerns were also raised that the increasing regulation of the industry was deterring people from joining the industry. In evidence before the Committee John Newson commented:

CHAIR - Do you think there really is a risk of the industry failing?

Mr NEWSON - All these new regulations that have come in have turned a lot of people off it. People who are participating now are saying, 'Why do we have to do this? Why do we have to have this done?' In years gone by it wasn't as regulated but now it is becoming very regulated.

CHAIR - Which is in line with community expectations. It is the evolution.

Mr NEWSON - I work in the construction industry. I know what has happened. I have worked for myself for 35 years. I know what I have had to go through with OH&S and workplace safety. I go to some jobs now to work on something and say, 'Is it really worth coming to do this job?' For what you have to go through to get started, is it really worth it?

That is what some of these participants are saying now: 'Is it really worth it? I might finish now with what I've got. I won't bother buying any more pups. I won't bother breeding any more litters. I do not know what the future is going to be like.' That is the expectation now, from the general public. That is how things are done now. They have to be done to the letter. That is life now, isn't it?³⁶¹

Committee finding:

10.43 The Committee notes the industry is having difficulties attracting new and younger participants.

³⁶⁰ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 18

³⁶¹ John Newson, Transcript of evidence, 18 September 2015, p 23

11 MATTERS INCIDENTAL TO THE INQUIRY

- 11.1 This chapter considers a number of issues raised throughout the inquiry that have not been referred to elsewhere in the report.

Muzzling of greyhounds

- 11.2 The Committee notes that greyhounds in Tasmania are required under section 18 the *Dog Control Act 2000* to be muzzled and on lead in public.
- 11.3 The Committee notes that the only other breeds of dogs that are required to be muzzled and on lead in public are those declared a restricted breed.³⁶²
- 11.4 The Hobart Dog Walking Association stated:

We are... unhappy at the delay involved in implementing a simple reform to the management of greyhounds within the general community. The issue of muzzling on-lead greyhounds has been considered in depth for many years and needs to be separated from the more complex issue of managing the greyhound racing industry.

More people are adopting greyhounds as pets. Greyhounds have been trained to walk well on-lead and while on-lead should not need to be muzzled in public.

Muzzling on-lead greyhounds places a constraint on the greyhounds' capacity to share the normal enjoyment of walking experienced by other dogs (e.g. sniffing grass, trees) or to socialise with them. It also conveys to at least some members of the public a negative image of these dogs as dangerous, potentially limiting their opportunities for adoption. Greyhounds are gentle in nature and are said to be good pets for older people given they walk easily on-lead and don't require much exercise.³⁶³

- 11.5 The Hobart Dog Walking Association commented on the review of the provisions to date:

*In 2012, the then State Government was approached by local government and Tasracing with proposed amendments to the *Dog Control Act 2000*.*

*On 6 October 2013, the Director of Local Government released an Issues Paper, which proposed several amendments to the *Dog Control Act*. Public submissions were invited. In early 2014, the Department of Premier and Cabinet's Local Government Division advised that the outcome and recommendations from the consultation process had been submitted to the relevant Minister.*

³⁶² Section 32 of the *Dog Control Act 2000*

³⁶³ Submission 35, Hobart Dog Walking Association Inc., p 1.

Specifically the Issues Paper proposed an alteration to Section 18 of the Act to “exempt greyhounds that have graduated from the Greyhound Adoption Program (GAP) from the requirement to wear a muzzle while in a public place.” This proposal received overwhelming support from key stakeholders – from the industry, GAP, adopting greyhound owners and associations concerned with the welfare of dogs.

.....

The provisions of Section 18 of the 2000 Dog Control Act requiring greyhounds to be muzzled on-lead were first enacted in 1932 and transferred unamended into the 2000 Act. Since then, a growing number of ex-racing greyhounds, which would previously have been destroyed, have been prepared for adoption by the Tasmanian Greyhound Adoption Program (GAP).

We urge the Select Committee to recommend that this long discussed recommendation, which has wide community support, be incorporated into legislation without delay.³⁶⁴

11.6 The Committee notes that in other jurisdictions greyhounds that have graduated from a certified rehoming program are not required to be muzzled in public.

11.7 The Committee heard mixed views on muzzling.

Dr Sally-Anne Richter commented:

Mr GAFFNEY - To ensure that they prolong the life of a greyhound racing, I noticed that you agree with the recommendation 7 about less ability for mature-aged greyhounds to continue. Interestingly, you raise the question about the greyhound as a dog, as quite a timid dog and a beautiful animal. Do you think therefore it is unfair that in the Dog Management Act they are singled out as having to be muzzled? There would be some people who would say, 'That is no different to walking your bloodhound or your little chihuahua'.

Dr RICHTER - Yes and no. If they have come from a racing background and they have been trained to chase, I think it is acceptable that they do have the muzzle on if they are out walking and there is a chance they might come into contact with other dogs. Often they go for the little white dogs or smaller dogs where they may have that instinct, which has been in them for the last three years to chase. Dog attacks can occur outside the industry as well. We see more dog attacks outside the industry than in the industry; that is for sure. If we can put that precaution in there, hopefully it makes other people feel safer with having greyhounds around.

Mr GAFFNEY - The Veterinary Association would say, 'We might as well keep that there'.

Dr RICHTER - Yes.

³⁶⁴ Submission 35, Hobart Dog Walking Association Inc., pp 1-2.

Ms RATTRAY - Even though they have been through the GAP program, and they have been socialised with other parts of our community?

Dr RICHTER - Yes. The GAP program is an excellent program. Even though they go through that, there is still the chance.

Ms RATTRAY - There is a chance any dog will bite you.

Dr RICHTER - Correct, but I suppose there is a slightly increased chance given that they have been around a track; they have been chasing and they have that instinct in them so there is chance that they may come back.³⁶⁵

11.8 Anthony Bullock commented:

Mrs RYLAH - Anthony, what is your view on the suggestion that muzzles be allowed to be removed from dogs that have gone through GAP?

Mr BULLOCK - I think it would be good in theory. Most people's perception is that they are going to kill everything. That is the main issue with the normal run-of-the-mill person. One greyhound on its own would not cause that much damage, but if you have two or three, it is like a pack animal chasing sheep. It is the same thing, they revert back.

CHAIR - You don't think it depends on how they have been trained, though? I think this goes to Tania's question before about socialising dogs.

Mr BULLOCK - I don't think it does. It only takes one to get going and they all follow on. You can have the nicest, quietest dog in the world but it only takes one to take off and you have carnage. That's nothing to do with training. You can't stop them. I gave a dog probably 10 years ago now to my mate and it tore his niece to pieces. She was eight years old at the time and she started screaming and ran towards him. It was shocking.

CHAIR - That was in Victoria. But it is possible that that dog had been trained with live baits.

Mr BULLOCK - It is the activation, the handling of the mindset - dogs bite kids all the time. It's the same principle. If the kid is screaming, it is noise.

CHAIR - I guess what Joan is asking though is, should greyhounds be treated differently from other dogs that are not muzzled?

Mr BULLOCK - Most people want muzzles on their dogs when they're pets because of the Rottweiler attacks and the German shepherd attacks on the street. The point being, when it becomes a pack environment, which is more dogs together, the more likely it is that something is going to go wrong.

Mrs RYLAH - Is the suggestion then, Anthony, that if a greyhound is on its own that has been through GAP, it is reasonable to have the muzzle off? Should it be in a space where, if there is more than one dog, it should have a muzzle on?

³⁶⁵ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 7.

Mr BULLOCK - Yes, it should have a muzzle on. That's the golden rule at my place. Muzzles are not safe because the racing muzzles are very flimsy and they break. We've got the big plastic American muzzles which take a fair bit more to bust. When there's more than one dog, anything can happen. They go in the same yard for six months and the next day you can get a dog torn to pieces.³⁶⁶

11.9 Emma Haswell commented:

Mr GAFFNEY - The muzzling is an interesting issue. Greyhounds are beautiful dogs but our Dog Management Act says they must be muzzled. We have heard from people who say they shouldn't have to have those conditions but we have also heard this morning from industry and a vet saying that for different reasons perhaps it needs to stay. Is there some way within the Act, if a greyhound had been reschooled and gone through a training program, that you could go to a vet and say, 'Here is my dog. Is it any worse than a chihuahua? Can it be not muzzled?' I don't think it will be removed from the Act so we have to come up with an amendment to it. What would you suggest?

Ms HASWELL - Some greyhounds certainly have to wear a muzzle for life and there is no two ways about it. If it is a greyhound that is that far down the scale, I am quite happy to admit it will not go through my adoption program. When you have so many dogs to choose from, you want to put the best dogs out there. When people ring up and inquire they get a lecture, then they get another one when they come to see the dog and then they get another one when they take the dog about how important a muzzle is. I say to some people, 'This particular dog will always need to wear a muzzle because she has a higher prey drive than other greyhounds'. Then you get other greyhounds, like the one I re-homed the other day - and I get a lot of them - that can go straight out within a few weeks to live with cats, rabbits and other animals, and those dogs shouldn't be wearing a muzzle.

I know in that submission about me they said there are Brightside greyhounds running around on Kingston Beach without a muzzle. As far I know there are two, and every other Brightside greyhound I have seen there is muzzled and on a lead. Those two are better trained than any other dog on the dog beach. They will sit and stay and are absolutely exceptional dogs. When they were in Brightside they didn't have prey drive even though they had trained; they just didn't run fast enough to race. I think there has to be a point where you say, 'This greyhound doesn't need to wear a muzzle'.

Mr GAFFNEY - If we did try to amend the Dog Act so some greyhounds would be allowed not to be muzzled, who do you think would be the best person to give that qualified assessment? Would it be a vet?

Ms HASWELL - I am not sure who does the accreditation for GAP in Victoria that the dogs do not have to wear a muzzle. I'm not sure how they do it but in

³⁶⁶ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 9-10

Victoria the GAP greyhounds wear a GAP collar and they don't have to wear a muzzle. I am not sure who does the assessment –

Mr GAFFNEY - Okay. That is something for us to look into.

Ms HASWELL - but for me at Brightside it is a really easy thing to see because you've got cats, chickens, rabbits, dogs, pigs, all running around the car park and the greyhounds out there as well. I can see really clearly what dog is going to become - it is so amazing.³⁶⁷

11.10 Ms Haswell also commented:

Mr GAFFNEY - ...If we are going to allow greyhounds to walk on leads unmuzzled there has to be a mechanism with the registration of the dog in the municipality that says, 'This greyhound is friendly. It is not a danger. It can walk unmuzzled.'

Ms HASWELL - In Victoria they have to wear, I think it is a green collar which is the GAP collar. They have to have that collar on to not have their muzzle on. They are identifiable straight away. Maybe you could have a Tasmanian GAP collar that was green and a Tasmanian Brightside collar that was orange and if the dog was not wearing it, it has to wear a muzzle. I would be the first person to be strict about who wore that collar because every dog is an ambassador for its kind. When I started re-homing greyhounds, it would take me months to find one greyhound a home. Now I can find six beautiful homes in a week. The more you get out there, the more they sell themselves. They are the perfect dog. You only want the good ones out there and you certainly don't want them not wearing a muzzle unless they are a perfect dog.

Mr GAFFNEY - That is the issue. When trying to re-home greyhounds, the fact that every one that is muzzled gives the indication to the person that the dog has to be muzzled so they must be dangerous, which is not really the truth. It is misrepresenting the breed.

Ms HASWELL - As a breed, they are amazingly gentle; they are the easiest dogs. If you have one that chases cats when it comes off the track, it is so easy to stop most them having an interest in cats.³⁶⁸

11.11 June Phillips commented:

Mr GAFFNEY - It is nice to hear somebody who has experience in the industry talk to us from both an administrative role and a breeder-owner role. I am interested in your comment regarding muzzling for greyhounds. It is part of the Dog Management Act and there is a move afoot to have a discussion about how that could be changed, although we did have a vet yesterday and somebody within the industry who believed for a variety of reasons that the muzzle part in the Act should stay. However, we have also heard that those dogs that have been through the GAP program or through a re-socialisation

³⁶⁷ Emma Haswell, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 19-20

³⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p 21

program and that exhibit no sign of aggressive tendencies should be able to be led without having a muzzle on.

Ms PHILLIPS - They are the only ones that I believe should not have a muzzle.

Mr GAFFNEY - If there were a change or an amendment to the Act to identify those dogs, who would be the responsible person to sign off on the form to say that this dog should now be able to be led, because it has gone through the program and has no signs of being aggressive? Should it be the vet or the person who runs the GAP program? Somebody at the end of the day has to have responsibility over that permission for that dog to be unmuzzled because of the Act. Who would you recommend would be the best person placed?

Ms PHILLIPS - To me, it would have to be Greyhound Adoption Program. They are the ones that assess the dogs, so therefore they are the ones that should be signing off. Maybe the integrity unit could co-sign it.

Mr GAFFNEY - Would it be the chair or the president?

Ms PHILLIPS - It would have to be the co-ordinator of that program because they are the ones that assess the dogs. They would have to have a collar on with a tag to say that they are Greyhound Adoption Program.

Mr VALENTINE - It is a red collar, is it?

Ms PHILLIPS - A green collar.

Mr GAFFNEY - It had been suggested that another dog might have been through a similar program with Brightside. My concern is that once you start getting too many people playing in that space it becomes unwieldy. A person could take a greyhound that might have been through the Brightside work to the co-ordinator of GAP and say, 'Could you please assess the dog?'. I think we need to fine-tune it somehow. GAP are the right people to be actually signing off?

Ms PHILLIPS - I would think so. When I was doing the Greyhound Adoption Program we had a litter of puppies that were at the RSPCA. I think they were nine or ten months old and they re-educated them. Then they had me to vet the people and the dogs prior to them going out. There isn't a problem with that.

Mr GAFFNEY - That is good because I think the integrity of the Dog Management Act has to be maintained - the Control Act. To have something placed on record will be really good along that line.

Ms PHILLIPS - It has worked very well in other states and there haven't been any problems with it.³⁶⁹

³⁶⁹ June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 4-5

Committee findings:

- 11.12 The Committee notes evidence received that greyhounds are differentially treated under the *Dog Control Act 2000*.
- 11.13 The Committee notes New South Wales³⁷⁰ and Victoria³⁷¹ have introduced exemptions to allow greyhounds rehomed through accredited programs to be exempt from wearing a muzzle while on lead in public.

Recommendation 31: That the Government review the differentiation of greyhounds under the *Dog Control Act 2000* with the intent to exempt greyhounds from wearing a muzzle while on lead in public.

Banning greyhound racing

- 11.14 A number of submissions to the inquiry called for greyhound racing to be banned:
- *Given the many and insurmountable welfare and ethical issues associated with the Greyhound Racing Industry, and based on the evidence of endemic corruption within the Industry, it is the position of the Animal Justice Party that the industry should be phased out over a reasonably speedy period of time to an eventual total shutdown.*³⁷²
 - *AWLA advocates for an end to greyhound racing, but while greyhound racing remains active, we call for: transparent control of all aspects of the industry and the introduction of mandatory and enforceable welfare standards for the breeding, training, sale and post-racing treatment of greyhounds; and strictly enforced registration and identification requirements be applied to greyhounds.*³⁷³
 - *I would like to see a complete ban on all racing codes but know that, in this world of human need for entertainment, wealth and glory, this is an unrealistic hope. I urge you at least make the penalties for cruelty*

³⁷⁰ The muzzle exemption process is administered by Greyhound Racing NSW as part of its Greenhounds program, in accordance with 'Guidelines for approval as a greyhound re-training program under clause 33B(1)(a) of the Companion Animals Regulation 2008, available at: <http://www.olg.nsw.gov.au/content/greyhound-muzzling> accessed 4 April 2016.

³⁷¹ See Order exempting Greyhounds Registered under the Greyhound Adoption Program from Operation of Section 27(1)(A) of the *Domestic Animals Act 1994* (Vic.) available at: <http://agriculture.vic.gov.au/pets/registration-legislation-and-permits/domestic-animal-legislation-and-latest-news/exemption-greyhounds-and-gap> accessed 4 April 2016.

³⁷² Submission 3, Animal Justice Party, p. 6.

³⁷³ Submission 4, Animal Welfare League Australia, p. 2.

*and neglect sufficient to make perpetrators think very very carefully about how they are treating the animals they are exploiting.*³⁷⁴

- 11.15 Emma Haswell considered that greyhound racing should be banned if the industry cannot be accountable for every dog. Ms Haswell commented:

CHAIR - Emma, what would you like to see happen to the greyhound racing industry in Tasmania?

Ms HASWELL - There are only a few countries left in the world where it still exists and there is a good reason for that. They are companion animals and I don't believe in using animals for entertainment and for gambling purposes.

*Until we have an industry that is accountable for every dog, I do not think there is an argument to continue an industry where we are killing them. They are dogs. If they were poodles, people would go off. They would go berserk. People would not tolerate us killing poodles or golden retrievers for sport, entertainment and gambling.*³⁷⁵

Committee findings:

- 11.16 The Committee notes the Governments of the Australian Capital Territory and New South Wales have announced an intention to ban greyhound racing.³⁷⁶
- 11.17 The Committee notes there is some community support for banning greyhound racing in Tasmania.
- 11.18 Noting the Inquiry's Terms of Reference and based on the evidence received the Committee does not support the banning of greyhound racing in Tasmania.

Proposals from stakeholders

- 11.19 A number of submissions outlined further suggestions of ways to improve animal welfare outcomes in the industry.
- 11.20 The RSPCA suggested the following strategies:

1. Any government or industry financial incentive schemes that encourage breeding of greyhounds should be immediately discontinued. Funding for the Tasmanian 'Vaccination Microchipping and Rearing Rebate' formerly referred

³⁷⁴ Submission 5, Liz Hynes, p. 1.

³⁷⁵ Emma Haswell, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 25

³⁷⁶ This was announced on 7 July 2016 after the Committee had completed its hearings. Legislation passed the Parliament of New South Wales banning greyhound racing on 24 August with the *Greyhound Racing Prohibition Bill* receiving assent on 26 August 2016.

to as a breeder's bonus should be redirected to rehoming initiatives for greyhounds.

2. A comprehensive independent review of breeding, rearing, training and housing practices should be undertaken to identify areas where significant improvements are required. This review should include external key stakeholder input from animal welfare organisations and the veterinary profession etc.

3. Best practice contemporary animal welfare standards for breeding, rearing, training and housing must be attained in order to increase success rates and reduce wastage.

4. Mandatory breeding limitations:

a. The introduction of a maximum number of litters permitted for each breeding female and a maximum number of litters permitted to be registered by greyhound owners and attach these maximum limits to licence/registration conditions.

b. A limit to the frequency of litters for an individual breeding female, attached to licence/registration conditions. This would help to enable enough time to properly assess the 'success' of a litter before considering any further breeding.

5. Expansion of the GRV/GRNSW joint animal welfare strategy proposal of a tiered system of trainer licence types which would stipulate how many greyhounds are permitted to be bred/kept by breeders, whelpers, owners, rearers and all other life stages.

6. The regulatory authority should regularly assess participant 'success rates' with their greyhounds by taking into account not only 'racing success' but also the rehoming success for their greyhounds (ie what is the outcome for this participant's greyhounds). Licence renewals and permitted future breeding should be subject to demonstrated high success rates.

7. Improve the quality of breeding programs to help reduce wastage rates:

a. Avoid inbreeding, inherited diseases and injury prone lines.

b. Careful and well-informed selection of suitable parent dogs based on both physical and behavioural (temperament) characteristics. Noting for example that anxiety is heritable. Anxiety can affect dog welfare but may also affect performance and hence influence wastage rates.

8. Ongoing mandatory education courses for all owners, breeders, whelpers, rearers and trainers (not just new participants) prior to issuing and/or renewing a licence for that life stage.

9. Education courses should be developed in consultation with external stakeholders to ensure best practice standards are maintained.

10. Breeding programs should be based on veterinary advice.

11. Targets and timeframes must be developed so that the Tasmanian greyhound industry has clear and published goals for the reduction in the number of greyhounds born and wastage to report their progress against annually.³⁷⁷

11.21 The Animal Justice Party also made a number of recommendations:

5. Breeding and Breeding Incentives: Given the irresponsible overbreeding, breeding incentives are illogical and unethical. They should be stopped immediately.

5.1 It is recommended that a legislated limit be placed on the total number of greyhounds allowed to be bred in Tasmania or imported into Tasmania for racing. This should be accompanied by mandatory recording and reporting of independently verified breeding numbers.

.....
6.1 Rehoming: It is unfathomable that a multi-million dollar greyhound racing industry is capable of rehoming only a very small proportion of greyhounds bred for racing through their GAP program. This reveals either a lack of will and/or ability by the GAP to ensure the welfare of its dogs. This reinforces that the Tasmanian racing industry should not be entrusted with a regulatory function of ensuring the welfare of animals in greyhound racing.

6.2 Legislation must ensure proper socialization of greyhounds during rearing to increase their potential for rehoming as a companion animal.³⁷⁸

11.22 Brightside Farm Sanctuary also made several recommendations:

- All greyhound breeding incentive schemes should be abolished.
- Schemes similar to those in other States should be introduced to direct a percentage of betting proceeds to the rehabilitation/rehoming of all greyhounds;
- Mandatory levies should be imposed on greyhound breeders to be used for the rehabilitation/rehoming of all greyhounds.
- GAP must be expanded to increase the number of places available for dogs to be entered into the program. The capacity of the program should never be compromised for reasons such as dogs being held during the suspension of trainer/owners. The fee should also be realistic to encourage the surrender of greyhounds.

Committee finding:

11.23 The Committee notes that certain proposals from animal welfare advocates have already been implemented by the regulatory authorities including the abolition of the ‘Breeders Bonus’ in Tasmania and the introduction of mandatory breeding limitations.

³⁷⁷ Submission 71, RSPCA, pp 3-4.

³⁷⁸ Submission 3, Animal Justice Party, p. 3.

Parliament House
HOBART
14 September 2016

Hon. Tania Rattray MLC
CHAIR

DISSENTING STATEMENT OF HON. ROB VALENTINE MLC, INDEPENDENT MEMBER FOR HOBART

The Independent Member for Hobart in the Legislative Council, Mr Rob Valentine, dissents from the Joint Select Committee Report into Greyhound Racing in Tasmania on the following points:

1. With reference to Finding 11.18 (Page 222) the Committee of Inquiry's Terms of Reference were too narrow to gain adequate evidence to fully address the question of banning greyhound racing in Tasmania and therefore support or opposition to banning should not be stated.

Rationale:

- 1.1 The inquiry was primarily focused on the issue of live baiting, as brought into prominence by the ABC 4 Corners program of April 2015, with animal welfare also being an issue canvassed within the Inquiry's Terms of Reference. Consequently the evidence gained primarily addresses these particular issues in Tasmania.
- 1.2 For the Committee to consider a position on the actual banning of the greyhound racing code, the Terms of Reference statement would have needed to be significantly expanded in the first instance.
- 1.3 Changes would have at least been required to elicit significant evidence from those jurisdictions across the world where banning has already been implemented. Areas of inquiry involving those locations would need to examine, for example:
 - a) the consequent breadth and depth of impact on the welfare of greyhounds since banning commenced, including:
 - i the nature and success, or otherwise, of rehoming opportunities provided in each jurisdiction;
 - ii changes in statistics on the movement of greyhounds being handled through animal welfare agencies, similar to the RSPCA;
 - iii the development of any 'underground' activity involving greyhounds or other animals that may have since arisen; and

- b) other relevant matters that authorities in those jurisdictions may wish to identify, either negative or positive, as a result of the code being banned.
 - c) Given such a move would significantly impact the racing industry and associated peripheral activity as a whole, from a financial perspective, it is arguable that appropriate evidence would need to be sought to at least clarify the likely breadth and depth of that impact. Finding 8.17 (Page 164) lends weight to the need for clarification.
 - d) While not intended to be in any way complete, changes of this nature to the Terms of Reference would be important to allow a proper assessment of banning, leading to a more informed set of recommendations to the Government on such a matter.
2. The following recommendation was put forward by Mr Valentine to be inserted after paragraph 11.18, but was not supported by a majority on the Committee:

“The Committee recommends that in 3 years’ time the Government review the performance of the greyhound racing industry in satisfying the measures to improve animal welfare proposed in this report and, should there still be animal welfare concerns, an inquiry be established to specifically address the issue of banning greyhound racing in Tasmania.”

Rationale:

- 2.1 The recommendation is self-explanatory and was devised to request action be taken by Government to fully assess progress in the improvement of animal welfare in a timely manner.
- 2.2 Should major improvement in the industry not be evident, steps should then be taken to seriously address banning of the code. To sit back in the face of limited improvement in animal welfare is simply not an option.

**Parliament House
HOBART
14 September 2016**

**Hon. Rob Valentine MLC
MEMBER FOR HOBART**

DISSENTING STATEMENT OF MS CASSY O’CONNOR MP, TASMANIAN GREENS’ MEMBER FOR DENISON

Introduction

This dissenting report is based on the strongly held view that, while all Committee members are clearly concerned to see improved animal welfare outcomes and the majority Report makes a number of important recommendations towards this aim, it has come down too firmly on the side of industry.

Tasmanians who recognise inherent value in the lives of animals and our responsibility to give voice to the voiceless, will be disappointed with the findings and recommendations of the majority Report.

While the Joint House Inquiry initiated by the Greens was prompted by live baiting practices interstate which were exposed in an ABC Four Corners investigation in February 2015, the cruelty at the heart of this industry extends well beyond the live baiting issue.

The Inquiry heard evidence of puppies and dogs that were killed for being surplus to requirements, injured, or not fast enough. We read and heard damning evidence of an industry culture that considers animals to be disposable items in the name of profit.^{379,380} A perspective supported by the industry’s peak body.³⁸¹

The extent of wastage of healthy and injured greyhounds in the Tasmanian industry is obscene. Right to Information documents requested by the Greens provide evidence that 1608 named dogs had died or been killed between 1 July 2013 and 9 June 2016.³⁸²

Limited data provided by the Tasmanian Government confirms that in 2011/12, more than 200 greyhounds were killed before they reached the age of two and were ‘named’ for racing.³⁸³

³⁷⁹ Submission 1, Biosecurity, p. 2.

³⁸⁰ Dr Rod Andrewartha, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 73-75.

³⁸¹ Crisis to Recover Program 2015, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 1.

³⁸² Racing greyhound deaths 2016, DPIPWE, Right to information documents.

³⁸³ Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry 2015, DPIPWE, p. 26.

Minister Rockliff’s review into animal welfare standards in the industry qualified its available wastage data by acknowledging that the figures were “reliant on those in charge of a greyhound notifying the regulator in accordance with the Rules of Racing” and should therefore be viewed as minimum figures.³⁸⁴

The Greens will continue to work towards a ban on greyhound racing in Tasmania on the basis of the facts presented to the Inquiry, and from a foundational belief this cruelty cannot be justified.

We also recognise that many greyhound owners, trainers and breeders do have a genuine concern for the welfare of the animals in their care. This, however, does not justify the inherent cruelty of the industry as a whole. We believe a ban and the consequent end to public funding of the industry would have strong community support.

While we do not support the continuation of greyhound racing or its public funding, the Greens support, and contributed to, every finding and recommendation in the majority Report that prioritises animal welfare reform.

Between the establishment of this Inquiry and the delivery of its recommendations, both the New South Wales and ACT governments have announced an end to greyhound racing in those jurisdictions.

Australia is one of only eight countries in the world that has not prohibited greyhound racing.

Background of the Inquiry

The Tasmanian Greens moved to establish a Joint House Parliamentary Inquiry into Tasmania’s greyhound racing industry following evidence of widespread live baiting and cruelty that was exposed on ABC Four Corners in February 2015.

In the investigative report, “Making a Killing”, award winning journalist, Caro Meldrum-Hanna revealed the practice of using live animals – such as piglets, rabbits and possums – to train racing greyhounds was widespread and systemic in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria.³⁸⁵

³⁸⁴ Ibid, p. 27.

³⁸⁵ Making a Killing 2015, ABC Four Corners.

The Greens believe that, despite the denials of TasRacing and the Tasmanian industry during the course of this inquiry, live baiting has taken place, and may still be happening here at any one of the 28 bullrings and 31 private tracks confirmed to the Committee to exist by the Office of Racing Integrity.

Until the Four Corners report, the greyhound industry and its governing body had consistently denied that live baiting was prevalent in the industry. There was a conspiracy of denial and silence that ensured the unimaginable suffering of countless small animals in the name of profit.

The community disgust and outrage demanded governments and Parliaments shine a spotlight on the industry.

The Greens secured the relatively willing support of the Tasmanian Liberals and somewhat reluctant support of Labor, along with members in the Legislative Council, to establish the Inquiry.

At the Committee's first meeting, Greens' Animal Welfare spokesperson, Cassy O'Connor MP, was elected as Chair. The Hansard record of proceedings will confirm that Ms O'Connor conducted herself fairly and impartially as Chair.

Ms O'Connor was removed as Chair after agreeing to speak at a rally to end greyhound racing at which she made it clear she was speaking only on the Greens' behalf, and not that of the Committee.

She continued to contribute actively to the work of the Committee and wishes to genuinely thank her fellow Committee members for their cooperative approach during the conduct of the regrettably prolonged inquiry.

Findings

LIVE BAITING

1. A consistent theme of industry participants who presented to the Inquiry was that the separation of the racing and integrity arms of the Tasmanian industry, as well as the lack of private trial tracks made it almost inconceivable that live baiting would be taking place in Tasmania.³⁸⁶

³⁸⁶ June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 1-2

2. A consistent theme of the RSPCA and animal welfare peak bodies was that it would be ‘naive’ to think live baiting had not been happening here as it had been in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria.^{387,388}
3. During the course of the Inquiry, the Office of Racing Integrity undertook an audit of properties where greyhounds are kept. Director of Racing, Tony Murray, made it clear to the Committee that he was genuinely surprised the audit had discovered 28 unregulated bullrings and 31 private tracks in Tasmania.³⁸⁹
4. The graphic footage obtained by Animals Australia and aired on Four Corners revealed live baiting takes place on private bullrings and private tracks, remote from public view.³⁹⁰
5. Written and spoken evidence to the Committee, including some in-camera evidence, makes a compelling case that the practice of live baiting has been a feature of industry culture since its beginnings in Tasmania.^{391,392,393}
6. The Office of Racing Integrity^{394,395} and the RSPCA³⁹⁶ both attested to the extreme challenges of obtaining evidence that would result in a conviction for live baiting.
7. The argument that live baiting could not occur in Tasmania relies heavily on the claim that this State does not have private trial tracks. However, according to the testimony of Anthony Bullock, a leading trainer, live baiting could occur in bullrings and on private tracks.³⁹⁷

³⁸⁷ RSPCA, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 45-46

³⁸⁸ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 2.

³⁸⁹ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 39-40

³⁹⁰ Making a Killing 2015, ABC Four Corners.

³⁹¹ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 4-5.

³⁹² Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 3 -4.

³⁹³ June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 1-2.

³⁹⁴ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p. 39

³⁹⁵ Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry 2015, DPIPW, p.

21.

³⁹⁶ RSPCA, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 45-46

³⁹⁷ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, p 1-2.

8. Another industry argument has been that if live baiting occurred in Tasmania it would have already been exposed. The Greens consider this to be fallacious for several reasons. First, before 2015, it had not been exposed in other Australian jurisdictions. Lack of evidence cannot be evidence that it is not occurring. Second, live baiting was only exposed due to unauthorised but important surveillance which has not been attempted in Tasmania. And third, Anthony Bullock³⁹⁸ and others^{399,400} confirmed that live baiting has occurred in the past in Tasmania, which was not exposed or prosecuted previously.
9. TasRacing, and the industry at large, has demonstrated a lack of capacity or willingness to admit, or genuinely consider the possibility, that live baiting has or may occur in Tasmania.
10. Industry participants have communicated their lack of willingness to report live baiting, even if they were aware it was happening.⁴⁰¹
11. Live baiting is a training practice that has taken place in the past, and may still be taking place, in Tasmania.

WASTAGE

12. There is a serious and unacceptable lack of accurate and transparent data on the number of greyhounds killed by the industry each year in Tasmania.
13. The RSPCA reported that combined statistics from Greyhounds Australasia and the *Tasmanian Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry* final report indicate that between 600–700 greyhounds are whelped in Tasmania each year. Qualifying its data as likely ‘minimum’ rates, the Tasmanian Review report also reveals that more than 216 greyhounds were killed before they were named in 2012/13.⁴⁰²

³⁹⁸ Anthony Bullock, Transcript of evidence, 11 August 2015, pp 3-4.

³⁹⁹ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, pp 4-5.

⁴⁰⁰ June Phillips, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 1-2.

⁴⁰¹ Dr Rod Andrewartha, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 71.

⁴⁰² Submission 71, RSPCA, pp 4-5.

14. The term “euthanasia” is not an accurate term to describe the killing of greyhounds due to over-breeding, cost, injury or lack of race performance. Euthanasia is the practice of intentionally ending a life humanely to relieve suffering. The puppies and dogs disposed of by this industry may be being put down humanely, but it is rarely for the relief of suffering.
15. While a number of industry participants told the Committee they believe the term ‘wastage’ is emotive, in fact it is a more accurate descriptor than euthanasia for the fate of industry greyhounds. The Chief Veterinary Officer stated to the Inquiry that greyhounds are considered to be livestock, and described the method of killing in this context as ‘slaughter’.

DRAINING

16. It is accepted that the practice of ‘draining’ involves the removal of blood by a registered vet, often prior to lethal injection, and that this blood is of use to veterinarians. On the limited statistical data available, we have between 800-900 dogs wasted in Tasmania each year, so the blood of a greyhound has become a useful by-product of an industry that too readily ends the lives of unwanted dogs.

OTHER EVIDENCE OF CRUELTY

17. Poor track design and a failure to prioritise the reduction of injury potential on circular tracks are significant factors in the rate of injuries and deaths in the Tasmanian greyhound racing industry. Track design is a major contributor to the number of dogs injured and killed each year.⁴⁰³
18. A number of submissions, including from the RSPCA and Brightside, pointed out that Tasmania’s minimum standards for housing of greyhounds are not currently consistent with best practice for the care

⁴⁰³ Submission 71, RSPCA, p 6.

of animals, as the Rules of Racing allow greyhounds to be kept in extremely cramped conditions for extended periods.⁴⁰⁴

19. Many greyhound kennels in Tasmania may be complying with the minimum standards outlined in policies and guidelines, but it is clear from submissions and evidence presented to the Inquiry that these are in substantial need of improvement.
20. There is no legislative or regulatory requirement for greyhounds to have environmental enrichment and socialisation from an early age to assist with re-homing if they have been found to be unsuitable for racing or at the end of their racing career.
21. There are increasing instances of the administration of prohibited substances to greyhounds, including methamphetamine, by industry participants. The Office of Racing Integrity gave evidence to the Committee that its capacity to undertake rigorous and regular testing is declining due to a lack of funding.⁴⁰⁵

TAXPAYER-FUNDED CRUELTY

22. The Tasmanian industry receives up to \$5 million in public funding each year. Industry participants who testified to the Inquiry claim that, despite this subsidy, the industry is struggling financially.⁴⁰⁶
23. TasRacing and the broader industry's claims of substantial flow-on economic benefits from the industry are not backed by credible evidence.
24. The source for their claims is a 2013 report from IER Pty Ltd. This report was clearly commissioned by TasRacing as a public relations document to justify the industry subsidy.⁴⁰⁷ The Greens have tested the methodology and assertions in this report, and found this document to be an unreliable source of facts on the financial contribution of the greyhound racing industry in Tasmania.

⁴⁰⁴ *ibid*, p 9.

⁴⁰⁵ Tony Murray, Transcript of evidence, 20 November 2015, pp 7 – 9.

⁴⁰⁶ Dr Eliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 37-38

⁴⁰⁷ Size and Scope of the Tasmanian Racing industry 2013, IER PTY. LTD.

25. The status of this IER report as a public relations document rather than a sound analysis of the industry is evidenced through common sense; the obvious attempt to draw out the largest figures possible; and the fact that no recommendations were put forward to support an economic analysis of an industry that takes 75% of its revenue from public subsidy.
26. The IER report derives the majority of its final figure of economic activity by double or triple counting the \$30 million subsidy that is given to TasRacing. It is inevitable that investing the \$30 million elsewhere would have similar flow-on economic effects, particularly given the Government's 'buy local' policy.
27. The IER report also does not consider the detrimental social impact and costs of gambling to the State. Racing gambling has a fairly high correlation with gambling addiction severity, and numerous studies indicate that productivity loss from gambling negatively affects economies and places a further burden on social support services.
28. Due to industry subsidy, the IER report itself represents a cost to the taxpayer. It is notable that such a substantially unsustainable industry would commission a propaganda report rather than an accurate analysis of its financial position.
29. The economic model for greyhound racing relies on taxpayer funding. Without it, the industry would not survive and the lives of thousands of dogs would not be expended for profit.
30. The greyhound racing industry nationally and in Tasmania is inherently and irredeemably cruel. It uses large sums of public money to perpetuate cruelty towards animals.
31. Community concern is growing about public funds being used to allow the slaughter of healthy animals for a gambling- industry.

INDUSTRY IN DENIAL

32. A leaked document from the industry's peak body, Greyhounds Australasia, found that *"The industry has done a poor job in*

- understanding the nature and depth of this fundamental problem and has done very little to find a genuine solution”.* ⁴⁰⁸ This was apparent during the hearings of the Tasmanian Inquiry.
33. Former TasRacing CEO, Dr Elliot Forbes, denied that wastage in Tasmania is caused by overbreeding due to being a net importer of dogs⁴⁰⁹ despite 600-700 being whelped each year⁴¹⁰, more than 200 dogs being killed before being named,⁴¹¹ and further hundreds being killed each year due to injury or for lack of racing talent.⁴¹²
34. Dr Forbes also considered housing standards for greyhounds to be suitable,⁴¹³ a position not supported by organisations concerned with animal welfare who made submissions or presented to the inquiry.^{414,415}
35. Furthermore, Dr Forbes suggested that racetrack injuries were often minor.⁴¹⁶ Given that RTI documents have revealed that racetrack injuries are a significant driver of wastage rates, this statement cannot be supported.
36. Dr Forbes’ responses to questions during the Inquiry and at Government Business Scrutiny hearings during 2015⁴¹⁷ revealed him as an obstructive witness unwilling to acknowledge the severity and reality of animal welfare issues in the greyhound racing industry.
37. Dr Forbes also referred to questions about what happens to horses after their racing career as “propaganda material”. All this in the wake of his introductory boasting before the Committee that TasRacing meets or exceeds community expectations regarding animal welfare.

⁴⁰⁸ Crisis to Recovery Program 2015, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 1.

⁴⁰⁹ Dr Elliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 44-45.

⁴¹⁰ Submission 71, RSPCA, pp 4-5.

⁴¹¹ Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry 2015, DPIPWE, p. 26.

⁴¹² Racing greyhound deaths 2016, DPIPWE, Right to information documents.

⁴¹³ Dr Elliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 36-37.

⁴¹⁴ Submission 71, RSPCA, p 9.

⁴¹⁵ Dr Sally-Anne Richter, Transcript of evidence, 30 June 2015, p 9

⁴¹⁶ Dr Elliot Forbes, Transcript of evidence, 1 July 2015, pp 30-31

⁴¹⁷ Government Businesses Scrutiny Committee 2015, Tasracing Pty Ltd.

38. Dr Forbes claimed ‘The Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry’ found no evidence of live baiting. This is a factually inaccurate representation that nonetheless keeps getting pushed by the industry body and industry participants.
39. The fact is that the Review report found there to be “no evidence that could lead to prosecution”. The qualifier “that could lead to prosecution” implies there is, in fact, some evidence of live baiting. This report emphasises, in bold, that “this finding does not exclude the possibility that live baiting could be happening in Tasmania”.
40. TasRacing has consistently dismissed or downplayed evidence of industry cruelty. Dr Forbes claimed TasRacing meets or exceeds community expectations towards animal welfare while labelling concerns over animal welfare as ‘propaganda’.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Due to the unfeasibility and unwillingness of the industry to address animal welfare issues to any acceptable standard, the Tasmanian Government has an ethical imperative to legislate a ban on greyhound racing in Tasmania.
2. The Tasmanian Government has a financial imperative to cease funding to the industry. Cessation of public funding to the industry needs to be included in the 2017-18 State Budget in order to give the industry time to transition.
3. Some of the millions of dollars saved can be allocated to the re-homing of all ex-racing greyhounds through organisations such as GAP, Brightside, the RSPCA and the Dogs Home to ensure the industry’s termination does not lead to more adverse outcomes for greyhounds.
4. Private bullrings and trial tracks must be prohibited structures under the *Animal Welfare Act 1995*.
5. The *Dog Control Act 2000* must be amended to allow greyhounds that were either not born into the industry, or have been appropriately

- rehabilitated and socialised through GAP, Brightside, or other qualified organisation, to be unmuzzled in public.
6. The *Animal Welfare Act 1993* must be amended to include an acknowledgement that pain and suffering includes (but is not limited to) distress and mental suffering as well as physical suffering as per the recommendation of the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (AWAC) in response to the 2012 review of the Act.

**Parliament House
HOBART
14 September 2016**

**Cassy O'Connor
MEMBER FOR DENISON**

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

Submissions received⁴¹⁸

1. Dr Lloyd Klumpp, General Manager, Biosecurity Tasmania – Submission dated 15 May 2015
2. Sharyn Marshall - Submission (no date)
3. Dr Eleonora Gullone, Coordinator Greyhound Racing Industry Campaign coordinator, Animal Justice Party – Submission dated 12 June 2015
4. Anne Boxhall, Executive Officer, Animal Welfare League Australia – Submission dated 4 June 2015
5. Liz Hynes – Submission dated 7 June 2015
6. Clare Jokuszies – Submission dated 6 June 2015
7. Beryl Dix – Submission dated 9 June 2015
8. Paul Whitmore – Submission dated 6 June 2015
9. Leica Wagner – Submission dated 5 June 2015
10. Noel Gibson – Submission dated 5 June 2015
11. Louise Willie – Submission dated 5 June 2015
12. Lena Bodin – Submission dated 5 June 2015
13. Anne-Marie Lewer – Submission dated 5 June 2015
14. Jennifer Denehey – Submission dated 5 June 2015
15. Angela Hanly – Submission dated 5 June 2015
16. Lynne Hill – Submission dated 9 June 2015
18. Gillian Fitzgerald – 11 June 2015
19. Philip & Inna Eldridge – 11 June 2015
20. Lisa White, President, Friends of the Hound Inc – Submission dated 10 June 2015
21. Natalie Coleman – Submission dated 11 June 2015
22. Susan Maher – Submission dated 11 June 2015

⁴¹⁸ Does not include submissions received on a confidential basis.

23. Belinda Dickenson – Submission dated 11 June 2015
24. Amanda Yorke – Submission dated 11 June 2015
25. Caroline Miller – Submission dated 11 June 2015
26. Graeme Barber, Chair, Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania – June 2015
27. Gail Fitton – Submission dated 5 June 2015
28. Launceston Greyhound Racing Club – Submission dated 11 June 2015
29. Ruth Eschmann – Submission dated 11 June 2015
30. D Adair – Submission dated 11 June 2015
31. Maria Moore – Submission dated 11 June 2015
32. Erica Holding – Submission dated 11 June 2015
33. Caitlin Connolly – Submission 11 June 2015
34. Lee Handley – Submission 11 June 2015
35. Tanzi Lewis, President, Hobart Dog Walking Association Inc – Submission 10 June 2015
36. Tasracing – Submission dated June 2015
37. Greyhounds Australasia – Submission dated June 2015
38. Fiona De Jersey – Submission dated 12 June 2015
39. P H Campbell, Chair, Animal Welfare Advisory Committee – Submission dated 10 June 2015
40. Cathryn Firkin – Submission dated 12 June 2016
41. Dorothy Rodgers – Submission dated 11 June 2015
42. Kate Gerdtz – Submission dated 11 June 2015
43. Yvonne Pittam – Submission dated 11 June 2015
44. Dr Kim Barrett, Associate Veterinary Surgeon, Launceston Veterinary Clinic – Submission dated 11 March 2015
45. Jane Bradford – Submission dated 11 June 2015
46. Hobart Greyhound Racing Club – Submission dated N/A

47. Susan Jones – Submission dated 11 June 2015
48. Gillian Brame – Submission dated 11 June 2015
49. Maureen Ackerley – Submission dated 11 June 2015
50. Penny Burns – Submission dated 11 June 2015
51. Ceinwen Price – Submission dated 11 June 2015
52. Sara Stevens – Submission dated 11 June 2015
53. Kirsty Leaf – Submission dated 11 June 2015
54. K Atkins – Submission dated 11 June 2015
55. Aimee Bound – Submission dated 11 June 2015
56. Adriana Bellemans – Submission dated 11 June 2015
57. Linda Zarik – Submission dated 11 June 2015
58. Marion Horton – Submission dated 11 June 2015
59. Carolyn Mart – Submission dated 11 June 2015
60. Danielle Coleman – Submission dated 11 June 2015
61. Helen Ivory – Submission dated 12 June 2015
63. Mehr Gupta, Secretary, Animals Tasmania – Submission dated 11 June 2015
64. Holly Mason-White – Submission dated 12 June 2015
65. Australian Veterinary Association – Submission dated 12 June 2015
66. Inez Hamilton-Smith – Submission dated 12 June 2015
67. Sandra John – Submission dated 12 June 2015
68. Jonathan Smith – Submission dated 12 June 2015
69. Anne Greenway, Principal, Lawyers for Companion Animals – Submission dated N/A
70. Janet Scott - Submission dated 12 June 2015
71. Heather Neil, Chief Executive Officer, RSPCA Australia – Submission dated 12 June 2015
72. Tony Murray, Director of Racing, Racing Services Tasmania – Submission dated 11 June 2015

73. Naomi Hayes – Submission
dated 11 June 2015
74. Renate Homburg – Submission
dated 12 June 2015
75. Julie Williamson, Brightside
Farm Sanctuary Inc –
Submission dated 9 June 2015
76. Mellissa Brow – Submission
dated 12 June 2015
77. June Phillips – Submission
dated N/A
78. Fran Chambers – Submission
dated N/A
79. Fiona Connolly – Submission
dated 11 June 2015
80. Cassandra Edwards –
Submission dated 11 June 2015
81. Alison Bailey – Submission
dated 8 June 2015

82. Jackie Mason – Submission
dated 8 June 2015
83. Cecily Lawrance-Harmey –
Submission dated 8 June 2015
84. Joanne Cowen – Submission
dated 6 June 2015
85. Glenys Oogjes, Executive
Director, Animals Australia –
Submission dated 16 June 2015
86. Carole Owen & Nick Atkinson –
Submission dated 18 June 2015

NOTE: Submissions 17 and 62 were
provided to the Committee in
confidence.

APPENDIX B:

Documents received⁴¹⁹

1. Letter providing supplementary information from Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO, Tasracing, dated 8 July 2016.
2. Brightside Farm Sanctuary, “A Guide to companion greyhound care.”
3. RSPCA Information Paper, “Compulsory muzzling of pet greyhounds in Australia.”
4. Document entitled: “Welfare and its impact on Performance”, tabled Dr Kim Barrett on 11 August 2015.
5. Greyhounds Australasia Constitution.
6. RSPCA – supplementary Information, dated 7 August 2015.
7. Letters regarding positive swabs, from Tony Murray, Director of Racing, dated 13 and 23 November 2015.
8. Letter regarding local and national rules and the future of GAP, from Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO, Tasracing dated 27 November 2015.
9. Document entitled: ‘Exciting New Greyhound Racing Opportunities Now Available’, tabled by Dr Eliot Forbes on 30 November 2015.
10. Letter and attachment regarding ‘strategic development – greyhound programme’, from Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO Tasracing, dated 5 January 2016.
11. Letter regarding trial tracks, stewards powers and dog importations, from Tony Murray, Director of Racing, dated 10 February 2016.
12. Letter regarding further information with respect to greyhounds euthanised in 2013/14 and 2014/15 (up until 10 March 2015), dated 2 March 2016
13. Letter regarding greyhound racing clarification of dates, from Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO, Tasracing, dated 16 March 2016.

⁴¹⁹ Does not include documents received on a confidential basis

14. Letter regarding definition of “Part of an animal” from Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO, Tasracing, dated 30 March 2016
15. Letter and enclosed report regarding status of Review Report recommendations to Committee Chair from Adam Brooks, Minister for Racing (no date).
16. Document relating to number of registered racing greyhound deaths for the six month from period 1st July 2013. Obtained by Ms Andrea Dawkins MP under a Right to Information application, dated 18 August 2016.

APPENDIX C: Minutes

TUESDAY, 21 April 2015

The Committee met in Committee Room 2, Parliament House, Hobart at 1:15 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon

Mr Gaffney

Ms O'Connor

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mrs Taylor

Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Ms Courtney.

ORDER OF THE DAY READ

The Secretary took the Chair and read the Order of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly appointing the Committee.

ELECTION OF CHAIR

The Secretary called for nominations, Mr Valentine nominated Ms O'Connor, who consented to the nomination.

Mr Gaffney nominated Mrs Taylor, who consented to the nomination.

A ballot was then conducted in accordance with Standing Order No. 10 of the House of Assembly, and the result was –

Ms O'Connor – 5 votes

Mrs Taylor – 2 votes

The Secretary declared Ms O'Connor elected as Chair.

Ms O'Connor took the Chair.

ELECTION OF DEPUTY CHAIR

The Chair called for nominations, Ms Rattray nominated Mrs Taylor, who consented to the nomination.

There being no other candidates nominated, the Chair declared Mrs Taylor elected as Deputy Chair.

PARLIAMENTARY RESEARCH OFFICER

Resolved, That unless otherwise ordered Officers of the Parliamentary Research Service be admitted to the proceedings of the Committee whether in public or private session. (Mr Bacon)

CHAIR TO BE THE SPOKESPERSON

Resolved, That the Chair be the spokesperson in relation to the operations of the Committee. (Mr Gaffney)

PRESS STATEMENTS

Resolved, That unless otherwise ordered, press statements on behalf of the Committee be made only by the Chair after approval in principle by the Committee or after consultation with committee members. (Ms Rattray)

REPORTING DATE

Resolved, That the Committee seek an extension of the reporting date for the report of the Committee until Friday 30 October next. (Mrs Taylor)

STANDING ORDERS

Resolved, That unless otherwise ordered the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly be adopted as the Standing Orders of the Committee. (Mr Bacon)

ADVERTISEMENT

The draft advertisement having been previously circulated by the Secretary was taken into consideration by the Committee.

The Committee deliberated.

An amendment was proposed (Mr Gaffney) by leaving out “29 May” and inserting “12 June”.

Which amendment was agreed to. Advertisement, as amended, agreed to with such advertisements to be placed in newspapers on Wednesday, 29 April next.

MEDIA RELEASE

The draft media release having been previously circulated by the Secretary was taken into consideration by the Committee.

The Committee deliberated.

The Committee agreed that the media release be amended to reflect the new closing date for submissions of 12 June 2015.

An amendment was proposed (Ms O’Connor) to insert a new paragraph: “Persons who wish to give confidential evidence to the Committee should contact the Secretary and request that the Committee hear their evidence in private.”

Which amendment was agreed to. Media release, as amended, agreed to.

INVITATION FOR SUBMISSIONS TO THE COMMITTEE

The Committee considered the proposed list of organisations and individuals to be directly invited to provide submissions to the Committee.

Ordered, That the following organisations and individuals be invited to make submissions:

1. Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Clubs;
2. Racing Services Tasmania;
3. Tasracing Board;
4. Greyhounds Australasia Ltd;
5. RSPCA Tasmania;
6. Animals Tasmania;
7. Greyhound Haven Tasmania;
8. Brightside Sanctuary, Emma Haswell;

9. Chief Veterinary Officer, Rod Andrewartha;
10. Tasmanian Veterinary Board;
11. Amanda Hill, Former Steward;
12. Biosecurity Tasmania;
13. Greyhound Reference Group.

POTENTIAL CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS

Ordered, That the Secretary seek advice in relation to how the Committee would deal with evidence that alleges criminal activities.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Resolved, That public hearings be held in Hobart on Tuesday 30 June and Wednesday 1 July 2015. (Mrs Rylah)

At 2:07 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 19 June 2015.

THURSDAY, 4 June 2015

The Committee met in Committee Room 2, Parliament House, Hobart at 1:15 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Gaffney

Ms O'Connor (Chair)

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mr Valentine

Ms Courtney

APOLOGIES

Mr Bacon

Mrs Taylor

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 April last were read and confirmed. (Mr Valentine)

SUBMISSIONS

The Committee noted the submission received for the inquiry and agreed that the receipt and publication of submissions should be decided after the closing date for submissions.

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

(a) The Committee considered the letter received from the Veterinary Board of Tasmania, dated 25 May 2015.

Resolved, That the Committee write to the Board acknowledging their position and indicating that should the Committee receive evidence that has the potential to impact on the practices of veterinarians in Tasmania, the Committee may seek the views of the Board, as the regulatory body for veterinarians in Tasmania. (Mr Gaffney).

Resolved, That the Committee write to the Tasmanian Division of the Australian Veterinary Association inviting a submission and requesting the Association advise its members of the inquiry. (Mr Gaffney)

(b) The Committee considered the request from Ms June Phillips to address the Committee.

Resolved, That the Committee invite Ms Phillips to appear as a witness at the public hearings to be held on 30 June and 1 July and request Ms Phillips to provide a written submission which provides a brief outline of her experience in the industry and a summary of the issues she wishes to raise with the Committee. (Mr Gaffney).

POTENTIAL CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS

The Committee considered a briefing paper in relation to how the Committee could deal with evidence that alleges criminal activities.

Resolved, That the Secretary consult with the Clerk in relation to the Committee's ability to access Crown Law advice if required. (Mrs Rylah).

At 1:50 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 9.30 am 19 June 2015.

FRIDAY, 19 June 2015

The Committee met in Committee Room 2, Parliament House, Hobart at 10.00am.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms Courtney
Mr Gaffney

Ms O'Connor (Chair)
Ms Rattray (by phone)
Mrs Rylah (by phone)
Mrs Taylor
Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Mr Bacon

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 June last were read and confirmed. (Mr Valentine).

The Committee noted the submission received for the inquiry and agreed that the following submissions be received and published in full (Mrs Taylor):

SUBMISSIONS

Submission 1: Biosecurity Tasmania
Submission 2: Sharyn Marshall
Submission 3: Animal Justice Party
Submission 4: Animal Welfare League Australia
Submission 5: Liz Hynes
Submission 6: Clare Jokuszies
Submission 7: Beryl Dix
Submission 8: Paul Whitmore
Submission 9: Leica Wagner
Submission 10: Noel Gibson
Submission 11: Lousie Willie
Submission 12: Lena Bodin
Submission 13: AnneMarie Lewer
Submission 14: Jennifer Dennehey
Submission 15: Angela Hanly
Submission 16: Lynne Hill
Submission 18: Gill Fitzgerald

Submission 19: Philip and Inna Eldridge
Submission 20: Friends of the Hound
Inc. Greyhound Adoption Group
Submission 21: Natalie Coleman
Submission 22: Susan Maher
Submission 23: Belinda Dickenson
Submission 24: Amanda Yorke
Submission 25 Caroline Miller
Submission 26: Greyhound Owners,
Trainers and Breeders Association of
Tasmania (Inc.)
Submission 27: Gail Fitton (Adams)
Submission 28: Launceston Greyhound
Racing Club Inc.
Submission 29: Ruth Eschmann
Submission 30: D Adair
Submission 31: Maria Moore
Submission 32: Erica Holding
Submission 33: Caitlin Connolly
Submission 34: Lee Handley
Submission 35: Hobart Dog Walking
Association Inc.
Submission 36: Tasracing
Submission 37: Greyhounds Australasia
Submission 38: Fiona De Jersey
Submission 39: Animal Welfare
Advisory Committee
Submission 40: Cathryn Firkin
Submission 41: Dorothy Rodgers
Submission 42: Kate Gerdtz
Submission 43: Yvonne Pittam
Submission 44: Dr Kim Barrett
Submission 45: Janet Bradford
Submission 46: Hobart Greyhound
Racing Club
Submission 47: Susan Jones
Submission 48: Gillian Brame
Submission 49: Maureen Ackerley
Submission 50: Penny Burns
Submission 51: Ceinwen Price
Submission 52: Sara Stevens
Submission 53: Kirsty Leaf
Submission 54: K Atkins
Submission 55: Aimee Bound
Submission 56 Adriana Bellemans
Submission 57: Linda Zarik
Submission 58: Marion Horton
Submission 59: Carolyn Mart
Submission 60: Danielle Coleman
Submission 61: Helen Ivory
Submission 63: Animals Tasmania
Submission 64: Holly Mason-White
Submission 65: Australian Veterinary
Association Ltd
Submission 66: Inez Hamilton-Smith
Submission 67: Sandra John
Submission 68: Jonathan Smith
Submission 69: Anne Greenaway,
Principal, Lawyers for Companion
Animals
Submission 70: Janet Scott
Submission 71: RSPCA
Submission 72: Tony Murray, Director
of Racing
Submission 73: Naomi Hayes
Submission 74: Renate Homburg
Submission 75: Brightside Farm
Sanctuary
Submission 76: Mellissa Brow
Submission 77: June Phillips
Submission 78: Fran Chambers
Submission 79: Fiona Connolly
Submission 80: Cassandra Edwards
Submission 81: Alison Bailey
Submission 82: Jackie Mason

Submission 83: Cecily Lawrance-Harmey

Submission 84: Joanne Cowen

Submission 85: Animals Australia

Submission 86: Nick Atkinson and Carole Owen

The Committee agreed to receive the following submissions on a confidential basis (Mrs Taylor):

Submission 17: name withheld; and
Submission 62: Name withheld.

The Committee agreed in principle to a media release being prepared by the Chair advising of the publication of submissions and hearing dates.

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

The Committee considered a number of proforma emails from the following interested persons:

Resolved, That the Secretary write to the interested persons noting their emails and interest in the inquiry. (Ms Courtney)

1. Gizelle Nijjar
2. Vicki de Bruin
3. Drina Coles-Hills
4. Brenda Quinn
5. Graham Lester
6. Wendy Gillard
7. Sharron Jones
8. Carolyn Wellington
9. Lucinda Davis

10. Helen Donovan
11. Shelia Stones
12. Leanne Coates
13. Lorraine Flakemore
14. Michele Blunstone
15. Sally Brooker
16. Amy Range
17. Karen Holm
18. Tristan Drew
19. Geraldine Robertson
20. Time Klinger
21. Allison Bollard
22. Andrew Doran
23. Jenny Fulton
24. Jane Hamilton-Foster
25. Angie Howard
26. Dan Boulter
27. Emma Rigari
28. Paul Kerrisk
29. Judy Kerrisk
30. Philip Fox
31. Jim Reece
32. Sue McKinnie
33. Patricia Tolond
34. Simon King
35. Anel Vermaak
36. Suzana Elder
37. Diane Miller
38. Marlene Oud
39. Graham Kefford
40. Angelina Priest
41. Venise Campbell
42. Liz Ashby
43. Rahmy Khan

WITNESSES FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Committee considered a list of potential witnesses for public hearings.

Resolved, That the following witnesses be invited to give evidence at the hearings: (Mr Gaffney)

1. Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania (Inc.);
2. Name withheld – witness in camera;
3. Australian Veterinary Association Ltd;
4. RSPCA;
5. Brightside Farm Sanctuary;
6. Launceston Greyhound Racing Club;
7. Dr Kim Barrett;
8. Name withheld – witness in camera;
9. June Phillips;
10. Friends of the Hound Inc/Greyhound Adoption Group;
11. Greyhounds Australasia;
12. Animal Welfare Advisory Committee;
13. Biosecurity Tasmania;
14. Tony Murray, Director of Racing;
15. Hobart Dog Walking Club;
16. Tasracing.

At 10:38 a.m. the Committee adjourned until 9.30 am 30 June 2015.

TUESDAY, 30 June 2015

The Committee met in Committee Room 2, Parliament House, Hobart at 9.30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon
Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor (Chair)
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah
Mrs Taylor
Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Ms Courtney

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 June last were read and confirmed. (Mrs Rylah)

SUBMISSIONS

The Committee discussed the publication of submission no. 46: Hobart Greyhound Racing Club following a request for the submission to be confidential.

Resolved, That the Committee ask the Chair of the Hobart Greyhound Racing Club whether the submission may be formally published. (Ms O'Connor)

MEDIA

Resolved, That the media be permitted to film and record proceedings of the public hearings held by the Committee (Mr Gaffney)

WITNESS

Name withheld was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in camera.

The witness withdrew.

WITNESS

Dr Sally-Anne Richter, President of the Australian Veterinary Association (Tasmania Division) was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

The witness withdrew.

WITNESS

Ms Emma Haswell, Brightside Farm Sanctuary, was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

The witness withdrew.

WITNESS

Mr Graeme Barber, Chair, Greyhound Owners, Trainers and Breeders Association of Tasmania Inc. was called. The witness took the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

The witness withdrew.

Suspension of sitting from 1.17 pm to 2.00 pm

WITNESS

Ms Heather Neil, CEO, RSPCA Australia; Ms Jade Norris, Scientific Officer, RSPCA Australia; Ms Caroline Williamson, State Operations & Animal Care Manager, RSPCA Tasmania (by telephone); and Mr Paul McGinty, Chief Inspector, RSPCA Tasmania, were called. The witnesses took the Statutory Declaration and were examined by the Committee in public.

The witnesses withdrew.

WITNESS

Ms Lisa White, President, Friends of the Hound Inc Greyhound Adoption Group was called (by telephone). The witness took the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

The witness withdrew.

WITNESS

Ms Lisa White, President, Friends of the Hound Inc Greyhound Adoption Group was called (by telephone). The witness took the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

The witness withdrew.

WITNESS

Dr Rod Andrewartha, Chief Veterinary Officer, Biosecurity Tasmania, was called. The witness took the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in Public.

The witness withdrew.

At 4.20 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 8.55 am 1 July 2015.

WEDNESDAY, 1 July 2015

The Committee met in Committee Room 2, Parliament House, Hobart at 8.55 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Ms O'Connor (Chair)

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mrs Taylor

Mr Valentine

WITNESSES FOR PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee discussed the unavailability of the Launceston Greyhound Racing Club to appear before the Committee on the dates scheduled for public hearings.

Resolved, That the Launceston Greyhound Racing Club be invited to appear before the Committee on either Monday 10 August 2015 in

Launceston or on a date suitable to the Club. (Mrs Rylah)

The Committee discussed further witnesses for the hearing in Launceston scheduled for 11 August.

Resolved, That Anthony Bullock be invited to appear before the Committee on 11 August 2015. (Ms O'Connor)

WITNESS

Names withheld were called. The witnesses made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in camera.

The witness tabled two documents.

The witnesses withdrew.

WITNESS

Ms June Phillips was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

The witness requested that part of her evidence be heard in camera.

Resolved, That Ms Phillips be permitted to provide evidence in camera and that the room be cleared. (Mr Bacon).

The media and public were cleared from the room.

The witness withdrew.

WITNESS

Mr Scott Parker, CEO, Greyhounds Australasia was called (by telephone).

The witness took the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

The witness withdrew.

WITNESS

Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO, Tasracing, was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

The witness withdrew.

At 1.36 p.m. the Committee adjourned to a date to be fixed.

TUESDAY, 11 August 2015

The Committee met at Henty House, Launceston at 12:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon

MS Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Ms O'Connor (Chair)

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mrs Taylor

Mr Valentine

WITNESS

Mr Anthony Bullock was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

The witness withdrew.

Dr Kim Barrett, Launceston Veterinary Clinic, was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

Dr Barnett tabled a document entitled: "Welfare and its impact on Performance".

The witness withdrew.

MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 30 June and 1 July 2015 last were read and confirmed. (Mr Gaffney)

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

The Committee discussed requesting documents relating to issues raised during testimony of the RSPCA at the previous Committee hearing.

Resolved, That the Committee writes to the RSPCA requesting that it provides all evidence held on file in relation to the investigation of live-baiting in Tasmania since 2008. Such evidence should be redacted to remove the identification of named parties.

WITNESS

Mr Tony Murray, Racing services Tasmania was called. The witness took the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

The witness withdrew.

At 4:03 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 8.30 am 18 September 2015.

TUESDAY, 25 August 2015

The Committee met in Committee Room 3 at 2:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

MS Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Ms O'Connor (Chair)

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mrs Taylor

APOLOGIES

Mr Bacon

Mr Valentine

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 August 2015 were read and confirmed. (Ms Rattray)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM WITNESSES

The Committee agreed to receive and publish the following additional information received from witnesses:

- (a) Greyhounds Australasia – GA Constitution;
- (b) Tasracing:
 - (i) Information regarding kennel size and exercise requirements;
 - (ii) Information regarding CCTV monitoring cameras “in and around the greyhound preparation area at Elwick.
- (c) RSPCA:
 - (i) Letter from Heather Neil, CEO, RSPCA Australia containing supplementary information;
 - (ii) Racing Services Tasmania notification of retired greyhound form.

The Committee agreed to receive and not publish the Minutes of the Greyhound Reference Group received from Tasracing as they pertain to the commercial and operational matters between Tasracing and its greyhound stakeholders.

The Committee agreed to note references regarding contemporary standards for dog housing, environmental enrichment and socialisation.

The Committee considered the evidence given by Emma Haswell, Brightside Animal Sanctuary in relation to allegations in relation to trainers who caged rabbits near where greyhounds were housed.

Resolved, That the Committee invite Ms Haswell to reappear in camera to expand on her evidence and that such invitation explain what protection is afforded by parliamentary privilege and the Committee's obligation to refer allegations of illegal activities to the relevant authorities. (Mr Gaffney)

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

(a) Email from June Phillips, dated 2 July 2015, advising that Mr Neville Allison had offered to show the Committee the operations of his kennel.

The Committee agreed that given a number of Committee Members had individually visited kennels that there was no need for a formal visit to be undertaken by the Committee but that Ms Phillips should be thanked for the offer.

(b) Correspondence from Ms Gail Fitton, dated 1 July 2015 forwarding additional information related to her submission.

Resolved, That the letter be noted and that Ms Fitton be thanked for keeping the Committee fully informed.

(c) Email from Sharyn Marshall, dated 6 July 2015, alleging intimidation from Emma Haswell in relation to comments made in her submission to the inquiry.

The Committee agreed that Ms Marshall should be contacted to determine whether the communications from Ms Haswell have been ongoing.

FUTURE HEARINGS

The Committee discussed the non-attendance of Rick Campbell, Chair of the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee at the hearing held in Launceston on 11 August 2015.

The Chair advised the Committee that the Minister had advised that the Committee should hear from Mr Campbell.

Resolved, That the Committee invite Mr Campbell to appear at a hearing on 18 September 2015. (Ms O'Connor).

At 2:28 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 8.30 am 18 September 2015.

FRIDAY, 18 September 2015

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 9.45 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Ms O'Connor (Chair)

Mrs Rylah

Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Mr Bacon

Ms Rattray

Mrs Taylor

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 August 2015 were read and confirmed. (Mr Valentine)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM WITNESSES

The Committee agreed to receive and publish the following additional information received from witnesses:

- (a) RSPCA: Information Paper: Compulsory muzzling of pet greyhounds in Australia;
- (b) Brightside Animal Sanctuary: Brightside Greyhound Guide.

The Committee agreed to receive the information from the RSPCA in relation to live baiting.

REPORTING TIMEFRAME

Resolved, That the reporting time frame for the inquiry be extended until 31 March 2016. (Ms O'Connor).

Resolved, That a media release be prepared in relation to the extension of the reporting timeframe to be issued when the motion for the extension is moved in the House of Assembly. (Mr Gaffney)

Resolved, That an email be sent to all authors of submissions and witnesses advising of the new reporting timeframe. (Ms Courtney).

FUTURE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

The Committee agreed that the following witnesses be invited to a hearing to be held on Friday 16 October:

- (a) *Name withheld*;
- (b) *Name withheld*; and
- (c) *Name withheld*.

The Committee agreed to hold a meeting on Friday 20 November at 9.00 am to consider findings and recommendations.

WITNESS

Mr Rick Campbell, Chair, Animal Welfare Advisory Committee, was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee on the telephone in public.

The witness withdrew.

Mr John Newson, Chairman and Ms Karlene Cuthbertson, Member, Launceston Greyhound Racing Club Inc were called. The witnesses made the Statutory Declaration and were examined by the Committee in public.

The witnesses withdrew.

At 12:01 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 9.00 am 16 October 2015.

FRIDAY, 16 October 2015

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 9.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Ms O'Connor (Chair)

Mrs Rylah

Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Mr Bacon

Ms Rattray

Mrs Taylor

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 September 2015 were read and confirmed. (Mr Valentine)

WITNESSES

The Committee agreed to hear from *name withheld*, in camera at the hearing to be held this day.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Committee noted the letter from Ms Gail Fitton, dated 30 September 2015.

FUTURE HEARINGS

The Committee agreed that *name withheld* should be rescheduled to appear at an in camera hearing to be held on Friday 20 November:

LETTER TO TASRACING

The Committee agreed to write to Tasracing for information on the future of the Greyhound Adoption Program (GAP).

WITNESS

Name withheld, was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in camera.

The witness withdrew.

WITNESS

Name withheld, was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in camera.

The witness withdrew.

FUTURE HEARINGS

The Committee agreed that Dr Eliot Forbes and Mr Tony Murray should be invited to reappear as witnesses to address a number of issues that have been raised since their previous evidence was given. It was agreed to seek their attendance on Friday 20 November.

The Committee also agreed that given Dr Forbes would be invited to reappear that questions related to the future of the Greyhound Adoption Program could be asked at the hearing rather than through correspondence.

The Committee agreed to seek from Tasracing a copy of the local and national rules and information on any procedures/processes in place for making such rules in advance of Dr Forbes appearing before the Committee.

At 11.26 a.m. the Committee adjourned until 9.00 am 20 November 2015.

FRIDAY, 6 November 2015

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 10.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon
Mr Gaffney (by telephone)
Ms O'Connor (Chair)
Mr Valentine
Mrs Taylor (by telephone)

APOLOGIES

Ms Courtney
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2015 were read and confirmed. (Mr Valentine)

FUTURE HEARINGS

The Committee agreed to call Dr Forbes to give evidence on Monday 30 November at 8.45 am

CORRESPONDENCE

Resolved, That the Committee request the raw data and actions taken on the number of positive swabs and for what substances in 2013, 2014 and 2015 to date from the Director of Racing. (Mr Bacon)

At 10.10 a.m. the Committee adjourned until 9.00 am 20 November 2015.

FRIDAY, 20 November 2015

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 9.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon
Ms Courtney
Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor (Chair)
Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah
Mrs Taylor
Mr Valentine

ISSUES PAPER

The Committee considered the issues paper, which had been previously circulated.

WITNESS

Ms Emma Haswell, Brightside Farm Sanctuary, was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in camera.

The witness withdrew.

WITNESS

Mr Tony Murray, Director of Racing, was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

At 12.15 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 11.00 am 30 November 2015.

MONDAY, 30 November 2015

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 11.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon
Ms Courtney (by Telephone)
Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor (Chair)

Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah (by Telephone)
Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Mrs Taylor

WITNESS

Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO, Tasracing, was called. The witness made the Statutory Declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

Dr Forbes tabled the following paper:

‘Exciting New Greyhound Racing Opportunities Now Available.’

FUTURE MEETING DATES

The Committee considered possible dates to consider proposed findings and recommendations and agreed to set aside Monday 1 and Tuesday 2 February 2016 as possible meeting dates to be confirmed in the New Year.

INFORMATION SOUGHT ON GAP

The Committee discussed the proposal of Tasracing to transfer a number of greyhounds that have completed the Greyhound Adoption Program to the RSPCA for rehoming.

Resolved, that the Committee write to Tasracing to request the details of the funding arrangements for the agreement with the RSPCA and in particular whether the funding is

indirectly or directly being sourced from the industry through a levy or some other measure. (Mr Bacon)

At 12.52 p.m. the Committee adjourned until a date to be determined.

TUESDAY, 2 February 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 10.30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon

Mr Gaffney

Ms O'Connor (Chair)

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah (by Telephone)

Mrs Taylor

Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Ms Courtney

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 6, 20 and 30 November 2015 were read and confirmed. (Mr Gaffney)

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

Resolved, that the correspondence received from Tony Murray, Director of Racing, dated 13 and 23 November 2015 regarding positive swabs be received and published. (Mrs Rylah)

Resolved, that the correspondence received from Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO,

Tasracing dated 27 November 2015 regarding local and national rules and the future of GAP be received and published. (Mr Gaffney)

Resolved, that the correspondence received from Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO Tasracing, dated 5 January 2016 in relation to strategy development – Greyhound Programme be received and published (Mr Gaffney)

CONSIDERATION OF THE CHAIR'S DRAFT REPORT

The Committee considered the Chair's draft report. Ms O'Connor moved that Chapter 2, Summary of Findings, be omitted and replaced with the following:

“The Committee finds that:

- a. Investigations by ABC Four Corners and the 7.30 Report revealed an entrenched culture of animal cruelty and neglect in the greyhound racing industry in Australia;
- b. Evidence presented to the Committee indicating the practice of live baiting had also taken place in Tasmania.
- c. The unacceptably high euthanasia rate of healthy greyhounds in Tasmania;
- d. The high level of public concern about animal welfare practices in the greyhound racing industry.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends that:

1. The Animal Welfare Act 1993 should be amended to reclassify greyhounds from livestock to domestic animals.

2. The greyhound racing industry nationally and in Tasmania has lost its social license and should be banned in this State.”

A debate arose thereupon.

Ms O’Connor, by leave, withdrew the motion.

The Committee continued discussion on the draft report.

Resolved, that the Director of Racing be asked to clarify his use of the term ‘trial tracks’ in evidence before the Committee. (Mrs Taylor)

Resolved, that the Committee Secretary determine the authority in relation to data collected about greyhound imports to Tasmania to seek information as to the quantity. (Mrs Taylor)

The Committee agreed that the Chair’s draft report be restructured as follows:

Chapter 1: Background, Appointment, Terms of Reference and Conduct of the Inquiry;
Chapter 2: Summary of Findings;

Chapter 3: Recommendations;

Chapter 4: Live baiting

4.1 Historic practices;

4.2 Obtaining evidence;

4.3 Differences between the

Tasmanian Racing Industry and the Industry Interstate;

4.4 Behavioural Differences;

4.5 Industry self-monitoring.

Chapter 5: Wastage

5.1 Wastage Rates;

5.2 Overbreeding and wastage rates;

5.3 Tracking of greyhounds.

Chapter 6: Draining

Chapter 7: Welfare Standards and Initiatives

7.1 Welfare Standards

7.1.1 Housing

7.1.2 Racing Injuries

7.1.3 Illegal substances;

7.2 Initiatives to Improve Welfare Standards

7.2.1 The introduction of tighter controls on breeding;

7.2.2 Eliminating breeding incentives;

7.2.3 Rehoming

7.2.3.1 Greyhound Adoption Program

7.2.3.2 Non-GAP rehoming agencies

7.2.4 New Grading System

7.2.5 Other potential welfare reforms

7.2.6 Education and training of participants in the industry

7.2.7 Export of greyhounds

7.2.8 Power of Stewards

7.2.9 Regulation of private training facilities
Chapter 8: Regulation and Reforms
8.1 Regulation of the Greyhound Racing Industry
8.2 Regulation of Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry
Chapter 9: Industry Financial Arrangements
9.1 The economic impact of the industry on the Tasmanian economy;
9.2 Government subsidies;
9.3 Financial sustainability of the industry
9.4 Attracting young participants
Chapter 10: Review of Animal Welfare Arrangements in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry
10.1 Progress of implementation of the recommendations.
Chapter 11: Future of the Industry
11.1 Relationship between Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity
11.2 Relationship between Industry and Tasracing
11.3 Impact of Judicial Decisions on the role of the regulator
11.4 Industry culture
11.5 Community expectations
11.6 Banning greyhound racing
Chapter 12: Matters incidental to the Inquiry
12.1 Muzzling of greyhounds
12.2 Proposals from stakeholders
Chapter 13: Conclusion.

The Committee also agreed that a list of acronyms and definitions appear at the front of the report.

Resolved, that the restructured draft report be provided to the Committee by 12 February 2016. (Mr Gaffney)

FUTURE MEETING DATES

The Committee agreed to the following meeting dates:

Monday 22 February: 1.00 pm to 5.00 pm;

Thursday 25 February: 10.00 am to 5.00 pm;

Wednesday 2 March: 1:00 pm to 5.00 pm; and

Thursday 3 March: 9.00 am to 12 noon.

At 3.34 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Monday 22 February at 1.00 pm.

MONDAY 22 February 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 1.00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon

Ms Courtney (by telephone)

Mr Gaffney

Ms O'Connor (Chair)

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah (by Telephone)

Mrs Taylor

Mr Valentine

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 February 2016 were read and confirmed. (Ms Rattray)

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

Resolved, that the correspondence from Tony Murray, Director of Racing, dated 6 February 2016 clarifying a number of issues for the Committee be received and published. (Mr Bacon)

Resolved, that the Deputy Chair, Hon. Adriana Taylor MLC, take the Chair to consider the email from Sharyn Marshall, dated 16 February 2016. (Mr Gaffney)

Motion moved, That in light of recent media coverage and in the best interest of the greyhound inquiry, that Ms Cassy O'Connor be replaced as Chair. (Mr Gaffney).

A debate arose thereupon.

The Committee divided

Ayes:

Mr Bacon

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mrs Taylor

Noes:

Ms O'Connor

Mr Valentine

It was resolved in the affirmative.

ELECTION OF CHAIR

The Deputy Chair called for nominations for Chair, Mr *Gaffney* nominated Mrs *Taylor*, who consented to the nomination.

There being no other candidates nominated, Mrs *Taylor* was declared elected as Chair.

ELECTION OF DEPUTY CHAIR

The Chair called for nominations for Deputy Chair, Ms Rattray nominated Mr Gaffney, who consented to the nomination.

Mr Bacon nominated Ms Courtney, who consented to the nomination.

Ms O'Connor nominated Mrs Rylah, who consented to the nomination.

Mr Gaffney and Ms Courtney withdrew their nominations.

There being only one candidate nominated, Mrs Rylah was declared elected as Deputy Chair.

CHAIR'S DRAFT REPORT

The Committee discussed the Chair's draft report and agreed that given the change in Chair that the new Chair would review the draft report prior to the Committee's consideration of it.

NEXT MEETING

At 2.20 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 25 February at 10.00 am.

THURSDAY 25 February 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 10.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon

Ms Courtney (by telephone)

Mr Gaffney

Ms O'Connor

Ms Rattray (by telephone)

Mrs Rylah (by Telephone)

Mrs Taylor (Chair)

Mr Valentine

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2016 were read and confirmed. (Mr Valentine)

BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Committee discussed the media release issued by the Committee in relation to the change in Chair and subsequent media coverage.

The Chair reminded Committee Members that Committee deliberations were confidential and that the Chair was the spokesperson for the Committee.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee considered proposed findings and recommendations.

Suspension of sitting from 12.45 pm to 2.00 pm

REPORTING TIMEFRAME

Resolved, That the reporting time frame for the inquiry be extended until 31 May 2016. (Mr Valentine).

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee considered proposed findings and recommendations.

CLARIFICATION OF DATA

The Committee agreed to seek clarification from Tony Murray, as to whether the data regarding euthanasia on page 27 of the Review of arrangements for animal welfare in the Tasmanian greyhound industry refers to healthy greyhounds that have been euthanased prematurely or whether it also include greyhounds that may have been euthanased due to injury and old age.

NEXT MEETING

At 4.22 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 2 March at 1.00 pm.

WEDNESDAY 2 March 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 1 at 1.00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah (by Telephone)
Mrs Taylor (Chair)
Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Mr Bacon
Ms Courtney

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 February 2016 were read and confirmed. (Mr Valentine)

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee considered proposed findings and recommendations.

NEXT MEETING

At 5.10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 3 March at 9.00 am.

THURSDAY, 3 March 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 9.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms Courtney
Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah (by Telephone)
Mrs Taylor (Chair)

Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Mr Bacon

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee considered proposed findings and recommendations.

NEXT MEETING

At 12.05 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Monday 21 March at 10.00 am.

MONDAY, 21 March 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 10.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon
Ms Courtney (by Telephone)
Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah (by Telephone)
Mrs Taylor (Chair)
Mr Valentine

MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 2 and 3 March 2016 were read and confirmed. (Ms Rattray)

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

The Committee noted the emails received from Valerie Andrews, dated 3 March 2016, and Tanzi Lewis, dated 20 March 2016.

Resolved, That Ms Andrews and Ms Lewis be advised that the matters raised in their correspondence form part of the Committee's inquiry.

The Committee noted the email received from the Office of Racing Integrity regarding whelping figures, dated 15 March 2016.

The Committee agreed the figures would be incorporated into the Committee's Report.

The Committee considered proposed findings and recommendations.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee considered proposed findings and recommendations.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Suspension of sitting from 12.45 pm to 1.35 pm

NEXT MEETING

At 4.07 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 30 March at 10.00 am.

WEDNESDAY, 30 March 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 10.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

*Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah
Mrs Taylor (Chair)
Mr Valentine*

APOLOGIES

*Mr Bacon
Ms Courtney*

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee considered proposed findings and recommendations.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Suspension of sitting from 12.18 pm to 1.00 pm

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee considered proposed findings and recommendations.

UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Resolved, that the Chair write to Tony Murray, Director of Racing and Dr Eliot Forbes, CEO, Tasracing requesting an update on the implementation of recommendations made in the Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry to ensure the Committee can report accurately on the current status of the recommendations. (Mr Gaffney)

NEXT MEETING

At 4.09 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 31 March at 9.00 am.

THURSDAY 31 March 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 9.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon
Ms Courtney (by telephone)
Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor
Ms Rattray (by telephone)
Mrs Rylah
Mrs Taylor (Chair)
Mr Valentine

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee considered proposed findings and recommendations.

NEXT MEETING

At 12.07 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 21 April at 12.00 noon.

THURSDAY 21 April 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 3 at 12.07 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon

Ms Courtney
Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah (by telephone)
Mrs Taylor (Chair)
Mr Valentine

MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 21, 30 and 31 March 2016 were read and confirmed. (*Mr Valentine*)

CORRESPONDENCE

Resolved, That the Committee noted the following correspondence:

- (a) Letter from Dr Eliot Forbes, dated 5 April 2016
- (b) Email from Ms Glenda Attenborough, dated 18 April 2016. (*Mr Gaffney*)

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee considered Chapter 9 and 11.

The Committee considered proposed findings and recommendations.

Resolved, that the following new paragraphs be adopted:

“3.4 The Committee finds the ABC Four Corners Program aired in February 2015 raised public awareness about illegal practices in the Australian greyhound racing industry.

3.5 The Committee finds as a result of the ABC program there is public concern about the possibility of live-baiting in the Tasmanian industry.”

Ms O’Connor proposed an amendment to paragraph 3.9 to leave out all words after “indicates” and insert instead:

“that live baiting has been part of training practice in the greyhound industry in the past, but it has not been possible for the Committee to determine when, or if, the practice has ceased.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It passed in the negative.

Paragraph 3.9, as read, agreed to.

Resolved, that paragraph 3.10 be amended to leave out “cultural and regulatory change, live baiting is no longer acceptable.” and insert instead “legislative, regulatory and cultural change, live baiting is neither legal nor acceptable in Tasmania.”

The Committee suspended from 2:15pm until 2:31pm.

The Committee continued considering proposed findings and recommendations.

Resolved, that paragraph 3.20 be amended to leave out “concrete” and insert instead “substantiated” and to leave out “absolutely”.

Resolved, that paragraph 3.21 be amended to leave out the words “activity” after “live baiting”, and “credible” after the word “obtain”.

Resolved, that paragraph 3.21, be further amended to leave out the words “allow an investigation” and insert instead “lead to a prosecution”.

Ms O’Connor proposed Recommendation 1 be amended.

Question put, That the amendment be agreed to:

It was passed in the negative.

Resolved, that Recommendation 1 be amended to leave out all words after “That” and insert instead:

“the Government review the legal framework underpinning the prohibition of live baiting in Tasmania, in light of the frustrations expressed by the Office of Racing Integrity and the RSPCA”.

Recommendation 1, as amended, agreed to.

Ms O'Connor proposed Recommendation 2 be amended.

The Committee divided

Ayes:

Ms O'Connor

Noes:

Mr Bacon

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mrs Taylor

Mr Valentine

It was passed in the negative.

Resolved, that Recommendation 2 amended to leave out all words after "That" and insert instead:

"the Government instruct the Office of Racing Integrity to educate industry participants and the general public of the contemporary legal framework underpinning the prohibition of live baiting in Tasmania."

Recommendation 2, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 3.34 agreed to.

Resolved, that new paragraph be inserted after paragraph 3.34:

"The Committee finds the separation of regulatory roles in Tasmania provides an opportunity for improved

welfare outcomes for facing greyhounds."

Ms O'Connor proposed the new paragraph be amended as follows:

To leave out all words after "finds" and insert instead "that while this separation of regulatory roles may lead to improved animal welfare outcomes for greyhounds in the industry, of itself, this separation of functions provides no guarantee of improved animal welfare outcomes.

Question put, That the amendment be agreed to;

It passed in the negative.

Ms O'Connor proposed to insert new paragraph:

"The Committee finds that, given the historic practices of live baiting in Tasmania, and ongoing professional connections between industry participants in Tasmania and interstate, it is unrealistic to operate under the assumption that there are significant cultural differences between the industry in Tasmania and interstate."

The Committee divided:

Ayes:

Ms O'Connor

Noes:

Mr Bacon

Mr Gaffney
Mr Valentine

Ms Courtney
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah
Mrs Taylor

It was passed in the negative.

Paragraph 3.35 agreed to.

Ms O'Connor moved an amendment to paragraph 3.36 to leave out all words after "trial tracks" and insert instead:

"in Tasmania, the Office of Racing Integrity has confirmed there are 28 bullrings and 31 private tracks in Tasmania and this raises concerns about the potential for live baiting practices taking place."

Question put, that the amendment be agreed to;

It passed in the negative.

Paragraph 3.36, as read, agreed to.

Resolved, that new Recommendation A agreed to be inserted after paragraph 3.36:

"Recommendation A: The Committee recommends that the separation between the Office of Racing Integrity and Tasracing be maintained."

NEXT MEETING

At 3:58 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Friday 22 April at 9.00 am.

FRIDAY 22 April 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 3 at 9.04 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon
Ms Courtney
Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah (by telephone)
Mrs Taylor (Chair)
Mr Valentine

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee considered proposed findings and recommendations.

Paragraphs 3.42 and 3.51 agreed to.

Resolved, that Recommendation 3 be amended to leave out all words after "That" and insert instead:

"the Government provide resources to effectively monitor, regulate and enforce section 11(2) of the *Animal Welfare Act 1993* to reduce the potential for live baiting."

Paragraph 4.8 agreed to.

Resolved, that paragraph 4.9 be amended to leave out the word

“done” and insert instead
“undertaken”.

Paragraph 4.18 agreed to.

Resolved, that paragraph 4.19 be amended to leave out “also notes” and insert instead “finds” and to leave out “may in fact” and insert instead “is likely to”.

Paragraph 4.27 agreed to.

Resolved, that paragraph 4.41 be amended to leave out all words after “data” and insert instead:

“regarding Tasmanian racing greyhounds”.

Resolved, that new Recommendation A be inserted before recommendation 4:

“Recommendation A: That the Government support the Office of Racing Integrity and Tasracing’s commitment to Greyhounds Australasia’s “Towards Zero Euthanasia” frame work and take active steps to achieve this goal.”

Recommendation 4 agreed to.

Resolved, that Recommendation 5 be amended to leave out all words after “Implemented” and insert instead:

“Create a rule of racing that at all times (from whelping onwards) a greyhound must be in the possession of, and under the ownership, care and control of a licensed person.”

Resolved, that paragraph 5.12 be amended to leave out: “which does not in itself raise any animal welfare issues.”

Resolved, that paragraph 5.13 be amended to leave out the word “such” and insert instead “greyhound”.

Resolved, that paragraph 5.14 be amended to leave out the words “the procedure given that it occurs prior to the dogs being euthanased” and insert instead “draining/blood collection”.

Ms O’Connor proposed an amendment to paragraph 6.16 to leave out all words after “finds” and insert instead:

“that there is significant room for improvement in the standards sets by the regulator for greyhound housing, socialisation and exercise levels in Tasmania.”

Question put, That the amendment be agreed to:

The Committee divided

Ayes:

Noes:

Ms O'Connor
Mrs Rylah
Mr Valentine

Mr Bacon
Ms Courtney
Mr Gaffney
Ms Rattray
Mrs Taylor

It was passed in the negative.

Resolved, that paragraph 6.16 be amended to leave out all words after “Committee” and insert instead:

“notes some animal welfare agencies believe the standards set for the greyhound industry do not meet best practices for the welfare of dogs.”

Resolved, that paragraph 6.17 be amended to leave out “notes” and insert instead “finds” and to leave out “and could be improved”.

Resolved, that recommendation 6 be amended to insert the word “welfare” after “best” and the word “improved” after “established”.

Ms Rattray withdrew at 10:28 a.m.

The meeting was suspended from 10:29 a.m. until 10:48 a.m.

The Committee continued to consider proposed findings and recommendations.

Paragraphs 6.33 to 6.35 agreed to.

Resolved, that a new paragraph be inserted after paragraph 6.35:

“The Committee finds that there is a link between racing injuries, euthanasia and wastage levels.”

Resolved, that recommendations 7 and 8 be amended as follows:

“Recommendation 7: That Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity collect information and report on injuries sustained during trialling and racing.

Recommendation 8: That Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity investigate the reasons for injuries and if the design and/or condition of the track is identified as a contributing factor, improvements must be undertaken.”

NEXT MEETING

At 11.59 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Friday 6 May at 9.00 a.m.

FRIDAY, 6 May 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 2 at 9.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon
Ms Courtney
Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor

Mrs Rylah (by telephone)
Mrs Taylor (Chair)
Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Ms Rattray

PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CHAIR'S DRAFT REPORT

The Committee agreed on the proposed approach for consideration of the Chair's draft report as follows:

- (1) The findings and recommendations, as agreed to by the Committee would be incorporated into the draft report;
- (2) Chapter 9 of the draft report would be redrafted by the Secretary to reflect the current status of the recommendations with the Committee to propose findings and recommendations for the Chapter at a subsequent meeting;
- (3) The draft report would then be considered page by page, with Members raising objections or amendment by exception.

REPORTING TIMEFRAME

Resolved, That the Committee seek an extension of the reporting date for the report of the Committee until Thursday 22 September next. (Mr Gaffney)

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

Resolved, that the correspondence received from Hon Adam Brooks MP,

Minister for Racing, undated regarding the status of recommendations made in the Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry be received and published. (Mr Bacon)

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Committee considered the Chair's proposed findings and recommendation:

Paragraphs 6.41 and 6.42 agreed to;

Recommendation 9 agreed to;

Recommendation 10, amendment agreed to insert "effective" before "routine". (Mr Valentine);

Amendment agreed to leave out "to meet its statutory obligations, specifically" and insert instead "In order". (Mr Gaffney);

Recommendation 10, as amended, agreed to;

Paragraph 6.45 agreed to;

Paragraph 6.51 amendment agreed to leave out "by a" and insert instead "out of". (Mr Valentine);

Paragraph 6.51, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.52 agreed to;

Recommendation 11 agreed to.

Recommendation 12 read. Question put that recommendation 12 be agreed to.

The Committee divided:

Ayes:	Noes:
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	<i>Mr Bacon</i>
	<i>Ms Courtney</i>
	<i>Mr Gaffney</i>
	<i>Mrs Taylor</i>
	<i>Mr Valentine</i>

It passed in the negative.
Paragraph 6.57 agreed to.

Paragraph 6.82, amendment agreed to leave out “supports the rehoming of the maximum number of greyhounds and acknowledges”. (Mr Gaffney).

Paragraph 6.82, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.83, amendment agreed to leave out “”could be more effectively managed” and insert instead “needs to be increased or more effective managed to maximise the number of dogs rehomed.” (Mr Gaffney)

Paragraph 6.83, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.84 agreed to.

Recommendation 13:

First amendment agreed to merge the two parts of the recommendation.

Second amendment to leave out the word “report” in the second sentence and insert “is to include examination of”. (Ms O'Connor).

Third amendment agreed to leave out “and investigate” and insert “as well as investigating” (Ms Courtney).

Recommendation 13, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 14, amendment agreed to leave out “provide further information to the industry in relation to” and insert instead “engage widely with the industry on available rehoming options including details of”. (Ms O'Connor).

Recommendation 14, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.94 agreed to.

Recommendation 15, amendment agreed to leave out “for the next three years”. (Ms O'Connor).

Recommendation 15, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.98 agreed to.

Recommendation 16, read, amendment proposed to leave out “further investigate whether provisions regarding mental suffering should be incorporated in the *Animal Welfare Act 1993*” and insert instead “move to incorporate provisions regarding the mental suffering of animals into the *Animal Welfare Act 1993*”. (Ms O’Connor).

Question put, that the amendment be agreed to.

The Committee divided:

Ayes:	Noes:
Ms O’Connor	Mr Bacon
Mr Valentine	Ms Courtney
	Mr Gaffney
	Mrs Taylor

Recommendation 16, as read agreed to (Ms Courtney abstaining).

Paragraph 6.109 agreed to.

Paragraph 6.110, amendment agreed to insert “considers it” after the word “industry”. (Mr Gaffney).

Recommendation 17, agreed to.

Recommendation 18, amendment agreed to leave out “the Government be responsible for providing” and insert instead “Tasracing provide”. (Mr Gaffney).

Recommendation 18, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment agreed to insert new paragraph above paragraph 6.113:

“The Committee notes that an unknown number of greyhounds bred and raised in Australia are being exported to countries with poor welfare standards.” (Ms O’Connor).

Paragraph 6.113, agreed to.

Amendment agreed to insert new paragraph below paragraph 6.113:

“The Committee is unable to ascertain if any Tasmanian greyhounds are being exported to countries with poor animal welfare standards.” (Ms O’Connor)

Mrs Rylah joined the meeting.

Recommendation 19, amendments agreed to:

First amendment to leave out “Federal Minister for Agriculture” and insert instead “appropriate Federal Minister(s)” (Mr Gaffney)

Second amendment to leave out “the issue of the export exploitation of greyhounds” and insert instead “the welfare of exported greyhounds.” (Mr Valentine)

Paragraph 6.122 amendment agreed to split the paragraph as follows:

“6.122 The Committee notes the powers of animal welfare officers have been extended through recent amendments to the Animal Welfare Act 1993.

New paragraph: The Committee finds there is uncertainty concerning the extent of the power of stewards to seize evidence under the Rules of Racing.” (Mr Gaffney)

Ms Courtney withdrew.

Paragraph 6.123 amendment agreed to leave out “question and obtain evidence from unlicensed persons.” And insert instead “question, obtain evidence or compel unlicensed persons to appear before an inquiry.” (Ms O’Connor)

Recommendation 20, amendment agreed to leave out “to seize evidence under the Rules of Racing, including whether unlicensed persons should be compelled to appear before an inquiry.” and insert instead:

“under the Rules of Racing and the Animal Welfare Act 1993: to seize evidence; to question and obtain evidence from unlicensed persons; and to compel unlicensed persons to appear before an inquiry.”

Recommendation 20, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.133 agreed to.

New recommendation agreed to: “That the Office of Racing Integrity progress the registration of all private training facilities as a matter of priority.” (Ms O’Connor).

FUTURE MEETING DATES

The Committee agreed to the following future meeting dates:

Wednesday 25 May at 1.00 pm; and
Friday 17 June from 9.30 am to 1.00 pm.

At 11.53 a.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 25 May at 1.00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, 25 May 2016

The Committee met in the Ante Chamber, Parliament House, Hobart at 1:06 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Bacon
Mr Gaffney
Ms Courtney
Ms O’Connor
Ms Rattray (Deputy Chair)
Mrs Rylah
Mr Mulder
Mr Valentine

ELECTION OF CHAIR

The Deputy Chair called for nominations;

Mr Valentine nominated Ms Rylah, who declined the nomination.

Ms Courtney nominated Ms Rattray who accepted the nomination.

Mr Mulder nominated Ms O'Connor who declined the nomination.

Ms O'Connor nominated Mr Mulder who accepted the nomination.

A ballot was then conducted in accordance with Standing Order No. 10 of the House of Assembly, and the result was –

Ms Rattray – 5 votes

Mr Mulder – 3 votes

The Secretary declared Ms Rattray elected as Chair.

Ms Rattray took the Chair.

Ms O'Connor requested the minutes note her concerns regarding a possible perceived bias of the new Chair towards the greyhound racing industry.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Mr Mulder advised that his spouse was the owner of a greyhound purchased

from the Greyhound Adoption Program.

NEXT MEETING

At 1.21 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 9.30am on 17 June 2016.

FRIDAY, 17 June 2016

The Committee met in the Ante Chamber, Parliament House, Hobart at 9.30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms Rattray (Chair)

Mr Bacon

Mr Gaffney

Ms O'Connor

Mrs Rylah (by telephone)

Mr Mulder

Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Ms Courtney

MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 22 April and 6 May 2016 were read and confirmed. (Mr Valentine)

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 May 2016 were read and confirmed. (Mr Gaffney)

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 April were deferred to enable the wording of amendments moved by Ms O'Connor to be inserted.

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

Resolved, that the email from Peter West, CEO of RSPCA Tasmania, dated 25 May 2016 be received and noted.
(Mr Valentine)

CONSIDERATION OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee considered the proposed findings and recommendations:

Paragraph 7.23 agreed to.

Paragraph 7.24, amendment agreed to insert the word “some” after the word “implemented.

Paragraph 7.24, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 7.25, amendment agreed to leave out the words “is generally positive for the industry” and insert instead “provides opportunity for improved animal welfare outcomes.”

Amendment agreed to split the paragraph into two findings and renumber to paragraphs 7.23 and 7.24.

Mrs Rylah proposed the following new Paragraph be inserted before recommendation 21:

“The Committee considers that the future of greyhound racing in Australia

and therefore Greyhounds Australasia rests upon the prioritisation of animal welfare outcomes in every rule and policy of racing.”

Amendment agreed to insert the words “community acceptance and/or” before the word “future”.

Amendment agreed to leave out the words “and therefore Greyhounds Australasia rests upon the prioritisation of animal welfare outcomes in every rule and policy of racing” and insert instead “rests upon Greyhounds Australasia and authorities prioritising animal welfare in the rules, policies and practices of racing.”

New paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 21, amendment agreed to leave out the words “through Greyhounds Australasia, to consult about potential conflicts between the Local and National Rules of Racing with a view to establishing national uniformity where possible” and insert instead “to reach an agreed position with the Office of Racing Integrity on rules affecting animal welfare standards and that this agreed position be presented to Greyhounds Australasia with the aim of achieving best practice in animal welfare

through consistent application and improvement of national standards.”

Mrs Rylah proposed a new recommendation:

“That the Government advocate for the Board of Greyhounds Australasia to be expanded to have equal board representation for States where the racing industry has separate commercial and integrity bodies.”

Amendment agreed to leave out the words “equal board representation for States where the racing industry has separate commercial and integrity bodies” and insert instead “separate and equal board representation for commercial and integrity functions.”

New recommendation, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 8.17, amendment agreed to leave out the words “the information it received on how the greyhound racing industry is funded, lacks consistency and clarity” and insert instead “there was conflicting evidence on financial arrangements of the greyhound racing industry.”

Paragraph 8.17, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 8.18, amendment agreed to leave out the words “the racing industry, including”.

Paragraph 8.18, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 8.19, amendment agreed to leave out all words after the word “notes” and insert instead:

“the perceived disparity of the allocation of revenue generated from the three racing codes relative to the revenue generated by the greyhound racing industry.”

Paragraph 8.19, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 8.22, amendment agreed to leave out the word “valuable”.

Paragraph 8.22, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 8.25 to 8.27 agreed to.

Recommendation 22 amendment agreed to leave out all words after the word “Government” and insert instead:

“undertake a cost-benefit analysis of the Tasmanian racing codes to inform a review of the current funding model for the racing industry.”

Recommendation 22, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 23, the Committee agreed to convert the proposed recommendation to a finding as follows:

“The Committee considers the continued public funding of the greyhound racing industry be conditional on improving animal welfare outcomes.”

Paragraph 10.10, amendment agreed to leave out the words “The Committee also notes Mr Murray’s comment that such tensions do not compromise efforts to improve animal welfare” and insert instead “which potentially compromise efforts to improve animal welfare.

Paragraph 10.10, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.18, amendment agreed to leave out all words after the word “finds” and insert instead:

“the evidence received indicates there is a lack of effective consultation and communication between Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity that disseminates to individual industry participants.”

The Committee agreed to reconsider paragraph 10.18, as amended at its next meeting.

FUTURE MEETINGS

The Committee agreed to the following meeting dates:

DATES

Tuesday, 2 August 2016 from 9.00 am to 2.30 pm

Friday 12 August from 9.00 am to 1.00 pm

Friday 19 August from 9.00 am to 1.00 pm

NEXT MEETING

At 12.35 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 9.00am on 2 August 2016.

Tuesday, 2 August 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 2, Parliament House, Hobart at 9.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms Rattray (Chair)

Mr Bacon

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Mrs Rylah (Deputy Chair)

Mr Mulder

Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Ms O'Connor

MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 17 June 2016 were read and confirmed.
(Mrs Rylah)

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 April were deferred to enable the wording of amendments moved by Ms O'Connor to be inserted.

CONSIDERATION OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee considered the proposed findings and recommendations:

The Committee agreed to amend Paragraph 10.18, to leave out the word "indicated", and insert the word "indicates", after "received" and to leave out the words "between Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity that disseminates" and insert after the word "participants", the words "from Tasracing".

Paragraph 10.18, as amended, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to amend Recommendation 26, to insert after the word "Tasracing", the words 'and the Office of Racing Integrity' and to

leave out the word "its" and insert the word "their".

Amendment agreed to leave out the word "communication" and to insert after the word "participants", the words "to improve animal welfare".
(Mr Gaffney)

Recommendation 26, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.24, amendment agreed to leave out the words "similar to other jurisdictions". (Ms Courtney)

Paragraph 10.24, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 27, amendment agreed to leave out the words "To support the regulator's role in penalising industry participants who are in breach of the rules of racing".
(Mr Gaffney)

Amendment agreed to insert after the word "existing", the words "penalties and appeal". (Mrs Rylah)

Amendment agreed to leave out the words "such as limiting stays of proceedings and the introduction of minimum penalties, and insert the words, "particularly pertaining to issues of animal welfare". (Mr Bacon)

Recommendation 27, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.28, amendment agreed to leave out the word “recognition”, and insert the words “heightened concern”. (Mr Valentine)

The Committee agreed to a further amendment to Paragraph 10.28 to leave out the words “industry that animal welfare expectations have changed”, and insert the words, “community for animal welfare and this concern has been recognised within the industry”.

Paragraph 10.28 as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.29, amendment agreed to leave out the words “endorsed by the industry”, and insert the words, “adopted by Tasracing and broadly supported by the industry”. (Ms Rattray)

Paragraph 10.29 as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.37, amendment agreed to leave out the word, “changing”. (Mr Gaffney)

Paragraph 10.37 as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.38, amendment agreed to leave out the words, “expectation is that”, and insert the word, “expects”. (Mr Valentine)

Amendment agreed to leave out the words, “monitor and”. (Mr Gaffney)

Paragraph 10.38 as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.39, as read, agreed to.

The Committee agreed that the following new recommendation be inserted after Paragraph 10.39:

“That the Government establish benchmarks for continual improvement of animal welfare standards to be reported in Tasracing’s annual report.”

The Committee agreed to amend Paragraph, 10.42, to leave out the word, “a level of”, and insert the words, “some” and insert the words, “in Tasmania” and the end of the paragraph.

Paragraph 10.42 as amended, agreed to.

The Committee agreed the following new paragraph be inserted after Paragraph 10.42:

“Noting the Inquiry’s Terms of Reference and based on the evidence received the Committee does not support the banning of greyhound racing in Tasmania”.

The Committee agreed to move the section on “Banning greyhound racing” to “Chapter 11: Matters incidental to the Inquiry”.

The Committee agreed to delete proposed Recommendation 28.

The Committee agreed that the following new paragraph be inserted before paragraph 11.12:

“The Committee notes evidence received that greyhounds are differentially treated under the Dog Control Act 2000.”

Paragraph 11.12 as read, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to amend Recommendation 29, to leave out all words after “that” an insert instead:

“the Government review the appropriateness of the differentiation of greyhounds under the Dog Control Act 2000.”

The Committee agreed to amend Paragraph 11.17, to leave out the words, “a number of proposals for

stakeholders”, and insert the words, “certain proposals from animal welfare advocates”.

The Committee agreed to delete Paragraphs 11.18 and 11.19 and Recommendations 30 and 31.

The Committee agreed to move the section “Attracting young participants” to “Chapter 10: Future of the Industry.”

The Committee considered proposed chapter 9: The Review Report.”

Paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2 as read, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to amend Paragraph 9.3, to leave out the words “on the Report”.

Paragraph 9.3, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 9.4 to 9.12 as read, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to amend Paragraph 9.13, to leave out the words, “it was noted by the Australian Veterinary Association (AVA) that introducing an offence to have small animals on a property where greyhounds are kept could impact on reforms to ensure greater socialisation of greyhounds. In evidence before the Committee”.

Paragraph 9.13 as amended, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to amend Paragraph 9.14, to leave out the words, “that a requirement to prohibit small animals on premises where racing greyhounds are kept was worthy of consideration but was probably more appropriately placed in a guideline and should be addressed through education of industry participants rather than in legislation”.

Paragraph 9.14 as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 9.15 to 9.22 as read, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to amend Paragraph 9.23, to leave out the word, ‘there’, and insert the word, ‘these’ in its place.

Paragraph 9.23 as amended, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to amend Paragraph 9.24, to include the words ‘The GAP Strategy 2020 & Beyond was officially released in July 2016’ at the end of the paragraph.

Paragraph 9.24 as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 9.25 to 9.32, as read, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to insert the following new paragraph after paragraph 9.32:

“Tasracing’s GAP Strategy 2020 & Beyond, released in July 2016 indicates that the funding for GAP has increased from an annual spend of \$118,000 in 2014/15 to \$264,000 in 2015/16.”

Paragraphs 9.33 to 9.36 as read, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to amend Paragraph 9.37, to leave out the words, " that he is considering the matter with respect”, and insert instead, the words, “this matter is being considered in relation”.

Paragraph 9.37 as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 9.38 to 9.50 as read, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to include additional quotes from the transcript between witness and committee members in paragraph 9.51.

Paragraphs 9.52 to 9.54 as read agreed to.

The Committee agreed to amend Paragraph 9.55, to leave out the word, “noted”, and insert in its place, the word, “advised”.

Paragraph 9.55 as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 9.56 to 9.64, as read, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to amend Paragraph 9.65, to leave out the words, “by the Director of Racing”.

Paragraph 9.65, as amended, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to delete paragraphs 9.66 and 9.67.

The Committee agreed to insert the following new paragraph, after Paragraph 9.65, with the following wording:

“The Committee notes that evidence received supports a lifetime ban for any person found guilty of live baiting.”

The Committee agreed to insert the following new Recommendation, after the new paragraph:

“That a lifetime ban be implemented for a person found guilty of live baiting in Tasmania.”

FUTURE MEETING DATES

The Committee agreed to the following meeting dates:

Friday 12 August from 9.00 am to 1.00 pm

Friday 19 August from 9.00 am to 1.00 pm

NEXT MEETING

At 2.05 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 9.00am on 12 August 2016.

Friday, 12 August 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 2,, Parliament House, Hobart at 8.30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms Rattray (Chair)

Ms Courtney (by telephone)

Mr Gaffney

Ms O’Connor

Mrs Rylah (Deputy Chair)(by telephone)

Mr Mulder

Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Mr Bacon

MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 21 April and 2 August 2016 were read and confirmed. (Mr Valentine)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT

Chapter 1: Conduct of the Inquiry

Paragraphs 1.1 to 1.6, as read, agreed to.

Mr Mulder
Ms O'Connor
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah

The Committee agreed to insert a table of events and the attendance record in Chapter 1.

Question passed in the negative.

The Committee deferred consideration of Chapter 2: Recommendations.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

Chapter 3: Live Baiting

The Committee divided

Paragraphs 3.1 to 3.21, as read, agreed to.

Ayes:	Noes:
<i>Ms Courtney</i>	<i>Ms O'Connor</i>
<i>Mr Gaffney</i>	<i>Mr Valentine</i>

Mr Mulder
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah

Paragraph 3.22 read.

Amendment proposed by Mr Mulder to leave out the words 'while' and 'it cannot be ruled out.'

Question resolved in the affirmative.

An amendment to the amendment was proposed by Mr Valentine to insert at the end of the paragraph the following words:

Paragraph 3.22, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 3.23, as read, agreed to.

"The Committee received insufficient evidence to conclude that live baiting is occurring in Tasmania."

Recommendation 1 read.

Amendment proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out the following words:

Question put that the amendment to the amendment be agreed to.

"in light of the frustrations expressed by the Office of Racing Integrity and the RSPCA."

The Committee divided

Ayes:	Noes:
<i>Mr Valentine</i>	<i>Ms Courtney</i>
	<i>Mr Gaffney</i>

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 1, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 2, as read, agreed to.

Paragraphs 3.24 to 3.38, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 3.39 read.

Amendment proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out all words after “that” and replace with:

“while there are different lure registration requirements and there are no registered private ‘trial tracks’ in Tasmania, the existence of other training facilities and the lack of information about them increases the difficulty of investigating the possibility of live baiting.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes:

Mr Gaffney

Mr Mulder

Ms O’Connor

Mr Valentine

Noes:

Ms Courtney

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 3.39, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 3, as read, agreed to.

Amendment proposed by Mr Gaffney to insert the following new recommendation after recommendation 3:

“That all training facilities including but not limited to trial tracks, training tracks and bullrings be registered with the Office of Racing Integrity.”

Question put that the new recommendation be agreed to.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraphs 3.40 to 3.44, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 3.45 read.

Amendment proposed by Ms O’Connor to insert the words “conflicting and” before the word “inconclusive”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 3.45, as amended, agreed to.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 3.46 to 3.52, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 4, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 3.53 read.

Chapter 4: Wastage

Amendment proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out the word 'significant'.

Paragraphs 4.1 to 4.7, as read, agreed to.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

Paragraph 4.8 read.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out the words "about the term 'wastage' being emotive and that the term is a factor in raising community concern about the industry" and insert instead:

Paragraph 3.53, as amended, agreed to.

"by the industry that the term 'wastage' is both emotive and is a factor in raising community angst."

Paragraph 3.54, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 4 read.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Amendment proposed by Mr Mulder to leave out all words after that and insert instead:

The Committee divided

"the Government review the legal framework underpinning animal welfare and the prohibition of live baiting in Tasmania with a view to increasing regulation and investigative powers with an emphasis on training facilities and industry practices."

Ayes:

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Mr Mulder

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mr Valentine

Noes:

Ms O'Connor

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 4.8, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 4.9 read.

Amendment proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out all words after "Committee" and insert instead:

"notes the common understanding of the term 'euthanasia' is the practice of intentionally ending a life in order to relieve pain and suffering, however the Committee finds the term 'wastage' is a more accurate descriptor for premature deaths in the industry."

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

The Committee divided

Ayes:	Noes:
<i>Ms Courtney</i>	<i>Mr Mulder</i>
<i>Mr Gaffney</i>	
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	
<i>Ms Rattray</i>	
<i>Mrs Rylah</i>	
<i>Mr Valentine</i>	

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 4.9, as amended, agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 10.40 am to 11.10 am

Paragraph 4.10, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 4.11 read.

Amendment proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out the words "the rates of euthanasia" and insert instead "wastage rates".

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Further amendment proposed by Ms O'Connor to remove the words "were euthanased" and insert instead "met premature deaths".

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

The Committee divided

Ayes:	Noes:
<i>Mr Gaffney</i>	<i>Ms Courtney</i>
<i>Mr Mulder</i>	<i>Ms Rattray</i>
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	<i>Mrs Rylah</i>
<i>Mr Valentine</i>	

Paragraph 4.11, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 4.12 to 4.13, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 4.14 read.

Amendment proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out the word

“euthanased” and insert instead “wasted”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes:

Ms O’Connor

Noes:

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Mr Mulder

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mr Valentine

It passed in the negative.

Further Amendment proposed to paragraph 4.14 by Ms Rattray to:

(1) Leave out the following words:

“The Committee also heard that such figures may not take into account greyhounds that are euthanased before they are named”; and

(2) Add “on the wastage of pups” after the word commented.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 4.14, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 4.15 read

Amendment proposed by Ms O’Connor to leave out the words “The industry itself was conscious that there were” and insert instead “Industry participants acknowledged.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Further amendment proposed by Ms O’Connor to leave out the word “level” and insert instead “number”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 4.15, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 4.16 read.

Amendment proposed by Ms O’Connor to leave out the word “euthanasia” and insert instead the word “wastage”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 4.16, as amended, agreed to.

The Committee agreed to defer consideration of paragraph 4.17.

Paragraph 4.18 read.

Amendment proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out the words "unacceptably high" and insert instead the word "unacceptable".

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 4.18, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 4.19 read.

Amendment proposed by Mr Mulder to leave out the words "the level of" and insert the word "rates" after the word "wastage".

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Further amendment proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out the word "much".

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 4.19, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 4.20 read.

Amendment proposed by Mr Mulder to leave out the word "euthanasia" and insert instead the word "wastage".

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 4.20, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 4.21 to 4.27, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 4.28 read.

Amendment proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out the word "euthanased" and insert instead the word "destroyed".

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Further amendment proposed by Ms Rattray to leave out the words “As noted in paragraph 4.14, Dr Sally-Anne Richter expressed concerns regarding how many dogs may be euthanased before they are named. This was also of concern to.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 4.28, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 4.29 to 4.40, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 4.41 read.

Amendment proposed by Ms O’Connor to leave out all words after “regulation” and insert instead the following words:

“and resourcing has resulted in incomplete data on industry-bred greyhounds from birth to death, and that this is hampering an accurate understanding of the number and type of injuries and premature deaths.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 4.41, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 5 read.

Amendment proposed by Ms O’Connor to add the word “stated” before the word “commitment”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Further amendment proposed by Ms O’Connor to leave out the words “take active steps to achieve this goal” and insert instead “to actively monitor progress towards this goal”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 5, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 6 read.

Amendment proposed by Mr Valentine to add the words “for the racing industry” after the word “imported”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Further amendment proposed by Mrs Rylah to leave out the words “their lives” and insert instead “life”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 6, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 7 read.

Amendment proposed by Mr Gaffney to add the words “the Government implement” before the words “Recommendation 19” and leave out the words “be implemented”.

An amendment to the amendment was proposed by Ms O’Connor to add the words “as a matter of priority” after the word “implement”.

Question put that the amendment to the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Question put that the amendment, as amended be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 7, as amended, agreed to.

Chapter 5: Draining

Paragraph 5.1 to 5.11, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 5.12 read.

Amendment proposed by Mr Mulder to leave out all words after finds and insert instead:

“draining’ is a misunderstood terms for blood collection and this misunderstanding raises community concern about the greyhound industry.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes:

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Mr Mulder

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mr Valentine

Noes:

Ms O’Connor

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 5.12, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 5.13 read.

Amendment proposed by Mrs Rylah to:

- (1) add the word “products” after the word “blood”;
- (2) leave out the words is routinely and insert instead “are”; and
- (3) leave out the word “dogs” and insert instead “all other dog breeds”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 5.13, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 5.14 read.

Amendment proposed by Ms O’Connor to add the word “made” before the word “available”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Question was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 5.14, as amended, agreed to.

FUTURE MEETING

The Committee agreed to the following meeting dates:

Friday 26 August from 9.00 am to 12.30 pm

NEXT MEETING

At 12.38 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 9.00am on 19 August 2016.

Friday, 19 August 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 2, Parliament House, Hobart at 9.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms Rattray (Chair)
Mr Bacon
Mr Gaffney
Ms O’Connor
Mrs Rylah (Deputy Chair)
Mr Valentine

APOLOGIES

Ms Courtney
Mr Mulder

MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 12 August 2016 were read and confirmed. (Mrs Rylah)

PAPERS

Ms O’Connor, by leave, tabled a document in relation to the number of registered racing greyhound deaths for the period 1st July 2013 to date obtained by Ms Andrea Dawkins MP under a Right to Information application, dated 18 August 2016.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT

Paragraph 4.17 reconsidered by the Committee.

An amendment was proposed by Mrs Rylah to insert the word “nationally” before the words “the greyhound industry”.

A debate arose thereupon.

Mrs Rylah, by leave withdrew her amendment.

Question put that paragraph 4.17, as read, stand part of the report;

The Committee divided;

Ayes:

Ms O'Connor

Noes:

Mr Bacon

Mr Gaffney

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mr Valentine

It passed in the negative.

Ms O'Connor proposed the following new paragraph be inserted after paragraph 4.12:

“The Committee notes evidence obtained in August 2016 indicating that between 1 July 2013 and 9 June 2016, 1608 Tasmanian racing greyhounds died.”

Question put that the new paragraph be inserted.

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Chapter 6: Welfare Standards and Initiatives

Paragraphs 6.1 to 6.15, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.16 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out the words “notes some animal welfare agencies believe that” and insert instead “received evidence from animal welfare agencies, including the RSPCA, that”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 6.16, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.17, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 8 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms Rattray to leave out the word “established”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 8, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 6.18 to 6.34, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.35 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Valentine to leave out the words “can be” and insert instead the word “are”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 6.35, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.36 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mrs Rylah to leave out all words after “finds” and insert instead the words “that racing injuries contribute to both euthanasia and wastage rates.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 6.36, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 9 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to add the word “data” before the word “information”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 9, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 10 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mrs Rylah to add the words “to the track” at the end of the recommendation.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 10, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 6.37 to 6.43, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 11, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 12, as read, agreed to.

Paragraphs 6.44 to 6.45, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.46 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out the words "and community".

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 6.46, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 6.47 to 6.51, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.52 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out the word "bitch".

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 6.52, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.53, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 13, as read, agreed to.

Paragraphs 6.54 to 6.57, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.58 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out the words "government financial incentives to breeders" and insert instead the words "the 'breeders bonus'".

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 6.58, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 6.59 to 6.84, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.85 read.

Question put that the paragraph as read stand part of the report;

It passed in the negative.

Recommendation 14 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mrs Rylah to leave out the words "in order to increase the number of greyhounds

appropriately rehomed” and insert the following words at the end of the recommendation:

“with a view to increasing the number of greyhounds rehomed.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 14, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 15 read.

Question put that Recommendation 15 stand part of the report.

It passed in the negative.

Paragraphs 6.86 to 6.95, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 16, as read, agreed to.

Paragraphs 6.96 to 6.99, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 17, as read, agreed to.

Paragraphs 6.100 to 6.111, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 18, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 19 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out the words “ongoing and” and insert the word “ongoing” before the word “education”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 19, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 6.112 to 6.113, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.114 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out the word “poor” and insert instead the word “unacceptable”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to.

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 6.114, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.115, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.116 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out the words “with poor animal welfare standards” and insert the word “other” before the word “countries”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 6.116, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 20 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out the words “welfare of exported greyhounds” and insert instead “issue of greyhound exports” at the end of the recommendation.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 20, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 6.117 to 6.125, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.126 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Valentine to leave out the word “finds” and insert instead the word “heard”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 6.126, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.127, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 21, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 6.128 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O’Connor to add the following words “undertaken by the Director of Racing” after the word “survey”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 6.128, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 6.129 to 6.136, as read, agreed to.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O'Connor to add the following new paragraph before paragraph 6.137:

“The Committee notes evidence that live baiting can occur in bullrings and heard evidence that live baiting has occurred in bullrings and private training facilities in Tasmania.”

An amendment to the amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out the words “bullrings and heard evidence that live baiting has occurred in bullrings and private training facilities in Tasmania” and insert instead “private training facilities.”

Question put that the amendment to the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Question put that the new Paragraph, as amended, be added to the report;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 6.137, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 22 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O'Connor to add the words “and unannounced inspections” after the word “registration”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

Recommendation 22, as amended, agreed to.

Chapter 7: Regulation and Reform in the Greyhound Racing Industry

Paragraphs 7.1 to 7.22, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 7.23 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out the word “opportunity and insert instead the words “greater scope”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 7.23, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 7.24 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mrs Rylah to add the word “currently” before the word “limits”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 7.24, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 7.25 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Valentine to add the words “within the industry” at the end of the sentence.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 7.25, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 7.26 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to add the word “some” before the word “regulatory”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 7.26, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 7.27, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 23 read.

An amendment proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out all words after Tasracing and insert instead:

“and the Office of Racing Integrity to reach an agreed to position on rules affecting animal welfare standards. This position be presented to Greyhounds Australasia with the aim of achieving best practice in animal welfare through consistent application and improvement of national standards.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 23, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 24 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Bacon to leave out all words after “expanded to have” and insert instead:

“Tasmania’s separate integrity and commercial bodies equally represented on the board.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 24, as amended, agreed to.

Friday, 26 August 2016

The Committee met in Committee Room 2, Parliament House, Hobart at 9.00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms Rattray (Chair)

Mr Bacon (by telephone)

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Mr Mulder

Ms O'Connor

Mrs Rylah (Deputy Chair)

Mr Valentine

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 August 2016 were read and confirmed. (Mrs Rylah)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT

Chapter 8: Industry Financial Arrangements

Paragraphs 8.1 to 8.18, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 8.19 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out all words after notes and insert instead:

“there is a discrepancy between the funds raised by the greyhound industry compared to the funds allocated by Tasracing to the industry.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 8.19, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 8.20 to 8.24, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 8.25 read.

An amendment was proposed by the Gaffney to leave out the words “the current model of” and “unviable.

and” and insert the word “greyhound” after the word “racing”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Further amendment proposed by Ms Courtney to leave out the word “substantial”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Further amendment proposed by Mr Valentine to add the word “financially” before the word “unsustainable”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 8.25, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 8.26, as read, agreed to.

An amendment was proposed by Ms Courtney to add the following new paragraph after paragraph 8.26:

“The Committee finds that racing participants are concerned the sale of TOTE and the associated ongoing financial arrangements have contributed to the challenges of the racing industry.”

Question put that the new paragraph be added to the report;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 8.27 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms Courtney to leave out the words “and continually reviewed and improved”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Further amendment proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out the words “now a higher level” and insert instead the word “a”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Further amendment proposed by Ms O’Connor to leave out the word “will ensure” and insert instead “ensures”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 8.27, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 8.28 read.

Question put that the paragraph as read stand part of the report;

It passed in the negative.

Recommendation 25 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O’Connor to add the word “independent” before the words “cost-benefit”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

The Committee divided:

Ayes:

Mr Bacon

Mr Mulder

Ms O'Connor

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mr Valentine

Noes:

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 25, as amended, agreed to.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O'Connor to add the following recommendation after recommendation 25:

“That continued government funding of the greyhound racing industry be conditional on upholding contemporary animal welfare outcomes.”

Question put that the new recommendation stand part of the report;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Chapter 9: The Review Report

Paragraphs 9.1 to 9.64, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 9.65 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out the words “these recommendations” and insert instead “the recommendations of the Review of Arrangements for Animal Welfare in the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing Industry.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 9.65, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 9.66 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Mulder to leave out the word “supports” and insert instead “from Tasmanian participants supporting”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Further amendment proposed by Mr Gaffney to add the following words at the end of the paragraph:

“which is contrary to the current position of Greyhounds Australasia.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 9.66, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 26, as read, agreed to.

Chapter 10: Future of the Industry

Paragraphs 10.1 to 10.8, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.9 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to add the word “reported” before the word “tensions”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 10.9, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 10.10 to 10.16, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.17 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Mulder to leave out the words “the evidence received indicates”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 10.17, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 27 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O’Connor to leave out the words “in order to develop and action an effective strategy to” and insert instead “to effectively”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 27, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 10.18 to 10.23, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 28 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms Courtney to leave out the word “conduct” and insert instead “instigate”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 28, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.24 to 10.26, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.27 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to add the word “also” before the words “been recognised within the industry”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 10.27, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.28 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms Courtney to leave out the words “marked” and “broadly”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 10.28, as amended, agreed to.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O’Connor to add the following new paragraph after paragraph 10.28:

“The Committee finds that ongoing cultural change within the industry is required to improve animal welfare outcomes.”

Question put that the new paragraph stand part of the report;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraphs 10.29 to 10.36, as read, agreed to.

Mr Bacon withdrew.

Paragraph 10.37 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O’Connor to leave out the word “will” and insert instead the word “to” after the word industry.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 10.37, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 10.38 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms Rattray to add the words “not only

industry participants but also” before the word “entities”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 10.38, as amended, agreed to.

Recommendation 29 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to add the words “standards and identify” before the word “benchmarks”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Further amendment proposed by Mr Mulder to leave out the words “continual improvement of animal welfare standards” and insert instead “for improving animal welfare outcomes”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Recommendation 29, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 10.39 to 10.42, as read, agreed to.

Chapter 11: Matters Incidental to the Inquiry

Paragraphs 11.1 to 11.13, as read, agreed to.

Recommendation 30 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O’Connor to leave out all words after “That” an insert instead:

“the Government review the differentiation of greyhounds under the Dog Control Act 2000 with the intent to exempt greyhounds from wearing a muzzle while on lead in public.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

The Committee divided:

Ayes:

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Ms O’Connor

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

Mr Valentine

Noes:

Mr Mulder

Recommendation 30, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 11.14 to 11.15, as read, agreed to.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O'Connor to add the following new paragraph before paragraph 11.16:

“The Committee notes the Governments of the Australian Capital Territory and New South Wales have announced an intention to ban greyhound racing.”

Question put that the new paragraph stand part of the report;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 11.16 read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out the words “there is some” and insert instead the word “unquantifiable” before the words “community support”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It passed in the negative.

Paragraph 11.16, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 11.17 read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr Valentine to leave out the paragraph and insert instead:

“The Committee finds the Inquiry’s Terms of Reference did not elicit adequate evidence to fully address the question of banning greyhound racing in Tasmania, including any consequences, unintended or otherwise, that may flow from such a ban, and it is therefore unable to state a position on the matter.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

The Committee divided:

Ayes:

Mr Valentine

Noes:

Ms Courtney

Mr Gaffney

Mr Mulder

Ms O'Connor

Ms Rattray

Mrs Rylah

So it passed in the negative.

A further amendment was proposed by Mr Gaffney to leave out the words “does not” and insert instead the word “cannot” before the word “support”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

The Committee divided:

Ayes:

Noes:

Mr Gaffney
Mr Mulder
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah

Ms Courtney
Ms O'Connor
Mr Valentine

The Committee met in Committee Room 2, Parliament House, Hobart at 9.00 a.m.

It was resolved in the affirmative.

A further amendment was proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out paragraph 11.17 and insert instead the following paragraphs:

“The Committee finds that while the greyhound racing industry receives substantial public funding, it no longer has strong public support as a result of its ongoing and demonstrated inability to put animal welfare above profit.

The Committee finds that on the available evidence, the experience of interstate and overseas jurisdictions and in light of ongoing animal welfare concerns, the Government should legislate to end greyhound racing in Tasmania.”

The Committee resolved to defer consideration of the proposed amendments until its next meeting.

NEXT MEETING

At 11.59 a.m. the Committee adjourned until 9.00am on 9 September 2016.

Friday, 9 September 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms Rattray (Chair)
Mr Bacon
Ms Courtney (by telephone)
Mr Gaffney
Mr Mulder
Ms O'Connor
Mrs Rylah (Deputy Chair) (by telephone)
Mr Valentine

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 August 2016 were read and confirmed. (Mr Valentine)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT

Further consideration of the amendments proposed by Ms O'Connor to leave out paragraph 11.17 and insert instead the following paragraphs:

“The Committee finds that while the greyhound racing industry receives substantial public funding, it no longer has strong public support as a result of its ongoing and demonstrated inability to put animal welfare above profit.

The Committee finds that on the available evidence, the experience of interstate and overseas jurisdictions and in light of ongoing animal welfare concerns, the Government should legislate to end greyhound racing in Tasmania.”

It was resolved in the affirmative.

An amendment was proposed by Mr *Valentine* to insert the following recommendation after paragraph 11.17:

“The Committee recommends that in 3 years time the Government review the performance of the greyhound racing industry in satisfying the measures to improve animal welfare proposed in this report and, should there still be animal welfare concerns, an inquiry be established to specifically address the issue of banning greyhound racing in Tasmania.”

Question put that the new recommendation stand part of the report;

The Committee divided

Ayes:	Noes:
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	<i>Mr Bacon</i>
<i>Mr Valentine</i>	<i>Mr Gaffney</i>
	<i>Mr Mulder</i>
	<i>Ms Rattray</i>
	<i>Mrs Rylah</i>

It passed in the negative.

An amendment was proposed by Mrs *Rylah* to insert the following new paragraph after paragraph 11.17:

“The community’s long-term response to the rehoming of greyhounds will have a profound impact on the future of greyhound racing.”

Question put that the new paragraph stand part of the report;

The Committee divided

Ayes:	Noes:
<i>Mrs Rylah</i>	<i>Mr Bacon</i>
	<i>Mr Gaffney</i>
	<i>Mr Mulder</i>
	<i>Ms O'Connor</i>
	<i>Ms Rattray</i>
	<i>Mr Valentine</i>

It passed in the negative.

Paragraphs 11.18 to 11.22, as read, agreed to.

Chapter One: Conduct of the Inquiry

The Committee considered the table of key dates and table of attendance that had been inserted in the Chapter.

Question put that the tables be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Executive Summary:

Paragraph 1 and 2 of the Executive Summary, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 3 of the Executive Summary read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr *Valentine* to leave out the words “its viability and future.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 3 of the Executive Summary, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Executive Summary, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 6 of the Executive Summary read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr *Valentine* to leave out the words “consideration” and insert instead “action” and to leave out the words “and at the same time providing a viable and financially secure industry.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 6 of the Executive Summary, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 7 of the Executive Summary, as read, agreed to.

Paragraph 8 of the Executive Summary read.

An amendment was proposed by Ms *O'Connor* to leave out the words “at this stage, the Committee has not received enough evidence to warrant banning of the greyhound racing industry in Tasmania.”

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

The Committee divided.

Ayes:

Ms *O'Connor*

Noes:

Mr *Bacon*
Mr *Gaffney*
Mr *Mulder*
Ms *Ratray*
Mrs *Rylah*
Mr *Valentine*

It passed in the negative.

Question put that paragraph 8 of the Executive Summary, as read, be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 9 of the Executive Summary read.

An amendment was proposed by Mr *Valentine* to leave out the words “to ensure the future of the industry in Tasmania”.

Question put that the amendment be agreed to;

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph 9 of the Executive Summary, as read, agreed to.

Paragraphs 10 to 14 of the Executive Summary, as read, agreed to.

Question put that the draft report, as amended, be the report of the Committee;

The Committee divided

Ayes:

Noes:

Mr Bacon
Mr Gaffney
Mr Mulder
Ms Rattray
Mrs Rylah

Ms O'Connor
Mr Valentine

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Resolved that a list of submissions received and published; a list of document received and published; and the minutes of the Committee be appended to the report. (Mr Gaffney)

Resolved, that the report be published on the Parliament's website once tabled. (Mr Gaffney)

MEDIA RELEASE

The Committee agreed that a media release be issued once the report has been tabled.

At 10.40 a.m. the Committee adjourned *sine die*.