## INQUIRY INTO ANIMAL CRUELTY LAWS IN NEW SOUTH WALES

Name:Mr Patrick MurphyDate Received:29 November 2019

I am writing to you as our law makers to respectfully express my will as a constituent in this state; regarding the inquiry into the animal cruelty laws.

I have found there is a lack of effectiveness for the administration and enforcement, for the protection from cruelty to animals in this state.

One of the first names that comes to mind when it comes to protecting animals from cruelty is, the RSPCA.

The general public have a perception, that this registered charity, has the best intention towards the care and prevention of cruelty towards animals. This is a fallacy.

They are constantly underfunded and lack the resources to do their job in the proper manner. They lack the effective commitment and drive to actually protect animals. The RSPCA lacks proper prosecutorial powers and are reluctant to do so when the need arises.

They are unaccountable to anyone, and are a law unto themselves.

When there are reports of animal neglect, the general public expects the RSPCA to spring into action to defend the animals and prosecute the offender/s, however, this is far from the case.

I had previously heard of multiple instances of lax actions by the RSPCA, but was reluctant to believe the stories.

Their credibility started to wane, from my point of view, when the ABC did a story on them. I think the story was named "For all creatures cute and fluffy."

It went on to show, how they basically only appeared to care for dogs, cat and koalas, as these animals tug at the heart strings of those most likely to donate to their organisation.

When it came to animals behind the farm gate, they were scarcely seen.

Further stories about them increasingly came to light, in regard to their total lack of will to rescue animals and charge the perpetrators for the crimes they had committed.

There was a story of neglected and emaciated horse in a bare paddock, out in the sun, with no apparent food or water. [1]

The RSPCA was contacted consistently. Their response was, "we are investigating".

This went on until, eventually, a neighbour called the RSPCA, then they turned up and took action.

They tried to blame the initial person filing the report, which is a disgraceful thing to do. They can't be trusted to carry out their function. They need someone who can.

My suggestion is an independent body.

Another this that is, the RSPCA Approved Farming labelling scheme. It actually hinders the achievement of the function people expect of it.

The RSPCA markets a funding scheme, as "A Brand You Can Trust", promising "humane eggs and meat" from animals who have "a good life".

This is all "humane-washing" trying to justify some sort of "right way" to do the wrong thing. The horrendous things done to animals on farms cannot be condoned by any organisation that has its name and function stating it is for the protection against cruelty to animals.

Consumers are being deliberately mislead, into believing that they can purchase animal products if they want to avoid causing suffering.

The RSPCA knows full well that this is not occurring, but continues to tell customers they can purchase these products with a clear conscience.

They should be charged with misleading and deceptive advertising under the department of fair trading act.

They are trying to have a foot in both camps, the animal rights camp and the animal abusers camp. This is simply not possible to do.

When their funding comes from those abusing animals, they can't be seen as objective and independent.

I challenge you to go to a "RSPCA approved farm" and tell me if you think that is humane or clean.

Even the farmers state their farms are biosecurity risks.

The RSPCA's mission, funding, support, authority and credibility are all a house of cards.

The sooner an independent, accountable government regulator is appointed the better.

If you are serious about this inquiry and acting on it; the better.

[1] Shame on you, RSPCA https://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/rendezview/shame-on-you-rspca/newsstory/9592dc65595f008f4216741036de976d