

**Supplementary
Submission
No 46a**

INQUIRY INTO ANIMAL CRUELTY LAWS IN NEW SOUTH WALES

Name: Mr Grant Holman

Date Received: 8 December 2019

Inquiry into Animal Cruelty Laws in New South Wales

By Grant Holman Dip Law(LPAB) GradDip Legal Practice

This is a further submission to my already accepted submission. Since I submitted my views on the current animal cruelty laws in New South Wales there has been some very significant issues and actions conducted on charities being the RSPCA seizing and also euthanizing large numbers of cattle at Binnaway and I dare say other parts of New South Wales.

As the committee are informed that the main legislation in New South Wales that deals with animal cruelty in the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979.

The title sums it up, “prevention of cruelty”.

I submit that the RSPCA have not and do not address these very words because there is now a significant amount of evidence in favour of removing the RSPCA as an investigation and prosecution body.

If we start with the example of the Cattle Farms owned by John Williams where approximately 1100 Cattle were seized by the RSPCA after a Taskforce was formed¹. I would argue that the Taskforce consisting of the Department of Primary Industries Veterinarian, Local Land Services, NSW Farmers Federation, NSW Police Stock Squad and the NSW RSPCA may find themselves liable in future proceedings if Mr Williams decides that course of action.

The NSW RSPCA was on site during the seizures. That makes them complicit. It is apparent from the evidence that Mr Williams was complying with the RSPCA/Taskforce orders. It would be interesting to see the makeup of the task force.

Mr Williams was not banned from owning any cattle. It's apparent that the Taskforce may have breached the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. I say this because Scott Moreton a professional stock musterer whom I submit would be an expert in the field said the stock “looked average six months ago on the road but in the meantime their condition had improved”. “I went to the saleyards to see for myself and got the shock of my life at how good a condition they were in”². I would argue that there has not been compliance with section 2B because it would be contrary to the evidence. For the Stock Panel and Secretary to form the view that the cattle were in poor condition or that the owner had not been abiding by a direction would be contrary to the evidence. Mr Williams has been allowed to purchase approximately 150 of his own cattle back at the Dubbo Sales which indicates that the cattle were not in a poor condition. How many more cattle were not in a poor condition or suffering? It is very important that this committee look into this and see what involvement the RSPCA have had.

Grant Holman

¹ Brown. J, The Land, 29 November 2019

² Brown. J, The Land, 29 November 2019