

From: bardia bodaghi
To: [SPSC SPSC](#)
Subject: New Animal Welfare legislation
Date: Thursday, 8 March 2018 9:17:45 PM

Hi

I just found out that a new animal welfare Bill is in the works, with submissions due by tomorrow COB.

While I have not had a chance to read it in full, I would like to know if it is true that:

1. There is a new requirement to provide proof that a person **INTENDED** to cause harm, therefore allowing people to get off by claiming ignorance. If it is the case that in other states and the previous Act, the prosecution needs only to prove that a 'reasonable person' would have known the animal was suffering and sought to alleviate it, why are we not aligning the Bill with legislation in other states? This seems like a step in the wrong direction.

2. Are animals not recognised as sentient in the Bill? Not including it means in essence that the legislation does not recognise animals as being able to feel pain, or having awareness of their surroundings or interactions with people or other animals.

I feel very strongly about this point and not recognising animals as sentient is beyond primitive and uncivilised.

3. Is it the case that the Bill in its current form does not appear to provide authorised officers with an explicit power to provide veterinary treatment to alleviate suffering, but only to direct an owner to do so? If it is the case then this is a failure.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bardia Bodaghi