



Peter Bright
NZCS (Physics)



Informative and comprehensive anti-Noise, anti-barking websites

[Quiet Tasmania](http://QuietTasmania.com) quietas.net

[Quiet Tasmania News](http://QuietTasmaniaNews.com) pebri.net

23rd September, 2019

Local Government Division,
Department of Premier and Cabinet,
GPO Box 123,
Hobart, TAS 7001

Dear sirs,

A public Submission on the

DRAFT DOG CONTROL AMENDMENT BILL 2019

Section 19AB – Dogs must not injure or kill sensitive wildlife

Telling an owner that "Dogs must not injure or kill sensitive wildlife"
is nearly as futile as telling their dogs!
It would be a near-total waste of effort!
Dog owners are defiant!

If they really cared about the welfare of dogs (and their noise-tormented neighbours)
they would not incarcerate theirs in their boring backyards all day. This is torture
for an intensely social animal congenitally programmed to free-range!

Have you not yet comprehended that owners defiantly let their dogs do
whatever they and the dog want to do?

To one degree or another, defiance of law is standard behaviour
for nearly all dog owners.

Their self-imposed challenge is to get away with it,
and the probably of doing so is almost 100%.

In practice, the laws you devise are almost entirely unenforceable,
and all dog owners know this, and rely on it.

Councils in turn may be relied upon for slackness and blindness and deafness too,
and the police want nothing whatever to do with dog law enforcement. I speak from 30 years
of suffering and torment inflicted by selfish, cruel and defiant dog owners.

According to the Greens "No dog responsible for killing penguins has been caught
in relation to existing offences, and no owners have been charged."

Do you really think that increased penalties will better regulate dog owners
when the lesser ones have failed?

Here's reality:

The only way to minimise harm to the health and safety of residents and native wildlife is to implement a state law that declares that there are to be **No Dogs Anywhere** and then vigorously enforce it.

You won't do that because you feel that dog owners will vote you out at the very next election, right?

Of course they would, because dog owners resent any law that interferes with their self-perceived right to do whatever they want, whenever they want, wherever they want, and they use their dog as their proxy for this purpose - because this is what dogs do.
"I didn't permit my dog to attack that penguin! It was all my dog's own idea and it just got away from me!"

So an inexperienced council allocates considerable time and expense to bring the case before the court using staff untrained in the laws of evidence and the interpretation of legislation, as well as being less than fully competent, to testify in the hard rigidities of the witness box.

The magistrate eventually doesn't know who or what to believe so he errs on the side of the offender who walks out while trying not to smirk, but alas, he can't help doing so.


The case fails and the council manager learns a hard lesson .. do NOT enforce the dog laws, and that becomes the unofficial, inflexible managerial dictate throughout the council unless real fear can be induced by the real threat of firmly imposed penalty.

Monitoring sensitive animal habitats around the clock is wholly impractical, but that would be the only way to ensure maximum protection for defenceless creatures that harm nobody.
Catch somebody and you'll never receive the imposed penalty because he is impecunious in this mendicant state.

NO DOGS ANYWHERE

It's the only fulsome solution
and we all know it.

Yours sincerely,



P S Bright
[REDACTED]
Tasmania