

PUBLIC

THE PARLIAMENTARY JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON GREYHOUND RACING TRANSITION MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON FRIDAY 6 MARCH 2026.

The committee met at 10.03 a.m.

CHAIR (Ms Johnston)- Welcome to today's hearing of the Joint Standing Committee on Greyhound Racing Transition and thank you very much for your attendance. To introduce you, to who we have at the table here today to my left we have Meg Webb, the Independent member for Nelson; we have Cassy O'Connor, the Greens member for Hobart; I am Kristie Johnston, an Independent member for Clark; Dean Winter, the Labor member for Franklin; we have Marcus Vermey, the Liberal member for Clark; and we also have Tania Rattray, the Independent member for McIntyre at the table.

If you wouldn't mind please stating your name and the capacity in which you are appearing before the committee here today.

Mr STOUT - I am Simon Stout. I am the chief executive officer of Greyhounds Australasia.

CHAIR - Thank you very much, and can you please confirm that you have received and read the guide sent to you by the committee secretary?

Mr STOUT - Yes.

CHAIR - Thank you. As you would be aware from that particular guide, this hearing is covered by parliamentary privilege, allowing individuals to speak with freedom without fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament. This protection is not accorded to you if statements that may be defamatory are repeated or referred to by you outside the parliamentary proceedings.

This hearing is public, and the public and media may be present and we are being broadcast online today. Should you wish aspects of your evidence to be heard in private, you must make this request to the committee at the time and we will give that consideration then. Could I ask you please to make the statutory declaration before you there, please?

Mr SIMON STOUT, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, GREYHOUNDS AUSTRALASIA, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Thank you very much, Simon. If you'd like to begin by making a brief opening statement, please.

Mr STOUT - Thank you, Chair. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Joint Standing Committee today. Greyhounds Australasia (GA) welcomes to the establishment of this committee and the breadth of its mandate to safeguard animal welfare, protect participant interests, consider fair and reasonable compensation and oversee the legislative framework supporting transition. These are obligations GA takes seriously, they are also, we submit, that the bill in its current form doesn't meet. GA is the peak national body for greyhound racing

PUBLIC

across Australia and New Zealand. As keeper of the Australian and New Zealand Greyhound Stud Book and primary liaison between all jurisdictional control bodies and regulatory authorities, our interest in how this transition is structured is not abstract. It is direct, practical and ongoing. We have engaged in good faith at every available opportunity, and we remain committed to constructive engagement with the committee.

As per our submission, GA does not accept the decision to phase out greyhound racing in Tasmania. It was not the product of a fair, transparent or evidence-based process. The decision proceeded without formal industry engagement and without development of a regulatory impact statement, which we believe should be required under Tasmania's own legislative review program. The staggered commencement framework, which brings parts 1 and 4 into force immediately and defers parts 2, 3 and 5 to the closure date of 30 June 2029, compounds this concern by creating regulatory obligations that do not align with operational realities at a point of risk.

The *Racing Regulation and Integrity Act* was passed with overwhelming parliamentary support and is still being implemented. When announcing its passage in August 2024, the Minister for Racing described it as evidence-based best practice legislation that would rebuild trust and see all three racing codes thrive. Just over 12 months later, the same government introduced legislation to abolish one of those codes. This contradiction has still not been explained.

There are a number of issues I would seek to provide information to the committee on about today's hearing. Given time constraints, I would ask leave to provide members with a detailed handout which will expand on these matters. I would ask that they be treated as a supplementary submission, and I am happy to answer any questions that may arise either today or subsequently in writing.

CHAIR - Thank you very much, Simon, and we have received a copy of that. The Committee Secretary has received it as well today, so it's been tabled.

Mr STOUT - Sorry, I've just got a little bit more, if I may continue?

CHAIR - That's alright.

Mr STOUT - Matters within this document relate to particular concerns about the legislation and others to issues that have been subject to debate and discussion at earlier hearings.

Briefly, the bill's approach to breeding dismantles the protections enshrined in the current system by allowing unregulated pet-only breeding, effectively outside the current regulated environment. This will undermine important welfare standards such as traceability and licensing. The establishment of a criminal offence by prohibiting keeping, selling, breeding or requiring a greyhound for racing purposes risks facilitating exactly what the bill seeks out not to do. That is, removing the traceability and visibility of the current regulatory system will facilitate the potential for dogs to be removed from regulatory protections and facilitating misuse. The Australian Capital Territory approach to implementing the closure of greyhound racing did not involve bans on breeding or keeping of racing greyhounds. It was also deemed not necessary and did not undermine the national regulatory system.

PUBLIC

The Minister for Racing's response to Lure Coursing Tasmania highlights that the approach being taken with greyhounds is confusing and at odds with other breeds that engage in these activities. Banning one breed from particular activity while not others is an inconsistent approach and is not evidence based.

The lack of detail and certainty around the transition framework provides participants with no confidence as they move forward in this environment. As previously evidenced, saying 'trust us' holds little weight to those who did trust this government, only to find their commitment to the future of their industry didn't even last a month.

Welfare and compensation issues are of particular concern to many. While the support that has been authorised by the Racing Integrity Commissioner is appreciated, the detailed consideration of what may additionally be needed and what compensation will be available is unknown at this stage. It has no framework to provide comfort to the many Tasmanians affected.

I would like to focus now on two issues which have been the subject of debate at committee at previous hearings:

- The economic position of greyhound racing and the implications of funding under the racing deed; and
- The situation regarding breeding and the ongoing sustainability of greyhound racing in Tasmania.

With respect to the economic position of greyhound racing, there has been a good deal of commentary about the cost of greyhound racing to Tasmanian taxpayers. Much of that commentary has been simplistic or based on partial examinations of aspects of the funding situation. I invite committee members to review the information contained in our supplementary submission. Any detailed financial analysis must move beyond the headline figure of \$7.6 million to the code in funding allocation.

On FY25 data, the greyhound code generates race field fee revenue in excess of \$8 million, funding that very allocation being characterised as a saving. The substantial shared costs for services, infrastructure, administration across all three codes will not be saved. Those services must continue for thoroughbred and harness racing regardless, and the transition itself, closure plan, administration, participant welfare obligations, and the compensation mechanisms this committee requires have not been estimated at all, let alone budgeted. This is supported by Tasracing's own figures and the recent evidence of CEO Mr Andrew Jenkins, which highlight that greyhound racing is the most financially viable of all three racing codes. Tasracing has advised that respected consultant Mr Ben Sellenger has been engaged to examine the financial impacts and costs of the phase-out. GA, like the committee, look forward to Mr Sellenger's findings. To date, the data and evidence is telling when considered on a net basis: there will be no financial windfall to Tasmanian taxpayers as a result of the ban on greyhound racing.

Breeding and the sustainability of the industry has been subject to considerable public comment. Again, unfortunately, much of the commentary has been ill-founded. It has been disappointing to have social media posts quoted as some sort of credible source. Fortunately, where necessary, this has been dismissed or discounted.

PUBLIC

Again, the evidence demonstrates the breeding figures since the ban was announced in August is in line with the last three years for the same period. There were 16 litters in financial year 23, 13 litters in financial year 24 and 25, and currently nine in financial year 26. There are still six services pending for 2025/26, providing a maximum of 15, but with the likelihood that there may be additional misses, it can be reasonably expected that the final figure may be lower. Commissioner Carroll has asserted that the industry is not sustainable and has reached a tipping point. He said:

The evidence is clear: the industry is approaching and, in some areas, has reached a tipping point where the number of greyhounds exceeds the system's capacity in responsibly managing and rehoming and supporting them.

We find this at odds with the data provided with the most readily available source on the matter: Tasracing's annual report. I submit to the committee members, examine the analysis of the data provided in our supplementary submission: it is clearly not the case. Over the last 10 years, there's been a steady decrease in litters and pups whelped. Over the last eight years, pup numbers have been halved, and in each, retirements, led by rehoming, have exceeded the number of new pups in Tasmania.

We are unaware of any new data being provided to support the tipping point assertion, and this claim has been repeated by a range of commentators without any supporting evidence. Given the implied implications of this claim, any new data needs to be examined, evaluated and assessed.

This debate has been very emotive and passionate. We do not question the genuine concerns that people in the community have regarding the wellbeing of greyhounds. However, this is a debate that needs to be based on evidence and not emotion. This ban will remove an industry that has been a mainstay for Tasmanians and their families for more than a century. Those Tasmanians deserve a rational, thorough, and reasoned consideration of the issues at hand. Thank you.

CHAIR - Thank you very much, Simon. I will open it up for questions.

Mr WINTER - Thanks very much for being here with us today and for providing more evidence. First, I will say your initial submission was really comprehensive and went to the bill, which is exactly what the committee was seeking, so we really appreciate that. There's been some discussion in the committee about breeding data and you've just outlined that. Would you be able to explain to the committee, because, as I understand it, GA is the holder of breeding data across Australia, how the interaction happens between your organisation and the various racing bodies in various states to ensure that you have accurate data about the number of dogs that are actually running, owned and being bred?

Mr STOUT - Thank you, Mr Winter. Yes, it is a complex system and it's one that we've inherited at GA. At the moment, to put it bluntly, there are three databases around the country that sort of all feed in together. As keepers of the studbook, we administer the registration of breeding units, so frozen semen, and the activity of sires of the services. At the same time, we then work with those two external databases to register the whelpings and do the naming of the greyhounds once they get to racing age.

PUBLIC

What I will say, and this is probably what's been confusing through the process, is that service is a metric that we keep to keep an understanding of the activity of the sires. It is a measure of activity; not a measure of productivity. I think that's a point in case here, is that it's the outcome of those services is the crucial part. That's the productivity piece - the whelpings and how many litters end up being registered.

We work hand in hand with the various jurisdictions and also with our registered veterinarians around the country. Those veterinarians have access to the GA database, so they can enter their data immediately or very close to when it happens in terms of servicing. The studmasters in the relative jurisdictions don't, so they feed their data back in through their controlling body and then that comes through to GA. We are actually in the process of recommissioning our new portal that will give everyone digitised access, but yeah.

Mr WINTER - Because the committee's had different numbers - and I don't think there's any ill intent from anyone - but Tasracing, the Commissioner, Greyhounds Tasmania and yourself have all, I think it is fair to say, given slightly different numbers. You provided your data, which is based on the Tasracing annual reports. So, in your -

Mr STOUT - Yes, that's the historical data that we actually help collate at the end of each season.

Mr WINTER - So, your organisation assist Tasracing to put those numbers together?

Mr STOUT - Yes, we make sure - we verify what's in OzChase, in one of the national databases. I think where there's been some confusion has been in Tasracing registering natural services here in Tasmania and/or activity solely in Tasmania. What we've provided the committee is a broader look, which is all Tasmanian registered breeders and their activity. Where Tasmanian breeders are utilising services of, say, veterinarians interstate, then it's quite common for them to be sending dogs over to vets in, say, Victoria to be inseminated. You find that they will go to the best practitioners. We have the case where a breeding unit can range anywhere up to \$10,000. So, when they're inseminating their dogs, they want to make sure that they have got the best veterinarians on hand doing that procedure.

Mr WINTER - In the table you provided under industry viability, you've outlined that there were 48 litters in 2017-18 and 25, so almost half. Is that in line with the rest of the country, or is that a Tasmania-specific thing that we're seeing, half the number of litters?

Mr STOUT - There has definitely been a contraction of the industry over time. I think that's been a multitude of effects, including responsible breeding, but also the industry has been, just like everyone else, subject to cost-of-living pressures and changes in economic circumstances. But the industry has certainly undergone a contraction around breeding. I think the same is happening in the other two codes as well. I think you will find that the foal crop in both the harness and the thoroughbred sector has also contracted in that time as well. That's where making really sound decisions is something we want to assist participants in doing and ensuring that the best practice utilisation of their greyhounds is also part of that process.

Ms RATTRAY - Thank you. I might just follow on from Mr Winter. Mr Winter has already referred to some of the information that the committee has received. We received some information just yesterday around the issues with the perhaps differing numbers, saying that OzChase, and you just referred to it, has some issues with it in recording data. The information

PUBLIC

we received talks about the fact that OzChase is updated manually on information that is inputted by participants and state racing authorities around the country. Can you expand on that a little bit so I can get a clear understanding of - do people put the wrong number in, or is it - I mean, how would that actually happen?

Mr STOUT - That would be the case, certainly, for the natural services that would be occurring around the country. The lodgement of those - it actually is a paper-based form here in Tasmania. The studmaster would lodge and get signed by the veterinarian. The same with a simple artificial insemination where they were using fresh semen, that paper-based form would be lodged with the controlling body, in this case Tasracing, and they would enter the details.

Some jurisdictions have more sophisticated access to digital lodgement and they will be using those. Where frozen semen is involved and, in particular, it relates to the Greyhounds Australasia database, the veterinarians are approved veterinarians and their facilities are provided access to the GA portal and they can put that data directly into our portal. So, it is a mix of old and new, so to speak, Tania. As I said, we're going through a process of upgrading our portal so we can improve that process and that procedure.

Ms RATTRAY - Right. This information goes on to say that the Tasracing greyhound audit team, who are currently undertaking a second audit of all greyhounds in Tasmania, has identified approximately 650 records that require verification and rectification. Does that sound plausible? Is 650 wrong?

Mr STOUT - Look, without seeing the information and what it actually relates to, I would only be guessing.

Ms RATTRAY - Okay, I mean it is a significantly high number -

Mr STOUT - It is, and in relation to that, our team is certainly available to assist in that process to expedite in any way we can if they have concerns around that.

Ms RATTRAY - And so, you work with Tasracing?

Mr STOUT - Yes.

Ms RATTRAY - And previously the Office of Racing Integrity around data, was that your role?

Mr STOUT - We're there to support all the jurisdictions, the controlling bodies and the regulators. So, if they have issues with any of that process, then we are certainly active in assisting them to rectify any data issues.

Ms RATTRAY - Chair, I have another area, so if you would like to go to -

CHAIR - We might keep on the breeding issue. Ms O'Connor.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you for your evidence. I just want to step back a bit to some of the animal welfare issues. There's plenty of evidence surrounding this injury and I was a bit disappointed not to see - in either your principal submission or the supplementary one we got today - much reference to animal welfare. On the data, so far in Tasmania this year, we have

PUBLIC

five dead dogs that were registered to race in Tasmania - and they are the ones we know of. We have the kennel cough outbreak in cramped conditions with stressed dogs that the chief vet has confirmed has killed dogs, and more than 50 injuries on and off the track. Can't Greyhounds Australasia see and accept that the evidence of this industry is that dogs are suffering in it every single day, and it's taking lives? That's why this legislation that we're here to examine has such significant public support.

Mr STOUT - Greyhounds Australasia, in line with all our member jurisdictions, is fully committed to improving animal welfare and ensuring that there are best-practice outcomes. What I will say about animal welfare. One it's not a linear process and it's certainly not a set-and-forget. So, the notion that we are continually striving to improve practices, how we go about it, and the outcomes for the dogs, and our own accountability and transparency - that's one thing I will say about our industry is that we pride ourselves on being accountable and transparent. The reason that you have so much information at hand is because we are. Ninety-nine per cent of -

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, I mean, it's also partly because of the work of stewards at Tasracing and the Racing Integrity Commissioner.

Mr STOUT - They're all part of the industry. No-one in the industry is an island. We all exist together and we're all there for the same overall outcome, and that is because of the love of the animal.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, with respect, the outcome ultimately, for most industry participants, is to profit from the racing of dogs, isn't it? Ultimately, that's the primary outcome.

Mr STOUT - As someone who got into racing and has been lucky enough to transition from one side of the fence to the other in the racing industry, my passion for racing came from the love of the animal, and it is still there. Ninety-nine per cent of - 99.9 per cent of the people who are in this industry, it is the love of the animal. You don't get out of bed every day at 4 o'clock in the morning or 6 o'clock in the morning and spend 12, 14 hours a day, seven days a week, if you don't have a passion for that animal-

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, I'll put it to you that there are other ways to love animals that don't lead to their exploitation.

CHAIR - We might move on.

Ms O'CONNOR - Just one final question.

Mr WINTER - I mean, if you don't have questions -

Ms O'CONNOR - No, well I've got another question.

CHAIR - Sorry, we -

Ms O'CONNOR - I want to explore with you the reality of the business model of the industry, which is that it needs to breed - and we've been talking about breeding data - it needs to breed a lot of dogs up, only some of whom will be named and ultimately race. They've got a relatively short racing life. Because of their susceptibility to injury and death on the track, the

PUBLIC

business model means that you're pumping all these dogs into the industry and then they get spat out the other side almost as industrial waste, which the community has to clean up through rehoming, funded by the public -

Mr WINTER - Chair, point of order.

Ms O'CONNOR - These are reasonable questions.

Mr WINTER - This is not a question. This is just your diatribe.

Ms O'CONNOR - No, this is a question and it's a legitimate question to put to the industry body.

CHAIR - Excuse me. Thank you very much.

Ms O'CONNOR - I didn't interrupt you, Mr Winter.

CHAIR - If you could ask the question.

Ms O'CONNOR - If you could just, you know, flesh out the reality of that business model.

Mr STOUT - I think the evidence that we spoke to about the breeding and the transition that the industry is making around breeding and sustainable breeding is very, very mindful of ensuring that the greyhounds have a wonderful, successful life - whether that's on the racetrack or transitioning through to pets. I'm lucky enough to go into the office every day where, you know, a retired greyhound is the first thing that greets you at the door.

Ms O'CONNOR - That's lovely. That's a very, very positive start to the day.

Mr STOUT - Well, that's it. I think that's an obligation that we've got, as an industry, is to love these animals whilst they're in our care and in the industry, but provide them with the avenue to go on and share that love beyond the racetrack. That's something that the industry is very, very focused on.

CHAIR - I'm mindful we only have 15 minutes left and I know that Mr Winter and Ms Rattray have another question, so I might move to Mr Winter.

Mr WINTER - Yes, I was going to go to the finances, but did you have something closer to where we were?

Ms RATTRAY - Yes, I did, if I might then.

CHAIR - Well, we will jump then to you, Ms Rattray.

Ms RATTRAY - Thank you for the additional submission today. In the submission you talk about the *Racing Regulation and Integrity Act 2024* and the fact that best-practice legislation was put in place at that time and only seven months or 12 months later, we're here where we are. I understand from my information and submissions that there have been significant industry improvements with animal welfare: more comprehensive regulation - the

PUBLIC

greyhound industry has a higher regulation than the harness and thoroughbred codes; mandatory police checks for all participants; strict euthanasia approval processes and reduced euthanasia rates, which are less than 1 per cent. Do you want to make a comment about the work that's been done in improving those animal welfare matters that were raised previously?

Mr STOUT - Yes, I think it's a testament to the industry and to the regulators that it's continued to show a willingness to step up its game. That's consistent around Australasia, and in terms of delivering confidence back to the community, I think the greyhound industry is certainly leading the way in that regard. We probably need to sell our story a little better, and that's certainly a challenge from my perspective because it's quite easy for the good things that the industry does to get overshadowed by the odd bad actor, but certainly here in Tasmania you only have to spend some time with the people in the industry to understand how committed they are to making sure that they adhere to the best-practice ethos.

Ms RATTRAY - So, you would agree that there has been a significant raise in the standards since that 2024 *Racing Regulation and Integrity Act* came into play in Tasmania?

Mr STOUT - I would think you could even go back further and post the 2021 inquiry, looking through the-

Ms O'CONNOR - It was 2016, I think.

Ms RATTRAY - 2015. Well, it was handed down in 2016.

Ms O'CONNOR - It handed down its report in 2016.

Mr STOUT - The industry has undergone substantive change from that time, and that has conditioned its participants to a readiness and a willingness to continue on that path of accepting of best practices as it evolves.

Mr WINTER - Yesterday, the Premier of Tasmania called your industry a bunch of thugs. How does that align with what you've seen around the industry?

Mr STOUT - Look, Mr Winter, I'm not really going to get drawn into that, but understanding that it is - I will just say that -

Ms RATTRAY - Passionate, perhaps. Over-passionate.

Mr STOUT - I have met Mrs Carol Martin, who's a volunteer for the Launceston Greyhound Racing Club, whose name sits behind the ads that are currently airing in defence of the industry, and I wouldn't have used that term to describe Carol.

CHAIR - I don't think there's an insinuation that the Premier referred to Carol as a thug, just to make it very clear for the record, for *Hansard*, today. It was directed -

Mr WINTER - I guess it depends on how it's taken by the industry. It's been very sad to see what's happened to good Tasmanian racing people when they're called thugs.

I want to go to the finances. We have received information, as part of this inquiry, from Tasracing about the financial results for 2025. The House of Assembly also received

PUBLIC

information from GBE hearings tabled yesterday for the result for the codes. Tasracing has reported that of the three codes there was a deficit for greyhounds of \$3.3 million; for harness, \$10.5 million and for thoroughbred, \$17 million, making your code, in terms of these financial results, the most sustainable of the three. Have you done any analysis of the impacts, for the other two codes, should greyhounds cease to exist in the Tasmanian context?

Mr STOUT - I haven't done any physical analysis, but as a past employee of Tasracing- and just so the committee is aware, I did spend five years at Tasracing as the thoroughbred code manager, so I know intricacies of the tri-code model particularly well. I also worked at Racing Queensland, which is also a tri-code model, so it relies on the three codes. I think a great analogy I've heard in relation to the racing industry down here is that it's a 'three-legged stool', and to take one leg of the stool away is going to completely destabilise the other two.

Now, knowing the breadth of employment, the breadth of community that the racing industry across the three codes provides - you've just witnessed the summer racing carnival here in Tasmania and I'm sure you've all had the opportunity to get out to community-based racing around the state that provides a wonderful opportunity for social gatherings that otherwise may not exist, certainly in regional areas, of that nature. I'm certainly concerned about the financial impact that removing greyhounds will have on the other two codes.

Mr WINTER - Tasracing has provided us with evidence that, if you were to take away the greyhound code, they would in fact be seeking the same amount of funding through the deed for two codes as they would for three. Does that align with the analysis that you've seen?

Mr STOUT - That's very close, too. We commissioned an inaugural report into taxation contribution from around Australia. In looking at the net taxation that's provided through racing to all three levels of government, that \$3.3 million figure is consistent with what we had from a Tasmanian perspective. In actual fact, what we found was the net benefit provided back through things such as wagering, events, hospitality, all those things, was actually in excess of \$10 million across the three levels of government: state, federal, and local.

Mr WINTER - That's on page 6 of your submission. You say - this is based on financial year 2023 data - demonstrated a significant net-tax contribution from greyhound racing throughout Australia and in Tasmania. You've said that Tasmania received a total of \$5.4 million in total government funding, consisting of \$1.95 million from the point-of-consumption allocation and \$3.45 million from the financial year 2023 government funding deed, delivering a net-tax contribution of \$10.4 million across federal, state, and local government. Your argument is that if there wasn't greyhound racing, then there would be a net-negative impact to Tasmania of \$10.4 million?

Mr STOUT - Not directly to Tasmania - that's across all three levels of government.

Mr WINTER - I see. That's good to know. Thank you.

Mr STOUT - But, certainly, going back to your point, what I've provided in a supplementary submission is that we haven't really - to this point in time - there's no understanding of what the cost of transition is going to be. Not only are you losing the income and what's being generated by the code now, we haven't evaluated what the additional cost of this is going to be.

PUBLIC

Ms RATTRAY - There has been a lot of discussion, particularly in some of the submissions and in the code, around compensation. It is very difficult to get any information about how compensation might work. I've had a look at what's available in New Zealand, but I think they're still grappling with that; there's certainly no compensation for dog owners; it's more about infrastructure and how that might be compensated for in the future. Do you have any thoughts on what a compensation model might look like for the code if it's to progress?

Mr STOUT - It's interesting you raise New Zealand because they are at a similar stage. Their legislation has gone back to committee and they're grappling with how to quantify and answer that question as well; certainly, given the timeframes that are currently in front of them, in a vastly shorter time with vastly greater consequences to their industry participants who are facing closure this year at this point in time. We've been part of that process in putting forward some ideas over there.

What I will say is that, realistically, it comes down to what the government is willing to look at as well. You can draw quite a wide circle. You are disrupting people's livelihoods, their families, their investments, and there may be properties where they've lived for generations and invested significant amounts of money over substantially long periods of time. How you compensate for that is quite a vexed question and certainly one that is being challenged both in New Zealand and it needs to be here as well.

Mr WINTER - Following up on that, sorry - I thought the legislation had actually gone through New Zealand?

Mr STOUT - No, New Zealand has a single House situation, so because of that, there's no upper House that provides scrutiny over the legislation that then passes it beyond, say, the House of Assembly. As a consequence of that, what they do have is a select committee process. So, following the legislation's first reading in the House, it is referred to dedicated committees - I think there's roughly five or six. So, there is a dedicated select committee that is currently reviewing the legislation and they run a public consultation process - hearings very similar to this. I will say that I was only afforded 10 minutes because they had so many submissions over there, but I managed to sit through hearings of the two days that they had them over.

Mr WINTER - So, that's an active consideration at the moment, the compensation question?

Mr STOUT - Yes.

Mr WINTER - Now, to the extent you are able to answer because we can do a bit of research on this ourselves as well, but are they considering including the compensation question in the legislation?

Mr STOUT - It is framed at the moment as support, participant support, so that support hasn't been defined. So, whether it's financial support or greater than financial support, that hasn't been defined. What I will say is that the minister did go on record, as Ms Rattray rightly pointed out, he wasn't going to compensate for the dogs, but there's a fair amount of investment within that and, certainly, the committee is very mindful, given a lot of them have a primary

PUBLIC

production background, that the cost of keeping animals and livestock, in this case greyhounds, is not insignificant.

Ms RATTRAY - It's difficult to get any real data or information about compensation. In the ACT model you can still actually breed and race in another jurisdiction - you can hop over the border there. It's not so easy for Tasmanians to hop over the border.

Mr STOUT - No, and certainly the legislation - in its current form, the bill does prohibit that kind of activity.

Ms RATTRAY - Exactly. Thank you.

CHAIR - I think we might have come to the end of our time with you. Thank you very much, Simon, for your appearance today. We do appreciate it. Just to remind you before we finish here that what you have said to us here today is protected by parliamentary privilege, but once you leave the table, you need to be aware that the privilege does not attach to comments you may make to anyone, including the media, even if you are just repeating what you have said to us here today. Do you understand that?

Mr STOUT - Yes.

CHAIR - Thank you very much for your time.

Mr STOUT - Thank you.

The witness withdrew.

The committee adjourned at 10:43 a.m.