



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

Joint Standing Committee on Greyhound Racing Transition

**Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments
(Phasing Out Reform) Bill 2025 Inquiry**

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Legislative Council

Ms O'Connor (Deputy Chair)

Ms Rattray

Ms Webb

House of Assembly

Ms Johnston (Chair)

Mr Vermey

Mr Winter

CONTENTS

Contents	3
Chair’s Foreword.....	5
Findings	7
Recommendations.....	11
1 Appointment and Conduct of the Inquiry	13
Appointment.....	13
Conduct of the Inquiry	13
Structure of this Report	13
2 Background to the Bill	15
3 Examination of the Bill.....	21
Part 1 – Preliminary (Clauses 1 & 2)	21
Findings:	32
Part 2 - <i>Animal Welfare Act 1993</i> Amended (Clauses 3 & 4).....	32
Findings:	43
Part 3 – <i>Dog Control Act 2000</i> Amended (Clauses 5 to 7)	43
Findings:	54
Part 4 – <i>Racing Regulation and Integrity Act 2024</i> Amended (Clauses 8 to 10)	54
Interpretation.....	55
Exercise of powers during transition period.....	56
Transfer of Greyhounds	69
Retirement of greyhounds	73
Use of interstate and overseas greyhounds	74
Destruction of greyhounds	79
Breeding of greyhounds.....	82
Authorisation in relation to greyhound racing on closure date.....	83
Regulations	83

	Findings:	85
	Part 5 – <i>Racing Regulation and Integrity Act 2024</i> Further Amended (Clauses 11 to 28)	86
	Part 6 – Repeal of the Act (Clause 29)	86
4	Other Issues	87
	Compensation for industry participants	87
	Findings:	94
	Rehoming concerns	94
	Findings:	98
	Dissenting Statement of Hon Tania Rattray MLC, Independent Member for McIntyre	99
	Dissenting Statement of Mr Dean Winter MP, Labor Member for Franklin	101
	Appendix A - List of Submissions	109
	Appendix B - List of witnesses	113
	Appendix C - Minutes of the Committee	115

CHAIR'S FOREWORD

On behalf of the Joint Standing Committee on Greyhound Racing Transition, I am pleased to present this report on the Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Act 2025 Bill Inquiry.

The Joint Standing Committee on Greyhound Racing Transition has been tasked by the Parliament with an important oversight role. At the commencement of the Committee, we took the opportunity to hear directly from key stakeholders including industry and community representatives, the Racing Integrity Commissioner, and the Government about the phasing out of greyhound racing in Tasmania and key matters that the Committee would need to oversee in any transition period.

The referral of the Bill from the Legislative Council was a welcome further opportunity to hear from industry and community, with particular focus on the specific provisions of the legislation which would provide the framework for the transition.

At the outset, I want to thank those who made submissions and those who attended hearings. It is also important to acknowledge the depth of feeling and passion about this issue – that was abundantly clear in the evidence provided. Whilst the terms of reference for this Inquiry referred to the provisions of the Bill, the Committee appreciates that many submitters also spoke more broadly about the policy decision leading to it.

Central to this Inquiry, and the Committee's substantive work, is the welfare of animals and participants. The Committee has heard clearly from both industry and animal welfare advocates uncertainty about the future has significant and negative impacts on the welfare of all those involved. As such the Committee has been cognisant of the need to ensure appropriate time for industry and community to be heard, whilst understanding the urgency and not unduly delaying the progress of debate on the Bill.

The Bill provides for the legislative framework for the phasing out of greyhound racing. It does so using a staged approach, alongside closure plan, that leads to the end of greyhound racing on 30 June 2029. The Greyhound Racing Transition Working Group, led by the Commissioner has already provided significant input and feedback into the matters to be included in a transition/closure plan. Their knowledge, skills, expertise and goodwill will be critical in the development in a robust and just transition plan. It was pleasing to hear, during evidence to this Inquiry, that industry participants have taken steps towards agreeing to participate in the Commissioner's Greyhound Racing Transition Working Group. Their participation is critical to any just and humane transition for participants and animals. I thank the Commissioner for establishing the group and for his ongoing willingness to engage collaboratively and transparently.

I note there may be some concern that this Inquiry has been conducted in haste as this has been a relatively short inquiry period, however, I would note the following:

- Prior to the referral of the Bill the Committee had already conducted a round of public hearings with key stakeholders discussing the Bill and other matters, and some of this evidence was relevant for this Inquiry;
- the period for public submissions was seven weeks;
- the establishment of the Inquiry was well known within the industry and community, and this was reflected in the number of submissions received;
- the Committee held 3 public hearings;
- the Committee asked numerous questions on notice and received responses to clarify and add to submissions and oral evidence; and
- the Committee was conducting an inquiry into the bill specifically rather than the policy issue as a whole.

I would like to acknowledge the valuable contribution of the Committee Secretariat in assisting with, and advising on, the administration of the Committee and this Inquiry – it is greatly appreciated.

The evidence the Committee received was at times challenging and distressing. I thank all members for their respectful engagement and consideration of each submission. The Bill has been considered clause by clause, noting that submissions often discussed the Bill as a whole.

The report has made findings directly relating to the provisions of the Bill and also matters adjunct to the Bill where evidence has been made available during the Inquiry. Although it is somewhat unusual to have these additional findings included in a bill inquiry, the Committee was of the view that these findings would benefit the work that may follow the passage of the Bill and assist both the Government and the Racing Integrity Commissioner.

The Committee by majority recommends approval of the Bill with amendments.



Kristie Johnston MP

CHAIR

19 March 2026

FINDINGS

The Committee finds:

1. The Commissioner's view, that the passage of the Bill is necessary to design, implement and enforce a transition plan for the phasing out of the greyhound racing in Tasmania.
2. The Commissioner's view that if the Bill does not pass, and the Government persists with its policy, it would leave participants, animals and the broader community exposed to unmanaged risks.
3. The Government's response to questions that the 1 January 2026 commencement date, could be amended to a date in the future or could be dealt with by regulation.
4. The greyhound racing industry is opposed to the Bill overall and has ongoing concerns about the Bill, including the haste of its development, lack of consultation, and commencement provisions.
5. Animal welfare organisations are concerned that delaying the commencement of the Bill will undermine their ability to deliver humane rehoming outcomes for racing dogs and potentially lead to poor animal welfare outcomes.
6. Breeding data provided in evidence has been inconsistent and difficult to verify.
7. Breeding data collection by Tasracing cannot be relied upon and further notes the Commissioner for Racing has undertaken to work with Tasracing on an audit of dogs currently in the industry.
8. The Government expects to have a report and advice in relation to the new Racing Deed by May 2026.
9. Penalties for offences under the Bill are not aligned with offences created under the *Animal Welfare Act 1993* and the *Dog Control Act 2000*.
10. Clause 4 of the Bill is drafted adequately to prohibit the export of greyhounds bred in Tasmania for racing interstate or overseas.
11. Lure coursing involving greyhounds would be illegal under Clause 4.
12. No legislative welfare void for greyhounds will be created by the passage of this Bill and they will be protected like any other dog under existing animal laws and regulations.
13. Current breed specific welfare laws and regulations for greyhounds only exist because they participate, or have participated, in the high-risk activity of racing. The passage of the Bill would prohibit this activity and therefore the need for breed specific welfare laws.
14. Industry certainty is required over the legal status and potential use of genetic material and arrangements for breeding dogs, during and following the

- industry transition. The Greyhound Racing Transition Working Group, the closure plan and regulations must address these issues.
15. The continued muzzling of greyhounds as domestic pets beyond 1 July 2029 cannot be justified if greyhound racing has ended.
 16. Clarity about desexing requirements for ex-racing greyhounds and the implications for breeding for domestic purposes, should be addressed in the transition plan.
 17. The closure date of 1 July 2029 provides three years for transition, which the Commissioner and rehoming organisations advises is adequate time for properly consulted transitional arrangements to be put in place for the welfare of animals and participants.
 18. Strong powers provided in the Bill in relation to compliance, inspection and audit, are required to ensure the welfare of dogs during the transition period. These are of similar scope to powers which already exist under the Rules of Racing and animal welfare legislation.
 19. Clause 10 of the Bill, schedule 8 (3) inserted, could specify a non-exhaustive list of matters that must be included in the closure plan and a requirement that consultation is undertaken in its development.
 20. The closure plan can be amended to deal with issues or needs that emerge during the transition period.
 21. That the matters outlined by the Racing Integrity Commissioner for current consideration in a draft closure plan are extensive and cover the breadth of matters raised with the Committee in submissions on the Bill.
 22. Parliamentary oversight of the transition will continue, including through the work of this Committee.
 23. Parliamentary oversight could be enhanced by tabling the closure plan in both Houses of Parliament.
 24. Deficient data and records keeping by Tasracing puts animal welfare and industry participant outcomes at risk during the transition period. Ongoing auditing by the Racing Integrity Commissioner is required to ensure that data is accurate for the welfare of animals and industry participants.
 25. The transition period will require greater ongoing resources for the Office of the Racing Integrity Commissioner to ensure statutory responsibilities are met.
 26. Current penalties relating to the unlawful destruction of greyhounds are insufficient as a deterrent.
 27. There is a strong case for a just and equitable compensation package for industry participants

28. Greater clarity and certainty is required on the matter of compensation for industry participants in the Bill, through the closure plan and the operation of the working group.
29. Tasracing is conducting a feasibility study on the impacts of the greyhound racing transition.
30. Consideration of compensation must be included in any transition/closure plan.
31. Compensation may be required and funded at different stages of the transition.
32. More than one thousand ex-racing greyhounds will need to be rehomed during and following the transition period
33. The rehoming of ex-racing greyhounds will be a substantial complex and costly endeavour both during and following the transition period.
34. Local rehoming organisations have expressed a willingness and capacity to undertake the task of rehoming ex-racing greyhounds but will require extra sustained resourcing.
35. Currently, non-industry rehoming organisations are not funded to rehome greyhounds exiting the industry and they have relied on community funding to do this important work to date.
36. Re-homing organisations will need to be adequately funded by Government to assist with the humane transition of dogs out of greyhound racing both during the transition period and at closure, until all dogs are rehomed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The majority of the Committee recommends that the Greyhound Racing Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill 2025 be agreed to with amendments.
2. The majority of the Committee recommends that Clause 1 and Clause 2 be agreed to with amendment to the commencement date at 2(1).
3. The majority of the Committee recommends that the penalties for offences in the Bill be aligned with *Dog Control Act 2000* and *Animal Welfare Act 1993*.
4. The majority of the Committee recommends clarity in relation to lure coursing be inserted into the Bill or in regulations under the *Animal Welfare Act 1993*.
5. The majority of the Committee recommends that Part 3 of the Bill be agreed to with amendment to remove the requirement for muzzling greyhounds after 1 July 2029.
6. The majority of the Committee recommends that Part 5 of the Bill be agreed to with amendment to include:
 - a non-exhaustive list of matters that must be included in the closure plan;
 - a requirement that consultation is undertaken in the development of the closure plan;
 - the tabling of the closure plan in both Houses of Parliament; and
 - Increased penalties relating to the unlawful destruction of greyhounds.
7. The majority of the Committee recommends the Office of the Racing Integrity Commissioner be adequately resourced during the transition period to ensure statutory responsibilities are met.
8. The majority of the Committee recommends that Part 5, Clauses 11 to 28, of the Bill be agreed to.
9. The majority of the Committee recommends that Part 6, Clause 29, of the Bill be agreed to.
10. The majority of the Committee recommends that compensation is explicitly referred to in the Bill as an element of the closure plan.
11. The majority of the Committee recommends that a just and equitable compensation package be provided for industry participants.
12. The majority of the Committee recommends rehoming organisations be supported with adequate funding with an allocation in the 2026-2027 state budget and forward estimates to facilitate rehoming efforts.
13. The Committee recommends that the Tasmanian Government be open and transparent about the development of the new Deed.

1 APPOINTMENT AND CONDUCT OF THE INQUIRY

Appointment

- 1.1. On 10 December 2025, the Joint Standing Committee on Greyhound Racing Transition (the Committee) received the following reference from the Legislative Council:

The Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill 2025 be referred to the Joint Standing Committee on Greyhound Racing Transition for Consideration and Report.

- 1.2. The Greyhound Racing Legislative Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill (the Bill) was introduced in the House of Assembly (the House) on 6 November 2025 by the Minister for Racing, Hon Jane Howlett MP and passed by the House on 4 December 2025.
- 1.3. On 10 December 2025 before the Legislative Council (the Council) commenced its second reading debate on the Bill, the Hon. Ruth Forrest MLC moved a successful motion to refer the Bill to this Committee.
- 1.4. This report should be read in conjunction with the attached documents. The minutes of the Committee are attached as Appendix C.

Conduct of the Inquiry

- 1.5. The Committee resolved to invite, by way of advertisement on the Parliament of Tasmania website and in the three major Tasmanian newspapers, interested persons and organisations to make a submission to the Committee in relation to the Bill. In addition to such general invitation, the Committee directly invited a number of persons and organisations to provide the Committee with any information they deemed to be relevant to the inquiry and to participate in public hearings.
- 1.6. Submissions to the Bill inquiry opened on 20 December 2025 and closed on 6 February 2026.
- 1.7. The Committee received 148 submissions, including several proformas and held 3 public hearings, with 14 witnesses.

Structure of this Report

- 1.8. This report consists of an examination of the Bill, including a discussion of evidence received and Committee findings regarding the Bill's clauses and overall intended impact. The report follows the following Chapters:
 - Chapter 1 outlines the appoint and conduct of the inquiry.
 - Chapter 2 outlines the background to the Bill.

- Chapter 3 is an examination of the Clauses of the Bill
- Chapter 4 discusses additional issues that were raised in relation to the contents of the Bill and the Bill generally.

2 BACKGROUND TO THE BILL

- 2.1 This Chapter outlines the background to the Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill 2025.
- 2.2 Greyhound racing is an organised sport in which greyhounds race around a track chasing a mechanical artificial lure. Support for greyhound racing has declined, with the sport being banned in 44 American states and recent bans in Scotland and Wales.¹ Currently in Australia, greyhound racing is banned in the Australian Capital Territory and a parliamentary inquiry into the ongoing viability of the sport is ongoing in Western Australia. New South Wales attempted to ban the sport in 2017, but the ban was overturned. New Zealand has also initiated a ban on the sport.
- 2.3 The change globally has been in response to concerns about the welfare of greyhounds, specifically regarding injuries, fatalities and general care of racing dogs and the recognition of greyhounds as sentient beings.
- 2.4 A petition was tabled in the House of Assembly on 3 March 2026 requesting that the House call on the Government to abandon the shutdown of greyhound racing and instead work with the greyhound community to build an even better, stronger racing code that loves and cares for its animals.² This petition was opened on 12 November 2025, closed on 8 December 2025, and had 1,072 signatures.
- 2.5 A previous Joint Select Committee on Greyhound Racing in Tasmania that reported to the Parliament of Tasmania (the Parliament) in 2016 had highlighted a need for reform in the racing industry particularly around animal welfare. The 2016 Committee was formed after ABC's *Four Corners* aired a documentary *Making a Killing* that investigated industry practices. The Committee made a series of recommendations leading to reforms in the industry, particularly in the sphere of regulation, animal welfare and data keeping.
- 2.6 A funding deed was signed in 2009 between the Tasmanian Government and the Tasmanian Racing Board following the sale of TOTE Tasmania. This deed ensured the ongoing funding of the racing industry through a yearly payment of \$27 million indexed over the life of the deed. In 2011 a variation to the deed was signed which extended a line of credit to Tasracing through the Tasmanian Public Finance Corporation (TASCORP) and in 2015 a further variation was signed. The deed is set to expire on 30 June 2029.

¹ Eslake, S. (2025) *The Financing of Greyhound Racing in Tasmania*, p. 2.

² Tasmania, House of Assembly e-petitions, "*Shut down of Tasmania Greyhound Racing*," details available here: -

<https://haepetitions.parliament.tas.gov.au/haepet/Home/PetitionDetails/137?title=Petition%20Details>

- 2.7 On 14 June 2022 the largest House of Assembly e-petition ever tabled was presented to Parliament containing 13,519 signatures and called on the ‘government to end the taxpayer subsidy of the inherent cruel greyhound racing industry’.³ This petition opened on 9 December 2021 and closed on 9 June 2022.
- 2.8 A petition with 3,603 signatures was also tabled in the Legislative Council on 8 August 2024 which requested ‘the Legislative Council, seek the agreement of the House of Assembly, to establish a Joint Select Committee to independently and thoroughly examine the economic and welfare implications of the industry subsidy ahead of any renewal of the current 20-year taxpayer funded Racing Deed, due for expiry in 2029.’⁴ This petition opened on 15 July 2024 and closed on 8 August 2024.
- 2.9 A further petition was tabled in the Legislative Council on 10 April 2025 which called on the ‘Rockliff Government to do what is right and demonstrate the same humane leadership as that shown in Aotearoa New Zealand and move to end greyhound racing, with a just transition period and support for industry participants, as well as funding for not-for-profit local animal welfare organisations to rehome ex-racing dogs.’⁵ This petition was opened on 12 December 2024, closed on 31 March 2025 and had 4,997 signatures.
- 2.10 In response to community concern about integrity and animal welfare issues in the industry, on 15 August 2024 the Parliament passed the Racing Regulation and Integrity Bill 2024 which was described as ‘evidence based and best-practice legislation’.⁶
- 2.11 On 17 July 2025 the Premier, Hon. Jeremy Rockliff MP, wrote to Northwest Greyhound Racing Club reiterating the Liberal Government’s ongoing support for the racing industry.⁷
- 2.12 Community organisations and advocates have continued to highlight welfare concerns about greyhound racing, particularly the deaths of greyhounds both on and off the track within the industry.

³ Tasmania, House of Assembly e-petitions – ‘End Public Funding of Greyhound Racing,’ details available here: -

<https://haepetitions.parliament.tas.gov.au/haepet/Home/PetitionDetails/98?title=Petition%20Details>

⁴ Tasmania, Legislative Council e-petitions, ‘Unacceptable rates of on and off track deaths of greyhounds in the Tasmanian greyhound racing industry,’ details available here: - [Petition Details - Tasmania Parliament E-Petitions](#)

⁵ Tasmania, Legislative Council e-petitions, ‘Iutruwita/Tasmania needs to follow Aotearoa New Zealand’s lead and ban greyhound racing,’ details available here: - [Petition Details - Tasmania Parliament E-Petitions](#)

⁶ Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP, press release, ‘Historical racing reforms pass Tasmania’s Legislative Council,’ dated 15 August 2024, available here: - [Historic racing reforms pass Tasmania’s Legislative Council | Premier of Tasmania](#)

⁷ Tasmania, House of Assembly Tabled papers 2025, Letter from Premier Hon. Jeremy Rockliff MP, to Ben Englund, North West Greyhound Racing Club, dated 17 July 2025, available here: -

<https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/house-of-assembly/taled-papers/house-of-assemblytabled-papershouse-of-assembly-tabled-papers-2025/TP52-1-1.pdf>

- 2.13 On 10 August 2025 the Premier announced that the Government would phase out greyhound racing by 30 June 2029. The reasons given were concerns surrounding social licence, animal welfare and the sustainability of the industry. The Premier stated that “*the reality is the greyhound industry is at a crossroads, is in decline and it is increasingly clear it does not align with community expectations.*”⁸ He also said that the phase out would “*coincide with the expiration of the current funding deed.*”⁹
- 2.14 Following the announcement to phase out the industry the Premier, and the Minister for Racing, wrote to the Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner (the Commissioner), Sean Carroll, requesting work commence to develop a plan to deliver the transition.
- 2.15 The Commissioner formed a working group of representatives from the Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner’s office (TasRIC), Tasracing, the RSPCA, the greyhound industry and an independent vet, to assist him in developing a phase out plan.
- 2.16 The Parliament also created the current Committee, the Joint Standing Committee on Greyhound Racing Transition on 25 September 2025, to oversee the greyhound racing phase out. The Committee has the following terms of reference: -
- That a Joint Standing Committee on Greyhound Racing Transition, be appointed with the power to send for persons and papers, with leave to sit during any adjournment of either House and with leave to adjourn from place to place to oversee the phasing out of greyhound racing in Tasmania by 30 June 2029 including matters of:*
- (i) Protecting the welfare of greyhounds and participants in the industry during the phase out period and following its conclusion;*
 - (ii) Transitional arrangements for greyhound racing industry participants, including any fair and reasonable compensation requirements;*
 - (iii) Requirements of rehoming organisations;*
 - (iv) Legislative requirements for the transition; and*
 - (v) Any other incidental matter thereto.*
- 2.17 The Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill 2025 was introduced in the House of Assembly on 6 November 2025 by the Minister for Racing. The Bill aims to phase out greyhound racing in Tasmania through a staged approach, with the industry concluding by 30 June 2029.
- 2.18 Prior to the referral of the current Bill, the Committee, in performing its oversight role of the greyhound racing transition, held two days of hearings. The Committee heard from greyhound racing industry participants, animal

⁸ Tasmanian Government, Media Release, *Phasing out greyhound racing*, 10 August 2025.

⁹ Tasmanian Government, Media Release, *Phasing out greyhound racing*, 10 August 2025.

welfare organisations, the Department of Natural Resources and Environment (NRE), the Minister for Racing and the Commissioner.¹⁰ Hearings focussed on how the Government planned to implement the transition, the industry's opposition to the closure and animal welfare concerns.

- 2.19 Additionally, the above hearings, having occurred shortly after the Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill 2025 was tabled, allowed the Committee to seek further information on the Bill from the Minister, the Department and the Commissioner.¹¹ Industry participants were also given the opportunity to express their views on the phase-out and the Bill at this time.
- 2.20 The Minister for Racing moved the Second reading of the Bill in the House on 4 December 2025. The Second reading passed following a Division of 22 Ayes and 11 Noes. Following the Committee of the whole House process, also on 4 December 2025, the Bill was read a Third time following a Division with 22 Ayes and 11 Noes.
- 2.21 On 10 December 2025, before the Council commenced its Second reading debate on the Bill, the Hon. Ruth Forrest MLC moved a successful motion to refer the Bill to this Committee.
- 2.22 During the Council Debate in relation to the referral of the Bill to the Committee a number of issues were raised. The main reason cited for the referral of the Bill to the Committee was a perceived lack of consultation with the greyhound racing community on the Bill. The Hon. Ruth Forrest MLC in moving the motion stated:
- I asked members to try... to identify another example of any time where a major reform - and it is a major reform for the people who are impacted by this - has proceeded without this sort of public consultation or engagement with the impact of parties before it was tabled.¹²*
- 2.23 Following debate on the Motion to refer the Bill to the Committee, the Motion passed upon Division with 8 Ayes and 4 Noes.
- 2.24 Upon receiving the referral from the Legislative Council, the Committee commenced its inquiry, further details of which can be found in Chapter 1.

¹⁰ Further information can be found at <https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/committees/joint-committees/standing-committees/joint-standing-committee-on-greyhound-racing-transition>

¹¹ Transcripts of these hearings held on 7 November 2025 and 28 November 2025 are available here - https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0029/99407/FOR-PUBLICATION-Transcript-of-Evidence-JSC-on-Greyhound-Racing-Transition-Hearing-1-7-November-2025.pdf & https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0016/100465/Final-Transcript-of-Evidence-JSC-Greyhound-Racing-Transition-Friday-28-November-2025.pdf

¹² Tasmania, *Parliamentary Debates*, Legislative Council, 10 December 2025, p. 5, (Ruth Forrest).

2.25 It is noted that as of 16 March 2026, the following has been recorded by Tasracing; - one on track death, one post-race euthanasia and 39 on and off-track injuries.¹³

¹³ Letter from Tasracing CEO, Andrew Jenkins, to the Joint Standing Committee on Greyhound Racing Transition, dated 20 March 2026, p. 1.

3 EXAMINATION OF THE BILL

- 3.1 This Chapter considers the various Parts of the Bill. Evidence received regarding individual Clauses and Sections is included, as well as any comments the Committee has formulated as a result of their inquiries.

Part 1 – Preliminary (Clauses 1 & 2)

- 3.2 Clauses 1 and 2 set out the short title and commencement provisions of the Bill. It is noted that as the Bill did not pass the Parliament prior to 1 January 2026, the commencement date will be on Royal Assent. It is included in Clause 2 that the commencement of Parts 2, 3 and 5 of the Bill are to be 1 July 2029.
- 3.3 The commencement provisions included in Clause 2 provide the timeline for the greyhound racing transition. The Committee received a substantial amount of evidence regarding the commencement of the Bill, including arguments which supported the need for a timely passage of the Bill to assist in the facilitation of the transition, and those which objected to the relative speed at which the Bill was drafted and placed before Parliament.
- 3.4 Before a hearing of the Committee, the Minister for Racing provided a statement regarding the timeliness of the Bill and the potential impact of the delay of its passage through Parliament on the welfare of greyhounds:

Ms O'CONNOR - ... Minister, as a consequence of the delay of the transition Bill, those provisions which were due to come into effect on 1 January this year [2026] obviously are not. In part 4, section 8 of the Bill, there's the prohibition on the breeding of greyhounds. We've received some evidence through commentary on social media that some industry participants, as a consequence of the delay, are moving towards more breeding of greyhounds. Do you have any more information on that? Is it of concern to you that the consequence of the delay means that there are more dogs being bred, which means that there are more dogs that will be exploited and more dogs at the end that will need to be rehomed?

Ms HOWLETT - ... I believe an audit was done yesterday and I believe that there has been a slight increase on the numbers. The Commissioner would have those exact numbers for you. What is concerning is that the longer this is delayed, the more animal welfare issues there will be. Obviously, that will put a huge emphasis on the Greyhound Adoption Program (GAP) facility and rehoming facilities as well. There has been an increase, but, the final number of the audit, the Commissioner will be able to give to you tomorrow.

Ms O'CONNOR - Presumably, the greater the delay -

Ms HOWLETT - The more their numbers will increase. That's right.¹⁴

¹⁴ Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP, and Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania representatives, pp. 5-6.

- 3.5 The Commissioner, Sean Carroll at a hearing of the Committee previously, mentioned the need for the legislation to be implemented in a timely manner to allow the transition process to progress:

Mr CARROLL - It's an essential requirement of making sure that we have a clear pathway and transition to cease greyhound racing by 2029. The timeframes that have been developed in that are taking into account good animal welfare, rehoming programs, and ensuring that there's a clear pathway for those participants who are going to be impacted by the transition program itself.

I can't determine the timing of the bill, but I support the introduction of the bill.

Ms O'CONNOR - You would presumably support its passage through parliament this year, preferably, in order for you to be able to get on with the work that you've been given.

Mr CARROLL - I think it's essential.¹⁵

- 3.6 In a subsequent hearing as part of this inquiry the Commissioner stated the following:

Mr CARROLL - ... The legislation provides the integrity authority with powers and a framework required to design, implement and enforce that transition plan. Without legislative authority, binding requirements cannot be imposed with certainty. Coordination across regulators, industry and welfare bodies will be fragmented, and enforcement mechanisms will be vulnerable to challenge or inconsistent.

In practical terms, without legislation, any transition plan would be difficult to design, difficult to implement and difficult to enforce. That would leave participants, animals and the broader community exposed to unmanaged risk.

...

The proposed legislation and transition framework offer a pathway out of uncertainty. It provides certainty for participants, assurance for the community, protection for animal welfare and stability for Tasmania's regulatory framework. From the perspective of integrity, enforceability and risk management, the conclusion is clear: the legislation is not only desirable: it's necessary.¹⁶

- 3.7 The Humane World for Animals submission emphasised the Commissioner's request for a swift implementation of the Bill to assist in facilitating the transition:

The Racing Integrity Commissioner had reportedly urged swift passage of the Bill to begin the transition plan in January 2026, so we encourage the Committee to ensure any delay caused by this review does not lead to increased breeding or the

¹⁵ Transcript of Evidence, 7 November 2025, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll, pp. 41-42.

¹⁶ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll, p. 47.

*eutanasia of racing dogs, and greyhound racing in Tasmania concludes by 30 June 2029.*¹⁷

- 3.8 In the public hearing, the management of the commencement provision of 1 January 2026 for parts of the Bill was discussed with the Minister for Racing and Stephen Hall, Principal Advisor - Legal Services, Biosecurity Tasmania:

Ms O'CONNOR - ... you will need to amend the dates, would you not, because there are two parts of the Bill that have provisions that would have come into effect on 1 January this year [2026]. Obviously, they can't, so is it the Government's intention to amend the dates in the Bill?

Ms HOWLETT - I'm advised that there are two ways that we could potentially deal with that. There's an option via regulation as well.

Mr HALL - The date in there for 1 January this year [2026] was mainly in relation to dogs that were pregnant before that day. They would not be affected by the breeding ban. There was that date; there was also the ability to make a regulation which also included the exception, so it could be done that way as well without - even if that date wasn't amended, there is the ability to make a regulation after the Bill is passed which expands the exemption for that breeding ban.

Ms O'CONNOR - Would it be the Government's expectation, should the Bill pass, that there will be some retrospectivity, given that a number of parts of the Bill came into effect on 1 January [2026]?

Mr HALL - I wouldn't want to prejudge what the regulation would look like, but for example, if there needed to be a regulation to avoid hardship or avoid an unintended impact - like someone who was breeding after 1 January [2026] on the belief that the Bill may not pass, and then the Bill passes and suddenly their dog is illegal, the regulation could be made to validate or protect that sort of situation for that person.

Ms O'CONNOR - It seems a slightly clunky way of doing it rather than just changing the dates to -

Ms HOWLETT - Amend it and change the date even.

Mr HALL - Well, yes. What I'm saying is there is a mechanism there to cover that, if you didn't amend the Bill. It wouldn't be that there is just a zero-sum situation at the moment.¹⁸

- 3.9 Given the referral of the Bill to this Committee, the commencement provisions have been delayed. With this in mind, as well as to consider the status of the greyhound racing industry in Tasmania over time, the Committee received evidence regarding breeding statistics of greyhounds since the announcement of the transition. Evidence was also received regarding previous periods of time to compare the status of breeding. The Committee received conflicting and different evidence in relation to the numbers of breeding services that had occurred since 1 January 2026. Greyhounds Australasia provided in its

¹⁷ Submission No. 119, Humane World for Animals, p. 2.

¹⁸ Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP, and Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania representatives, pp. 17-18.

submission that one service had occurred¹⁹, Greyhounds Tasmania submitted that two had occurred²⁰ and the Commissioner in a hearing stated that two services had occurred.²¹

- 3.10 Greyhounds Australasia in answers to questions, clarified the numbers of services that had occurred for the month of January 2026 and the reasons for the discrepancies in numbers:

Greyhounds Australasia can confirm that four (4) breeding services occurring within Tasmania or involving Tasmanian breeders, were conducted during January 2026. Greyhounds Australasia acknowledges that the figure of one (1) service cited on page 10 of its submission reflects data that was available to it as at 31 January 2026 – the date on which the submission data was compiled.

The updated data, as captured on 26 February 2026, confirms a total of four (4) services for the month of January.

The discrepancy in data is timing based and arises from the lodgement conditions and 14-day timeframe permitted under the Greyhounds Australasia Rules (GAR) for registration of services. Meaning that services conducted later in January 2026 were either not yet lodged or fully processed at the time the submission data was extracted from the database.²²

- 3.11 The following was also noted by Greyhounds Australasia regarding its sources of breeding data:

Greyhounds Australasia sources its breeding service data from two notification streams, consistent with the registration requirements under the GAR 61, with all notifications required to be lodged within 14 days of the service:

*1. **Natural services and fresh semen artificial insemination:** notification is lodged by the studmaster or AI Technician with the relevant state Controlling Body in the jurisdiction in which the sire is domiciled, within 14 days of the first service of the breeding female (GAR Rule 61(2)). This notification is predominantly a paper-based notification, in this case via a prescribed Tasracing form.*

*2. **Frozen semen (registered Breeding Unit) inseminations:** notification is lodged directly with Greyhounds Australasia, via the GA Veterinary Portal, within 14 days of the insemination taking place and completion of the notification includes the physical return of the used breeding unit phial (GAR Rule 61(3)).*

In both cases, data from all notification streams is recorded in and accessible through the national greyhound racing administration databases, including OzChase and FastTrack. OzChase provides Tasracing and Greyhounds Australasia with

¹⁹ Submission No. 40, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 10.

²⁰ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Luke Gatehouse, Claire Robins, Ben Englund, Ben Clark and John Newson, p. 6.

²¹ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll, p. 49.

²² Additional information provided by Greyhounds Australasia, 2 March 2026, p.1.

consolidated visibility across service types and jurisdictions. Additional breeding data, specific to frozen semen breeding units and stud sire activity, is maintained on the GA Portal.

As noted above, the 14-day lodgement window, and varied data processing, means that data extracted at a point in time may not yet capture all services conducted close to that date.²³

- 3.12 In an email to the Committee on 5 March 2025 the Commissioner provided further explanation for the variance in figures provided, noting:

I was advised by the Greyhound Transition Project Manager that the figures provided by Tasracing in their correspondence to the JSC were obtained from the National database Ozchase. As I provided in my evidence before the JSC, unfortunately Ozchase is a system that is updated manually on information that is inputted by participants and state racing authorities around the country. On occasions manual forms that have been completed by participants and given to the previous Tasmanian racing authorities have not been entered into the National database for month/years or on occasions not at all. I am not confident in the current Tasmanian Greyhound statistics detailed in Ozchase (This is not a criticism of Ozchase). This lack of confidence has been justified given the number of “record rectifications” identified and undertaken by the Tasracing Greyhound Audit team who are currently undertaking a second audit of all greyhounds in Tasmania.

The audit team have identified approx. 650 records that require verification and rectification. These are historical issues believed to be caused by a failure of data entry and process by the former Office of Racing Integrity and previous Tasmanian Greyhound authorities. Now this process failure has been identified and a rectification process is underway, I am confident that we should have accurate Greyhound data in the future. Until that process is completed the only accurate data that can be relied upon is as a result from the manual Tasracing audit currently being undertaken.²⁴

- 3.13 The Commissioner also stated that as of 5 March 2026, 12 services had occurred for 2026.²⁵ The Committee notes the Commissioner is doing an audit to provide further clarity.

- 3.14 Discussions regarding the perception and undertaking of breeding since the announcement of the transition were also raised with the Committee. Representing Greyhounds Tasmania, Luke Gatehouse concluded that while some services had occurred since the announcement of the transition, this did not mark an increase compared to previous numbers and years:

Mr GATEHOUSE- ... We've had a lot of comment, some of it ill-informed, on breeding issues. Now, dogs don't just breed at the drop of a hat. It is a biological process. It is

²³ Additional information provided by Greyhounds Australasia, 2 March 2026, p.2.

²⁴ Email to the Joint Standing Committee on Greyhound Racing Transition dated 5 March 2024 from Sean Carroll, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner.

²⁵ Email to the Joint Standing Committee on Greyhound Racing Transition dated 5 March 2024 from Sean Carroll, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner.

Mother Nature at work. You can't force it. The process occurs when a female greyhound is fertile, which is once every six to 12 months. There's a 63-day gestation period after the service before the pups are born, which means any dog that has been serviced post 1 January [2026] is yet to give birth, so there's been no spike in litters on the ground. The greyhounds may have been serviced in January [2026] and the figure is no different to January last year [2025].

...

The figures so far to this year in terms of services, because there's a lag between obviously service and litters on the ground, is pretty much the same as last year.

There were two dogs serviced in January 2026: two. There was this narrative that we needed to pass legislation last year [2025] so that the breeding ban could start on 1 January [2026]. No-one's jumped for joy. The industry hasn't jumped for joy. They haven't run out and made their female greyhounds come on season so they could have them serviced; Mother Nature takes its course. They make a decision to breed with a female responsibly, with a pink card.²⁶

- 3.15 In his submission Michael Pearce, a Tasmanian greyhound trainer expressed concern about the timeline of the introduction of the Bill:

This bill has been introduced with alarming speed and without genuine consultation with the Tasmanian greyhound community. Trainers, breeders, owners, racing staff, veterinarians, and rehoming volunteers — the people with the most practical knowledge of greyhounds — have been excluded from the decision-making process.

There has been no transparent, independent research undertaken into the Tasmanian industry specifically. Instead, the bill appears heavily influenced by misinformation and campaigning from animal activist groups who have little to no direct involvement with greyhound racing in this state...²⁷

- 3.16 The Commissioner was asked in the hearing on 11 February 2026 to provide his understanding of breeding activity since the transition was announced:

Mr CARROLL - ... *What I've seen to date is that we've had 19 pups that have been born in the last two months. We've had 15 registered services in the last four months. Comparative to that - and these are numbers that I got off Tasracing - in the four months before that, there were two, and that's since the announcement of the transition. If I go off that, and some of you may or may not have seen, whilst we take on board and deal with data, we also deal with other evidence before us. There was a lot of messaging that was going on through social media after the postponement of the Bill going through the Upper House to this committee, rightly so, that breeders should go out and breed as many as they can for the reasons they've said to continue bloodlines, for potential compensation, but to ensure that numbers don't diminish.*

We take that with a grain of salt. What we're dealing with is the reality of the numbers that are coming through. As I've said, on the numbers that I've been given

²⁶ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Luke Gatehouse, Claire Robins, Ben Englund, Ben Clark and John Newson, pp. 6-7.

²⁷ Submission No. 46, Michael Pearce, p. 3.

for the numbers of mating services, they've been 15 compared to two since the announcement was made. We haven't seen those pups being whelped yet.²⁸

- 3.17 The Commissioner also discussed how the passing of the Bill was essential to ensure that the welfare of greyhounds can be protected and maintained throughout the transition:

Mr CARROLL - I will reiterate: I'm not here to defend the position of the Government or the decision made to phase out greyhound racing. My job is to put in place a transition plan that manages those risks. I don't know the position of the Government if the legislation doesn't proceed and what position they will take if it purely relies on rules of racing and a written transition plan that has no legislative framework.

The way in which participants would look at the rules of racing, the perception to those start to diminish and the reliance that Tasracing, as the enforceable body, would have, that power would also start to diminish because the pressures of any penalties would diminish as the phase-out became closer to 30 June 2029. The clarity that the legislation provides, but also - I don't hide behind this - the penalties that are attached to breaching that legislation, provides a greater deterrent to address those risks I speak about.²⁹

- 3.18 Tasmanian greyhound industry participants were also asked to provide their perspective of what may happen to the industry if the Bill is not passed, but the Government maintains its policy to implement the greyhound racing transition:

CHAIR - I want to be really clear: your submission is then that if the Government no longer funded [the] greyhound racing industry, it stood alone either as privately funded or however it might operate, that there would be confidence in the industry to continue on racing at current levels and that wouldn't impact on your participants?

Mr GATEHOUSE - As long as the regulatory functions of racing were covered by Tasracing.

Ms RATTRAY - Which they would be funded to do so, in whatever form.

Mr GATEHOUSE - Yes. As long as the appropriate amounts of commercial revenue were passed on to the greyhound racing code, which in terms of wagering turnover on greyhound racing in this state is 40 per cent - or 39.6 per cent - of the race field fees for this state, which is give or take, \$8 million.³⁰

- 3.19 The Tasmanian racing industry is underpinned by a Deed with the Tasmanian Government which expires on 30 June 2029. The Government is developing a new funding deed, as outlined by the Minister for Racing:

²⁸ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll, pp. 48-49.

²⁹ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll, pp. 46-47.

³⁰ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Luke Gatehouse, Claire Robins, Ben Englund, Ben Clark and John Newson, pp. 31-32.

Ms HOWLETT - If you might indulge me, Chair, in relation to the development of a new funding deed, for the member for Hobart. As I stated, there's a working group developing a draft and a new funding deed and I'm expecting advice and a report from them I said in four months - six months, in terms of the latest date - I want to make it clear that I want it finalised as quickly as possible. As soon as we can and as soon as Treasury can, that's my priority to have that finalised for certainty for the industry.³¹

3.20 Before a hearing of the Committee, Tasracing CEO Andrew Jenkins, was asked about its expectations of funding from 2029 onwards:

Mr WINTER - ... What's the expectation from Tasracing's board about the amount of funding that's going to be required from 2029 onwards? Are we looking at a similar amount of money or are we looking at a reduction in total that you'll be requesting?

...

Mr JENKINS - I would expect, Mr Winter, that our submission will be for funding in the order of what is currently in place. What's often –

Ms O'CONNOR - Sorry, just to be clear, do you think the harness and thoroughbred codes should have the greyhound money?

...

Mr JENKINS - I would expect so, yes. Obviously, it's not finalised yet, Chair, but based on our early thinking, yes, it would be in the order of what is currently being received. As you would appreciate, there are a number of costs that, simply by removing one code, it doesn't mean that a third of our organisation or a third of our infrastructure and other costs are removed.³²

3.21 Tasracing provided analysis that in 2024-25, the greyhound code lost \$3.2 million, while harness code lost \$11.3 million and thoroughbred code \$21.6 million. Six million was allocated as 'general'.³³

3.22 In answers to written questions, the Minister for Racing provided the following in regard to comments on the need for Tasracing funding to stay the same for two codes compared to the three, and whether the Government supports this:

Work has commenced on a new racing industry funding deed to ensure the financial sustainability of the Tasmanian racing industry. This is particularly important to provide certainty to the industry following the Government's announcement of the phase out of greyhound racing by 30 June 2029.

A project to assess options for the next deed is being conducted jointly by the Department of Treasury and Finance and the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania. This includes modelling the impacts of the Government's announcement surrounding the greyhound code.

³¹ Transcript of Evidence, 7 November 2025, Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP and Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania, p. 23.

³² Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Tasracing, Andrew Jenkins, p 26.

³³ Additional information provided by Tasracing CEO Andrew Jenkins, dated 2 March 2026, p 11.

Accordingly, it is prudent that Tasracing's ongoing funding arrangements beyond the expiration of its main funding deed be informed by the proposed greyhound racing Closure Plan and the anticipated impacts of the phase out.

This assessment work will also assess the funding requirements of the thoroughbred and harness racing codes to ensure Tasmanian racing can thrive in the future.

We remain absolutely committed to supporting our wider Tasmanian racing industry and its participants.³⁴

3.23 The RSPCA Tasmania, in its submission, made the following comment on the commencement provisions:

*RSPCA Tasmania strongly supports commencement arrangements that avoid abrupt change and instead enable orderly, humane transition. As Jan 1st, 2026, is no longer pertinent, the RSPCA recommends a commencement date in the first half of 2026 to ensure that the breeding of greyhounds for racing can be halted as soon as possible.*³⁵

3.24 The Dogs' Homes of Tasmania also provided support for a timely commencement of provisions in the Bill to enable the path to transition to commence:

From an animal welfare perspective, the most critical factor for a successful transition is time. Rehoming greyhounds is skilled, resource-intensive work that cannot be safely compressed without increasing welfare risk. Delaying the commencement of the transition period would materially undermine the ability of animal welfare organisations, like Dogs' Homes of Tasmania to deliver humane outcomes within the proposed timeframe of June 2029.

Early legislative certainty is essential to:

- *Prevent welfare harm associated with uncertainty and unmanaged exits from the industry*
- *Enable staged, coordinated rehoming rather than a late-stage surge in dog numbers*
- *Mobilise foster carers and community support in a planned and sustainable way*
- *Stop adding to the rehoming task through continued breeding*

*Dogs' Homes of Tasmania is ready to play a central role in the transition. However, we cannot responsibly do so without early commencement, coordination and appropriate resourcing. Time lost at the beginning of the transition cannot be recovered at the end.*³⁶

3.25 FOUR PAWS Australia also strongly supported the end date of the industry in 2029:

FOUR PAWS strongly supports the inclusion of a clear, statutory end date for greyhound racing operations in Tasmania within the Bill – no later than 2029. A

³⁴ Additional information provided by the Minister for Racing, Hon Jane Howlett MP, received 25 February 2025.

³⁵ Submission No. 23, RSPCA Tasmania, p. 4.

³⁶ Submission No. 58, Dogs' Homes of Tasmania, p. 1.

legislated end date of 2029 is essential to provide certainty, protect greyhounds from ongoing harm, and safeguard the integrity of the reform.

A defined end date will:

- **Provide certainty for planning:** Industry participants, employees, local councils, welfare organisations and service providers can adequately plan for the transition, investment decisions, and workforce changes.
- **Support effective enforcement:** Regulators and agencies will have a clear temporal framework to set milestones, compliance requirements and reporting obligations.
- **Maintain public confidence:** A firm end date demonstrates the Tasmanian Parliament's commitment to implementing the phase-out in a timely and irreversible manner, consistent with the Government's policy decision and public expectations.³⁷

- 3.26 While support was received for the timeliness of both the ban on breeding and the closure date of the industry, there were some submitters who opposed the proposed timeframes. Stefan Wells wrote of a need to extend the date for the ban on the breeding of greyhounds:

In terms of the bill itself, then Clause 6, Breeding of Greyhounds, page 21, needs amending please. The ban on breeding for racing of greyhounds from the 1 January 26 (or any date during the phase out period) does not provide for the welfare of participants. Without a full complement of race dogs during the phase out period, how are participants [sic] supposed to support themselves and their families, cover rents etc if their income is dropping month on month due to lack of race dogs and the associated income?³⁸

- 3.27 Janine Rhodes also supported an extension to the period of commencement for the banning of breeding for racing greyhounds:

- *Ban on breeding racing greyhounds from 2027 onwards. This would align with the timeline that it takes to bring a dog to the track (2 years) and the cessation of funding.³⁹*

- 3.28 In its opposition to the Bill, Greyhounds Australasia raised concerns with the drafting and passage processes undertaken through Parliament so far. The organisation suggested there was a lack of a proper legislative process undertaken and the swift creation and progression of the Bill added to these process concerns:

GA's concerns is the speed with which the decision to prohibit greyhound racing and the resultant legislation has progressed, particularly given the size and complexity of the industry and the animal welfare responsibilities involved.

Under Tasmania's Legislation Review Program, any Bill that restricts competition, imposes business impacts, or alters market structure requires a Regulatory Impact

³⁷ Submission No. 141, FOUR PAWS Australia, pp. 1-2.

³⁸ Submission No. 24, Stefan Wells, p. 1.

³⁹ Submission No. 128, Janine Rhodes, p. 1.

Statement (RIS). The Bill does all three: it abolishes a competitive and sustainable industry, terminates hundreds of small businesses, and impacts the structure of the racing and wagering markets. Despite these substantial impacts, GA notes that no Regulatory Impact Statement has been developed and consequently provided, in relation to the Bill.

The absence of a RIS underscores the lack of evidence for the legislative response and denies participants, the Committee, and the Parliament the comprehensive analysis of costs, benefits, and alternatives that informed decision-making requires.⁴⁰

- 3.29 The absence of a Regulatory Impact Statement was also raised in a number of other submissions.⁴¹ In verbal evidence Luke Gatehouse, representing Greyhounds Tasmania, raised the matter of departmental oversight over the formation of Bill:

Mr GATEHOUSE - ... Tasmania's Department of Treasury has a Legislation Review Program [LRP]. Reading from that, the LRP deals with primary legislation and promotes the adoption of regulatory impact analysis as a key element of policy development for new and amending legislation. Primary legislation, when I did statutory interpretation, is acts of Parliament. I would suggest that we may need to review whether we actually have met the standards of the Legislative Review Program, but I will leave that up to the committee.⁴²

- 3.30 When raised with the Minister for Racing and Department of Natural Resources and the Environment Tasmania (NRE) representatives, it was noted that a Regulatory Impact Statement was not required by Treasury for this Bill:

Ms WILSON - We took advice from Treasury and ... Treasury's advice was ... we did not need to undertake a regulatory impact statement.

Ms O'CONNOR - Why? Do you remember what reason they gave, just for clarity for the committee?

Mr HALL - No reason was given. Typically, regulatory impact statements are required for subordinate legislation; this is the main Bill. One of the reasons is it will be debated in Parliament, unlike regulations.

Ms WILSON - And there's the capacity for the transition plan to consider the orderly transition.⁴³

- 3.31 The Committee heard the following from representatives of NRE about the drafting process of the Bill:

Ms WILSON - The Bill was drafted based on Office of Parliamentary Counsel (OPC) advice. It's based on ensuring that the Commissioner has the capacity to develop an

⁴⁰ Submission No. 140, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 11.

⁴¹ Submission No. 100, Sarah Boyd, p. 3; Submission No. 130, Greyhounds Tasmania, p. 3; Submission No. 131, Luke Gatehouse, p. 2.

⁴² Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Luke Gatehouse, Claire Robins, Ben Englund, Ben Clark and John Newson, p. 9.

⁴³ Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Minister for Racing and Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania representatives, p. 18.

*appropriate plan. It has to be approved by the Minister, and then the plan has to be publicly released. The Joint Select Committee [on Greyhound Racing Transition], as I understand it, was set up to review the transition plan and that is the element and the mechanism the Government has set up to ensure that there is some oversight by the Parliament for review of the transition plan.*⁴⁴

Findings:

The Committee finds:

1. The Commissioner's view, that the passage of the Bill is necessary to design, implement and enforce a transition plan for the phasing out of the greyhound racing in Tasmania.
2. The Commissioner's view that if the Bill does not pass, and the Government persists with its policy, it would leave participants, animals and the broader community exposed to unmanaged risks.
3. The Government's response to questions that the 1 January 2026 commencement date, could be amended to a date in the future or could be dealt with by regulation.
4. The greyhound racing industry is opposed to the Bill overall and has ongoing concerns about the Bill, including the haste of its development, lack of consultation, and commencement provisions.
5. Animal welfare organisations are concerned that delaying the commencement of the Bill will undermine their ability to deliver humane rehoming outcomes for racing dogs and potentially lead to poor animal welfare outcomes.
6. Breeding data provided in evidence has been inconsistent and difficult to verify.
7. Breeding data collection by Tasracing cannot be relied upon and further notes the Commissioner for Racing has undertaken to work with Tasracing on an audit of dogs currently in the industry.
8. The Government expects to have a report and advice in relation to the new Racing Deed by May 2026.

Part 2 - Animal Welfare Act 1993 Amended (Clauses 3 & 4)

- 3.32 Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill relate to amendments to the *Animal Welfare Act 1993*. Clause 4 inserts through the inclusion of Section 11C inserted, definitions of a commercial dog race, dog, greyhound, and greyhound race. The Clause also sets out penalties for organising, conducting or participating in a greyhound or commercial dog race, or for keeping or owning a dog for the purpose of greyhound or commercial dog racing.

⁴⁴ Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP and Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania representatives, p. 3.

3.33 The Clause also sets out penalties for selling, supplying, offering or breeding a dog to sell or supply to another person if it can be reasonably suspected that the other person will race the dog.

3.34 The Committee heard the following from representatives of NRE:

Ms WILSON: As you're aware, the framework within this Bill is to amend other pieces of legislation, so it's really important to note that we are amending the Animal Welfare Act 1993 as well as the Dog Control Act 2000. Those acts already have frameworks that deal with animal welfare, particularly the Animal Welfare Act 2000. So all those provisions will apply to the care and control of greyhounds.

There is also currently a process in play to review the Animal Welfare (Dogs) Regulations 2016 which have specific provisions currently pertaining to greyhounds, and that process is continuing. There was an issues paper released and then there will be an outcome from that.

To say that because an industry is not in play that has rules around the industry which are then removed means that there is a gap in terms of animal welfare is -

Ms O'CONNOR - Untrue. They will be treated, won't they, protected in the same way as every other dog under the Animal Welfare Act 1993?

Ms WILSON - is a misunderstanding of how the framework will work post the changes. There are more than adequate controls under the Animal Welfare Act 1993 and under the Dog Welfare Act 2000 to ensure that the pet greyhounds are appropriately managed and if there were incidents of mismanagement of those dogs, there is a capacity for criminal offences.

Mr HALL - That's right. That's why the amendments through this Bill of the Dog Control Act 2000 for the provisions that relate to greyhounds don't completely remove those provisions; they just simply relax some of the requirements around muzzling because it does recognise that greyhounds as a breed are in a special situation and have special requirements. That will continue under the Dog Control Act 2000 and we can also make specific regulations under the Animal Welfare (Dogs) Regulations 2016 that are specific to greyhounds, if that's needed.

Ms WEBB - For the post transition period?

Mr HALL - Post transition, that's right.⁴⁵

3.35 North West Greyhound Racing Club Chair, Ben Englund in his submission stated:

The Bill proposes amendments to the **Animal Welfare Act 1993** and the **Dog Control Act 2000** that will make greyhound racing and associated activities illegal following the transition period and prohibit breeding for racing purposes. While the stated intent of the Bill is to protect animal welfare, it fails to guarantee funded infrastructure, veterinary services, housing, or enforceable oversight for greyhounds exiting the racing system. Greyhounds currently operate within one of

⁴⁵ Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP and Department of Natural Resources and Environment, pp. 7-8.

the most regulated animal welfare frameworks in Tasmania, subject to lifetime traceability, veterinary oversight, compliance audits, and enforceable standards.

Removing greyhounds from this regulated environment and reclassifying them solely as domestic pet's [sic] risks creating significant welfare gaps. Without statutory funding or enforceable standards, accountability for welfare outcomes diminishes rather than improves.⁴⁶

- 3.36 Dr Hannah O'Brien, a veterinarian, suggested in her submission that the appropriate welfare for greyhounds can be best achieved through the monitoring, not the abolition, of the industry:

Greyhound racing currently operates under mandatory pre-race and post-race veterinary examinations, injury surveillance and reporting systems, track surface standards and ongoing safety modifications, enforced stand-down periods and rehabilitation protocols.

While these systems are not perfect, they provide structured, enforceable veterinary oversight. From a welfare standpoint, strengthening and properly resourcing these frameworks is likely to produce better outcomes than abolishing the industry altogether. A phase-out ban, risks removing regulated oversight without guaranteeing equivalent welfare controls once dogs exit the racing system.⁴⁷

- 3.37 Andrea Dawkins from RSPCA Tasmania gave evidence regarding the animal welfare provisions:

Ms DAWKINS - ... *As you would all be aware, Australia's lagging when it comes to animal welfare reform, specifically around greyhound racing. Hellyer Dougie, the dog who died after racing in Tasmania this year [2026], would be the first, if they were here and if somebody who loved them was here to speak about them, to be able to attest to that fact. The number of animals that have been injured on racing tracks this year [2026] already is beyond the pale. We should have acted on this much, much sooner. This delay is only hurting animals, especially because more animals are being bred while this delay is occurring. ...*

The RSPCA does not support breed-specific legislation, which is why the amendments to the Dog Control Act 2000, we believe, are entirely appropriate. All dogs should be treated the same, whether that comes to a dangerous dog assignment or a breed-specific piece of legislation, the same way greyhounds have been treated in Tasmania in the past. We believe it's entirely appropriate that this legislation, if enacted by 30 June 2029, would see an end to that, because all dogs should be treated the same.⁴⁸

- 3.38 Further Ms Dawkins noted:

Ms DAWKINS - *The reason that there are more strict regulations and rules around racing greyhounds is because it's such a high-risk activity. Of course, there needs to be extra eyes on dogs in the racing industry. Apart from the millions of dollars that flow through the government coffers, through taxpayers, to the*

⁴⁶ Submission No. 67, Ben Englund, p. 2.

⁴⁷ Submission No. 109, Dr Hannah O'Brien, p. 2.

⁴⁸ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, RSPCA Tasmania and Dogs' Homes of Tasmania, pp. 33-34.

*industry, those animals are in such high-risk activities that there needs to be stronger legislation.*⁴⁹

3.39 Greyhounds Australasia (GA) provided a synopsis of their clear opposition to the prohibitions imposed by Clause 4:

GA acknowledges that proposed section 11C gives legislative effect to the policy intent of the Bill by prohibiting greyhound racing, commercial dog racing and associated activities after 30 June 2029. GA accepts that this provision reflects the fundamental premise of the Bill.

However, GA holds concerns regarding the breadth and application of section 11C, particularly the lack of clarity around definitions, enforcement responsibilities and transitional treatment of individuals and animals connected to the industry. The provision extends beyond racing activity itself to prohibit keeping, breeding, selling or acquiring dogs intended for racing, without sufficient regard to lawful participation through interstate or overseas regulatory frameworks.

GA submits that precedent from the ACT's closure of greyhound racing is instructive and warrants review and consideration. In particular mechanisms that permitted licensing arrangements for individuals through interstate racing integrity systems, thereby avoiding abrupt disruption to animal welfare arrangements and legitimate participant activities. GA submits that similar consideration should be given in Tasmania.

*GA cautions that an absolute prohibition, without recognition of interstate regulatory mechanisms, risks unintended consequences including loss of traceability, reduced welfare oversight, and incentives for non-compliant activity outside regulated systems.*⁵⁰

3.40 Submissions from Tasmanian greyhound industry participants strongly opposed Clause 4, arguing it as a 'disproportionate response' to the industry.⁵¹

3.41 In relation to the definition of commercial racing proposed by the Bill, Jan Davis commented in her submission that it needs to be sufficiently robust:

The legislation must be sufficiently robust to ensure against re-emergence of commercial racing activity in disguised forms (eg private events, "trials", streaming to closed groups, indirect payments, etc).

*The definition and offence structure should be tested for enforceability against these scenarios, and tightened where ambiguity exists.*⁵²

3.42 The Tasmanian Dog Walking Clubs Inc. provided comment on two areas of the definition of commercial dog racing included in Clause 4 of the Bill, proposing that the definition be further amended:

⁴⁹ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, RSPCA Tasmania and Dogs Homes of Tasmania, p. 34.

⁵⁰ Submission No. 140, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 12.

⁵¹ Submission No. 67, Ben Englund, p. 3; Submission No. 68, Northwest Greyhound Racing Club Committee, p. 4.

⁵² Submission No. 27, Jan Davis, p. 2.

(1) – definition of (sic) dog racing

Could include gambling.

(3) – *The owner or person in charge of a dog must not allow the dog to participate in a greyhound race or a commercial dog race in Tasmania.*

Could be more specific and include not sending dogs to other states or territories to race.⁵³

- 3.43 Dr Katrina Ward, Dr Tering Stafford and Dr Vibeke Rusell, spokespeople for a group of 38 Tasmanian veterinarians and veterinary assistants, submitted that the definition of commercial dog racing should be expanded to more fully encompass what they deem to be potential loopholes within the Bill:

Part 2 (amendments to the Animal Welfare Act 1993). The definition of a commercial dog race always includes reference to a mechanical or electronic lure. Our concern is that this could create a loophole in the form of races being held without a lure (or with a different form of lure). The definition should also include the betting/gambling aspect and that prize money is awarded⁵⁴

- 3.44 The definitions in Clause 4 include the identification of sanctions for activities to be outlawed under the Act. Animals Australia suggested that such sanctions and the actions upon which sanctions can be placed, should be increased:

In addition to the penalty units and potential imprisonment terms specified in the Bill, the inclusion of other practical enforcement tools to deter illegal activity, and preserve the welfare of affected dogs, should be considered, especially during the transition period when dogs continue to be raced. Implications on the licencing status of the individual, such as disqualification from further racing activity, are a standard disciplinary instrument currently administered by the Tasracing Integrity Unit for breaches of the Rules of Racing.⁵⁵ Disqualification periods and other restrictions on licences are utilised as deterrents given the ongoing nature of pausing racing activity for the participant, and their associated income, rather than solely a one-off fine. Licence restrictions and disqualifications should be considered as an additional enforcement tool for breaches of the legislation.

In cases of breaches where greyhound welfare is potentially jeopardised, such as allowing a breeding female to whelp with the intention of puppies entering the racing industry, seizure of the involved dogs may be an appropriate course of action, and this would be best specifically stipulated in the legislation. Additionally, allowances should be made in the legislation to allow for cost recovery from the greyhound's "owner" of any expenses associated with their care following seizure.

⁵³ Submission No. 57, Tasmanian Dog Walking Inc, p. 2.

⁵⁴ Submission No. 83, Dr Katrina Ward, Dr Tering Stafford and Dr Vibeke Russell, p. 1.

⁵⁵ Footnotes 27 & 28 cited in Submission No. 144, Animals Australia – 27. Tasracing. 2026. Notice of Disqualifications, Warned Off and Forfeits/Defaulters List. <https://tasracing.com.au/integrity/notice-of-disqualifications-warned-off-and-forfeits-defaulters-list>. Accessed 18 January 2026. 28. Tasracing Integrity Unit. 2026. Tasmanian Greyhound Rules of Racing. <https://tasracing.com.au/hubfs/industry/greyhounds/Rules/Tasmanian%20Greyhound%20Rules%20of%20Racing%2001-01-26.pdf> Accessed 18 January 2026.

This inclusion would provide a more robust framework for dog welfare in situations where their future care is jeopardised.⁵⁶

3.45 Animals Australia went on to further discuss how sanctions for non-compliance could be strengthened:

Given the need to prioritise dog welfare and allow for a smooth transition during the wind down period, adherence and enforcement of the legislation is paramount. As such, penalties for non-compliance, especially in cases with clear intent to propagate racing beyond the phase out period, should be a clear and effective deterrent to such behaviour. Considering the extent of the potential financial benefit to unscrupulous industry participants who choose to deviate from the Bill's principles, in addition to the enforcement tools discussed above, increased financial penalties are strongly recommended.

...

Further, the maximum penalties set out in the Bill, most of which are intended to be in place from 2029, are a maximum 100 penalty units (A\$20,500) or six months imprisonment. These penalties relate to allowing greyhound racing to occur, either by conducting or participating in a race, and supplying or breeding racing greyhounds. Again, considering the considerable financial benefit that could be achieved if these activities were to take place undetected, a much higher penalty is required to act as an effective deterrent. The only penalty during the transition period to attract the maximum fine or imprisonment relates to destruction of a greyhound without prior approval. Given the gravity of the animal welfare consequences in this instance, the strongest penalty is appropriate; however, this still seems lenient given inappropriate greyhound killing is so widely acknowledged historically as a major issue in the industry. Given the adverse animal welfare implications of attempting to conduct racing when it is banned (or inappropriate euthanasia), we advise, as a minimum, penalties as reflected in the Animal Welfare Act 1993, of up to 200 penalty units and/or appropriate imprisonment, the precedent for mismanagement of animals.^{57 58}

3.46 The Committee received a considerable amount of evidence regarding Clause 4's interaction with lure coursing in Tasmania.⁵⁹ In her submission Sharyn Marshall raised concerns over the wording of Clause 4, questioning the meaning of the section requiring that two or more dogs not be allowed to pursue a lure:

Just one other point that is somewhat confusing Sect 4 11c (1) refers to a race between two of [sic] more dogs in pursuit of a lure. Does this mean that my retired greyhounds may not compete in Lure coursing?

⁵⁶ Submission No. 144, Animals Australia, p. 2.

⁵⁷ Submission No. 144, Animals Australia, pp. 2-3.

⁵⁸ Footnote 29 cited in Submission No. 144, Animals Australia - Tasmanian Government. 2025. Animal Welfare Act 1993. <https://www.legislation.tas.gov.au/view/whole/html/inforce/current/act-1993-063> Accessed 18 January 2026.

⁵⁹ Submission No. 46, Michael Peace, p. 5; Submission No. 44, Tash Croft, p.4; Submission No. 106, Janet Ramsay, p. 2; Submission No. 34, Noel Gibson, p. 1.

My older dogs who have retired – very reluctantly – do on occasions [sic] get to go and chase a lure with other dogs at lure coursing. Will they no longer be allowed to do this?

While the changes are advocating that a greyhound has the right to “run free on a beach” to the risk of other dogs and beach goers and the danger of it injuring itself or developing acidosis it will not be able to compete at Sprint dog trials or Lure coursing?

This seems a little strange and another example where this Bill has not been thought out particularly well.⁶⁰

- 3.47 The Tasmanian Canine Association Inc (trading as Dogs Tasmania) are the organisation responsible for the registration of purebred dogs and the administration of dog sports in Tasmania. They requested an exemption from Clause 4 (1) for Lure Coursing and SprintDog™ in Tasmania to allow greyhounds to participate.⁶¹
- 3.48 In a letter tabled with the Committee sent from the Minister of Racing to Griff Parry of Lure Coursing Tasmania, NRE’s advice regarding the status of lure coursing under the Bill stated:

Based on the advice from NRE Tas, I am pleased to confirm that lure coursing and sprint dog racing not involving greyhounds are not expected to be impacted by the Bill.

If the Bill is passed, from 1 July 2029, it will be an offence under the Animal Welfare Act 1993 to race greyhounds in any way (including time trials, with or without lure), or to race any other dog breeds in way that replicates current greyhound racing. It will also be an offence to keep a dog for racing, or to keep, sell, breed or acquire any dog that is intended to be used in greyhound or commercial dog racing.

...

If there are any unintended or unforeseen impacts on lure coursing and other dog related activities because of the Bill, the Animal Welfare Act 1993 enables the making of regulations which would exempt those activities from the post-2029 prohibitions on dog racing (if necessary).⁶²

- 3.49 The Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds, endorsed a further broadening of the definition of racing within Clause 4 to ensure that all races, with or without lures, are banned:

*According to the Clause Notes, the intent of these definitions is to make “...it an offence (after 30 June 2029) to race greyhounds in any way (time trials, lure or **no***

⁶⁰ Submission No. 25, Sharyn Marshall, p. 5.

⁶¹ Submission No. 129, Tasmanian Canine Association Inc (trading as Dogs Tasmania), pp. 1-2.

⁶² Tabled Paper, Letter from the Hon. Jane Howlett MP, Minister for Racing, to Griff Parry of Lure Coursing Tasmania, tabled on 10 February 2026, https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0013/101803/Tabled-Paper-received-10022026-Minister-for-Racing,-the-Hon.-Jane-Howlett-MP.pdf

lure) and to race other dog breeds in a way that replicates current greyhound racing (defined as “commercial dog racing”).” CPG strongly supports the intent of this definition.

However, the definitions of “commercial dog racing” included in the Bill specify that “commercial dog race means a race, between two or more dogs **in pursuit of a mechanical or electronic lure**, where any one or more of the following occurs...” This definition does not capture races between two or more dogs where there is no lure.

CPG notes that to achieve the intent of this definition to cover all dog races with or without lures, the definition of “commercial dog race” in both the Animal Welfare Act 1993 and the Racing Regulation and Integrity Act 2024 must be changed to specifically capture races with no lures.⁶³

3.50 In addition to discussions regarding the definitions in Clause 4, evidence was received regarding the restrictions that will be placed upon the breeding and trade of greyhounds under the Bill, enacted under 11C (4) and (5).

3.51 Greyhound owner and trainer Noel Gibson, raised concern about the restrictions on trade in the Bill:

*The Bill also restricts owners from advertising or selling their dogs and from breeding litters for sale, which directly impacts legitimate business activities. Over the past seven years, my partner and I have rehomed over 20 greyhounds privately and prepared several for entry into GAPTAS. Those activities would be severely limited under the proposed changes, threatening both our livelihood and the welfare of the animals.*⁶⁴

3.52 Concerns were also raised by Mr Gibson about the participation restrictions, including competing interstate:

*By forbidding owners from participating in canine activities or competing interstate, the Bill risks negatively affecting both the welfare of the greyhounds and the mental wellbeing of their owners. Personally, caring for and training greyhounds has been vital to my own mental health, providing structure and purpose in my daily life. The inability to engage in these activities could lead to increased stress and hardship for participants and families. For example, when greyhound racing ceased in ACT, participants were not banned from competing outside the territory, which helped mitigate the negative impact on their wellbeing.*⁶⁵

3.53 Greyhound industry participants, Ross and Cheryl Freeman, also supported the re-consideration of whether the breeding of greyhounds within Tasmania for racing interstate should be allowed under the Bill:

As drafted, this clause operates as a de facto prohibition on all racing-related breeding, including breeding intended for lawful racing activities outside the jurisdiction. This represents an unreasonable and unjustified extension of

⁶³ Submission No. 142, Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds, p. 5.

⁶⁴ Submission No. 34, Noel Gibson, p. 1.

⁶⁵ Submission No. 34, Noel Gibson, p. 2.

regulatory reach and fails to recognise the continued legality of greyhound racing in other states and territories.

Stud dogs and frozen semen are critical to the preservation of high-quality bloodlines, animal health, genetic diversity, and the ongoing viability of the racing industry nationally and internationally. Frozen semen in particular allows responsible breeders to contribute to racing programs in other jurisdictions where racing remains lawful and regulated.

Preventing such use does not advance animal welfare outcomes and instead risks:

1. Eliminating valuable and established bloodlines that continue to produce greyhounds with the capacity to race safely and successfully.
2. Causing significant financial and commercial loss to stud dog owners who have lawfully invested in breeding programs under existing regulatory frameworks.
3. Undermining national and international racing industries by restricting access to Australian-bred genetics that are widely regarded as world-class.
4. Creating regulatory inconsistency between jurisdictions, leading to confusion, enforcement difficulties, and potential legal challenge.

The clause fails to distinguish between breeding for racing within the jurisdiction and breeding for racing in other jurisdictions where such activity remains lawful. In doing so, it unjustifiably interferes with lawful interstate and international trade and imposes restrictions that are neither proportionate nor necessary to achieve the stated objectives of the provision.

These proposed changes do not merely affect breeding practices in isolation. They impact families, mental health, intergenerational involvement, and the continuation of responsible, regulated participation in an industry that still operated lawfully in other jurisdictions.⁶⁶

3.54 The NSW Greyhound Breeders, Owners and Trainers Association also submitted that the Bill had a lack of clarity regarding what, if any, interstate greyhound industry activities could be undertaken by Tasmanians after the Bill is enacted:

While the Bill restricts interstate greyhounds from racing in Tasmania, it fails to clarify whether Tasmanian greyhound owners will be permitted to:

- Transfer their greyhounds to other states
- Continue to race dogs interstate
- Participate in the broader national industry

This is a major concern.

*Participants must be given clear legal rights to continue their involvement elsewhere in Australia if they choose. Without such provisions, the Bill effectively strips them of their ability to remain in the sport at all.*⁶⁷

⁶⁶ Submission No. 116, Ross and Chery Freeman, pp. 4-5.

⁶⁷ Submission No. 115, NSW Greyhound Breeders, Owners and Trainers Association, p. 5.

3.55 The Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds (CPG) recommends further constraints be added by defining overseas transfers as illegal:

Despite the general decline of the greyhound racing industry worldwide, greyhound racing is allowed to continue in other countries and in some Australian states and territories. CPG is concerned that there will be incentive for owners of Tasmanian racing greyhounds and their offspring to sell their dogs, or their reproductive material, to those jurisdictions. Even worse would be selling them to countries that have lesser welfare laws or where greyhound racing is conducted illegally. This would permit the shifting offshore of welfare concerns and cruelty against greyhounds.

CPG therefore recommends the 11C(5) definition be changed to cover the transfer of greyhounds to overseas persons.⁶⁸

3.56 Tasracing raised concerns in its submission that under the legislation dogs breed in Tasmania may be transferred to international jurisdictions with poor welfare outcomes:

The proposed legislation also refers to the prospect of criminal proceedings being available for breeding racing greyhounds, to be sold interstate.

If the proposed greyhound phase-out legislation allows the breeding of greyhounds for “pets” or for “non greyhound racing” purposes, this will create a serious and foreseeable risk that dogs will be exported overseas, including to high-risk jurisdictions such as China.

For your information, Victoria has recently intervened to warn off a Chinese national who was actively approaching trainers to purchase greyhounds for export. That same individual was subsequently detected conducting the same activity in New South Wales.

Permitting breeding in these circumstances would create a clear and exploitable loophole, effectively enabling the export of greyhounds under the guise of companion animal placement. The consequences of this would include:

- Severe animal welfare outcomes, with no capacity for oversight once dogs leave Australia*
- Reputational damage to the industry and to government, particularly in the context of a publicly stated phase-out*
- Regulatory failure, exposing authorities to criticism that risks were known and ignored*
- Undermining the integrity and intent of the phase-out legislation itself*

This is an extremely high-risk scenario. Any legislative framework that permits the continued breeding of greyhounds without an explicit prohibition on export will facilitate outcomes that are contrary to animal welfare, public expectations, and the stated objectives of the reform.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ Submission No. 142, Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds, p. 6.

⁶⁹ Submission No. 77, Tasracing, p. 2.

3.57 In evidence at a hearing, Mr Jenkins subsequently clarified Taracing were satisfied the Bill as drafted addressed this concern above:

Ms O'CONNOR - ... I will take you to part 2, clause 5, which is the amendments to the Animal Welfare Act 1993 that makes it an offence punishable by up to six months in prison for: selling or supplying a dog to another person; offering a dog for sale or supply to another person; breeding, acquiring, or keeping a dog for sale or supply to another person, if the person knows, or ought reasonably to know, that the other person intends to cause or permit the dog to participate in a greyhound race or a commercial dog race.

Doesn't that clause very effectively ameliorate any concerns of Tasracing?

Mr JENKINS - Thank you, Ms O'Connor. Yes, you're quite right. Our representation is to ideally ensure that that amendment is continued in the legislation and isn't removed.

Ms O'CONNOR - ... So, you would agree that part 2, clause 5 of the Bill, as it was passed by the House of Assembly, to the greatest extent that the state of Tasmania can, because we don't have customs regulation powers, would make it very difficult for a person to supply a dog that has been bred as a companion animal to race interstate or overseas?

Mr JENKINS - Yes.⁷⁰

3.58 Representatives of NRE further expanded the function of the clause restricting interstate and overseas conduct:

Mr HALL - There are constraints on interstate law about exporting, whether it is to other states. That's one of the reasons why the Bill amends the Animal Welfare Act 1993 to prohibit the supply of a greyhound for the purpose of racing. The supply that's prohibited would be someone in Tasmania and from Tasmania and if it was able to be proved that the supply was for a dog to be raced interstate, overseas, in Tasmania - it doesn't matter where - that's prohibited.

The very act of supply, which may encompass someone intending to export or whatever, it doesn't matter, that's prohibited. That's how the Bill deals with that particular issue.

...

Mr HALL - If you possess, breed, train, do anything with a dog with the intent of supplying that dog, selling it, giving it, whatever, so that it can be raced somewhere, that's the offence.⁷¹

3.59 NRE Acting Chief Operating Officer, Ms Wilson and Principal Advisor, Legal Services, Biosecurity Tasmania, Mr Hall provided further information as to the manner in which this provision was included in the Bill during the drafting process and how it may be enacted:

⁷⁰ Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Tasracing, pp. 21-22.

⁷¹ Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP and Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania representatives, pp. 6-7.

Mr WINTER - How do you actually police this issue?

Mr HALL - All offences come down to a matter of evidence. The test here is they know or they reasonably ought to know. If you were prosecuting someone under this offence, you would need to provide evidence to prove beyond reasonable doubt that any reasonable person in that situation would have known this dog was going to be raced in Victoria, China, wherever. If you can do that, they are guilty of an offence under this provision.

Ms WILSON - Whilst this might be a new issue to the committee that's been raised, this is not a new issue to us. It was - whether it was raised, however it was raised, this was definitely a question that we did genuinely consider in the drafting. I have full confidence in the drafting of the Bill

Yes, it does come down to a matter of fact, but most criminal prosecutions come down to a matter of fact, as does mens rea, which is the intent of the person. It's really quite important to understand that we did consider this. I appreciate that it has been raised for the committee, because it gives us an opportunity to address it, to answer the question that's been raised and to reassure you that it was considered in the drafting, and we have full confidence in the drafting of the Bill.⁷²

Findings:

The Committee finds:

9. Penalties for offences under the Bill are not aligned with offences created under the *Animal Welfare Act 1993* and the *Dog Control Act 2000*.
10. Clause 4 of the Bill is drafted adequately to prohibit the export of greyhounds bred in Tasmania for racing interstate or overseas.
11. Lure coursing involving greyhounds would be illegal under Clause 4.

Part 3 – Dog Control Act 2000 Amended (Clauses 5 to 7)

- 3.60 These clauses of the Bill relate to the amendment of the *Dog Control Act 2000*. Clause 6 removes the requirement that a racing greyhound be muzzled during a racing event, removes the definition of greyhound racing, and adds to section (5) that an approved greyhound suitability program is one approved in accordance with section 18A or a program 'as approved by the Secretary'.
- 3.61 The amendments to the *Dog Control Act 2000* are not set to take effect until after 30 June 2029.
- 3.62 Clause 6 provides the basis for broadening rehoming and support mechanisms for the care of greyhounds throughout the transition, by allowing the Secretary to approve, in addition to existing rehoming mechanisms, any other programs to be used.

⁷² Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP and Department for Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania representatives, pp. 11-12.

3.63 Clause 7 inserts a new section into the Dog Control Act 2000 that prohibits the breeding of greyhounds for the purposes of racing. Penalties are created for breeding a greyhound for racing purposes. The breeding of greyhounds for the purpose of keeping them as pets is permitted.

3.64 Tasracing in its submission noted that:

There is currently no rule preventing breeding greyhounds as pets nationally, however there are no breeders in Australia who are doing so.⁷³

3.65 The submission from the RSPCA Tasmania noted the organisation's support for the breeding controls in the Bill:

Reducing the number of dogs entering the system as racing winds down:

- *Improves the likelihood of successful rehoming*
- *Reduces pressure on welfare and rescue organisations*
- *Aligns dog numbers with realistic community adoption capacity*

This is a key safeguard for ensuring the transition remains humane.⁷⁴

3.66 However, in her submission, Jan Davis pointed to exceptions with the proposed breeding controls as a potential risk for the continuation of racing-adjacent breeding:

Breeding “exceptions” (re-labelling risk)

Any “domestic pet” exception to the breeding ban is a classic loophole risk. If an exception is retained, it must be tightly controlled, with:

- *approval/registration requirements,*
- *mandatory recordkeeping, and*
- *the ability to audit, investigate and prosecute misuse.*

Otherwise, the exception can become a pipeline that keeps breeding going under a different label.⁷⁵

3.67 The submission of Free the Hounds (FTH), while supporting the prohibition on breeding in the Bill, noted a need for the tight regulation of breeding:

FTH strongly supports the prohibition on breeding of racing greyhounds during the transition period. However, FTH is concerned that exemptions for “domestic pet” breeding may be exploited as a workaround if not tightly regulated.

To prevent this, FTH recommends that any breeding exception be subject to:

- *A formal approval process, with clear eligibility criteria;*
- *Demonstrable separation from racing-connected individuals, facilities, or commercial interests;*
- *Limits on numbers and strict traceability requirements; and*
- *Mandatory record-keeping and auditing to ensure compliance.*

⁷³ Submission No. 77, Tasracing, p. 1.

⁷⁴ Submission No. 23, RSPCA Tasmania, pp. 4-5.

⁷⁵ Submission No. 27, Jan Davis, p. 1.

*FTH submits that any breeding during a phase-out should be exceptional, transparent, and fully auditable. A transition process should reduce overall greyhound numbers and associated welfare risks, not maintain supply under an alternative label.*⁷⁶

- 3.68 While supporting the transition of the industry, including a cessation of racing and breeding, the submission from Dr Ward, Dr Stafford and Dr Russell raised concerns of potential unregulated breeding and backyard racing continuing, and how such concerns could be addressed:

*Backyard racing and unregulated breeding are of concern. Mandatory reporting by veterinarians is an option but runs the risk of greyhound racing participants failing to seek veterinary care. We recommend veterinarians are encouraged to report any suspicious cases to the relevant authorities and be assured they have statutory protection against litigation and other reprisals.*⁷⁷

- 3.69 Greyhounds Australasia submitted a strong critique of Clause 7, alleging it could negatively impact the welfare of greyhounds through transitioning away from what they consider the current, regulated conduct of the industry:

At present, greyhound breeding in Tasmania is conducted under a comprehensive and tightly regulated framework administered by Tasracing as the Controlling Body and governed by the GA Rules of Racing. Individuals seeking to breed greyhounds must be licensed, breeding stock must undergo DNA profiling and veterinary assessment, and each mating or insemination requires approval. The GA Rules impose clear limitations on breeding frequency, litter numbers and breeding age, alongside mandatory annual veterinary examinations for all breeding greyhounds. All breeding activity is documented and integrated with the Australian and New Zealand Greyhound Stud Book, ensuring full traceability, transparency and accountability across the breeding lifecycle.

GA submits that section 18B displaces this established regulatory framework and forces breeding activity into an unregulated environment without any equivalent welfare protections. While the Bill prohibits regulated breeding for racing purposes, it permits unregulated “pet-only” breeding and establishes no replacement licensing, monitoring or welfare framework during the period between the commencement of the prohibition and the implementation of any future Animal Welfare Act reforms. This creates a clear regulatory void, with no mechanism to monitor breeding activity, enforce veterinary standards, limit breeding practices or ensure traceability.

GA is concerned that the loss of industry oversight removes mandatory sterilisation protections for greyhounds exiting the racing system. Under GAR [Greyhounds Australasia Rules] 24 and Tasmanian Local Rule 24, greyhounds retired as pets must be surgically sterilised prior to leaving the care of licensed participants, subject only to limited veterinary exemptions. These requirements prevent retired racing greyhounds from contributing to uncontrolled breeding populations and ensure that breeding remains confined to licensed, regulated sources. Once greyhounds fall

⁷⁶ Submission No. 36, Free the Hounds, p. 3.

⁷⁷ Submission No. 83, Dr Katrina Ward, Dr Tering Stafford and Dr Vibeke Russell, p. 2.

outside industry licensing and GA Rules, there is no mechanism to enforce sterilisation or prevent breeding from retired racing stock.

The practical effect of section 18B is to drive breeding activity away from transparent, regulated systems at precisely the point when transition pressures exist. Without licensing or registration requirements, there is no visibility over how many greyhounds are bred, under what conditions, or with what welfare outcomes. GA submits that this outcome directly undermines the Bill's stated animal welfare objectives.⁷⁸

- 3.70 While acknowledging that future reforms to the Animal Welfare Act 1993 have been flagged, Greyhounds Australasia still contends that without these future changes, welfare of greyhounds may be at risk:

GA notes the Government's position that broader canine breeding regulation will be addressed through future Animal Welfare Act reforms. However, these reforms are yet to be substantively progressed, and doubts remain over the Government's capacity for their timely delivery. GA submits that reliance on a position paper and unspecified future reforms provides no assurance of continuity of welfare protections. The timing, scope and content of those reforms remain uncertain, and they do not address the immediate and unique transition risks associated with the greyhound industry. Critically, they do not resolve the regulatory gap created by the immediate removal of industry oversight.⁷⁹

- 3.71 Greyhound owner Mary Bent also expressed concern regarding restrictions on breeding, including impacts on the welfare of greyhounds due to the proposed restrictions:

The Bill's assumptions about future pet-only breeding are unrealistic. Breeding greyhounds requires expertise, resources, and commitment. There are currently no greyhound breeders in Tasmania outside the racing industry, and it is unlikely any will continue once racing ends.

As drafted, the Bill prevents current breeders from continuing to breed in Tasmania for interstate racing. The suggestion that they can simply "undertake their business interstate" is dismissive.

Key questions remain unanswered:

- Will retired greyhounds continue to be desexed before rehoming?
- Will there be any licensing or oversight of greyhound breeders?
- Will Tasmanian-bred pet greyhounds be allowed to be exported interstate, and under what conditions?
- Will greyhounds be allowed to be imported into Tasmania as pets?

Greyhounds are not like other dogs. As pets, they require special care and safety arrangements. Greyhounds were hunting dogs long before they were racers and I fear for their safety if care is not taken as to their welfare once racing ceases.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ Submission No. 140, Greyhounds Australasia, pp. 13-14.

⁷⁹ Submission No. 140, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 14.

⁸⁰ Submission No. 71, Mary Bent, p. 3.

- 3.72 Carol Martin, an industry participant, provided a critique of Clause 7, suggesting that the proposed changes do not correlate with the practical undertaking of breeding greyhounds:

Based on the proposed bill, this would be an immediate cessation and be prohibited.

No consideration has been given for the many participants who have invested an enormous amount of personal time, years, and finances in the preparation for a breeding bitch (female greyhound). Breeding is not a decision taken lightly given the enormous amount of time and continual ongoing costs involved.

As the current legislation and rules of greyhound racing stand, only registered breeders are permitted to breed, and they can only breed from registered DNA tested, approved brood bitches who have been issued 'pink cards'.

No female greyhound can have any more than 2 litters in an 18-month period and strict regulation is around the total litters. No female greyhound can breed over the age of 8 years old unless fully certified by a registered veterinary clinic, followed by approval from Tasracing[.] The value of a broodbitch alone, depending on her own breeding and progeny, will range from \$10,000 to \$50,000. This does not consider that her progeny can be valued at a minimum \$10,000-\$35,000 per pup and in the hundreds of thousands for the litter's future stake funds, let alone her progenies progeny.

Nowhere in the proposed ban does it consider any compensation for the owners and breeders for this immediate devaluation of their greyhounds or loss of financial costs.

Compensation around breeding and breeders should be immediate if the proposed bill enforces breeding to be immediately prohibited.⁸¹

- 3.73 The Launceston Greyhound Racing Club expressed its concerns around Clause 7:

A major concern within the proposed bill on this new section 18B, is that post 1st July 2029, breeding greyhounds as pets is allowed.

There is nothing proposed in the bill to safeguard the public and dogs from potential dangerous, un-regulated cross-breeding.

It is glaringly obvious that the following has been an oversight.

What legislation will there be to ensure no cross-breeding with the 'pet' greyhound will occur?

The greyhound is one of the purest breeds in the world, credited to current legislated controls and responsible due diligence. Will the steering committee be able to give assurances that as the greyhound is widely known to have distinct physiological, haematological and metabolic differences compared to other dog breeds, that allowing, without clear legislation the breeding of greyhounds as pets, as per all other dog breeds, will not constitute medical, physical or psychological issues in types of cross breeding?

⁸¹ Submission No. 104, Carol Martin, p. 2.

Key problems may include a higher incidence of certain behavioural issues, reduce sociability or a risk of inheriting genetic diseases.

Many greyhounds within Tasmania are also closely related which is why responsible breeding practises are currently in place and breeders predominately use a mainland stud dog to ensure no inter-breeding occurs which results in developmental issues and serious health problems.

The greyhound's main medical differences are their blood chemistry and haematology, thyroid levels, sensitivity to anaesthesia and drug sensitivity. What assurances can be given that when these cross-bred new breed are presented for medical care, that it will be evident their genetics have changed, therefore leading to potentially higher surgical issues?

This un-regulated cross breeding will potentially limit, if not eradicate the 'blood donation' currently afforded for canine blood transfusions by the current pure greyhounds due to their high haemoglobin. Cross breeding will certainly alter the medical makeup of the current, pure greyhound.

The current proposed bill also does not address the potential biosecurity risks when these new pet greyhounds and/or crossbreed greyhounds travel inter-state.

What measures and legislation are in place to ensure that the 'pet' greyhounds are not intentionally or un-intentionally mated with the highly regulated and registered mainland greyhounds?⁸²

- 3.74 Dr Claire Sheppard, a Tasmanian veterinarian, provided an alternative to the limitation of breeding currently proposed in clause 7 of the Bill:

Addressing the Breeding Prohibition (Clause 18B) Breeding of greyhounds should be limited and monitored, not prohibited. Ethical, selective breeding is essential for long-term health; it improves physical soundness, reduces injury risk, and stabilises the calm temperament that makes the breed ideal for blood donation and rehoming. Clause 18B, by imposing a near-total prohibition, freezes this genetic progress and threatens the breed with local extinction in Tasmania. A high certificate level should be obtained by breeders and trainers to ensure appropriate and best-practice techniques are implemented. Breeding, rearing and training practices must be conducive to eventual rehoming to reduce euthanasia rates.⁸³

- 3.75 Dr Hannah O'Brien, also a veterinarian, raised genetic health concerns for the welfare of the greyhound breed if the transition is to occur:

Veterinary organisations have previously raised concerns that broad legislative changes affecting breeding and reproductive material can reduce genetic diversity, increase the risk of inherited disease or encourage unregulated or underground breeding practices. Greyhounds already represent a relatively narrow genetic population. Veterinarians recognise that responsible, regulated breeding is critical to maintaining long-term breed health, irrespective of the future of racing.

⁸² Submission No. 120, Launceston Greyhound Club, pp. 2-3.

⁸³ Submission No. 86, Dr Claire Sheppard, p. 2. See also Submission No. 67, Ben Englund, p.3; Submission No. 68, Northwest Greyhound Racing Club Committee, p. 4.

Legislation that indirectly restricts genetic management must consider these consequences.⁸⁴

- 3.76 A number of submissions⁸⁵ raised what they considered would be a ‘welfare vacuum,’ or ‘welfare void’ created by the removal of highly regulated oversight of greyhounds in the racing industry to oversight under the *Animal Welfare Act 1993* and *Dog Control Act 2000*. The Greyhounds Tasmania submission commented:

Under the current system, every race meeting is supervised by an on-track veterinarian. Every injury is recorded and reported. Every greyhound is tracked from birth to retirement. Every euthanasia requires veterinary justification. Every trainer is subject to drug testing, compliance checks, and integrity oversight. The system is transparent, accountable, and continuously improving.

The Bill dismantles this framework entirely. It removes mandatory veterinary checks, whole-of-life tracking, injury reporting, and steward oversight. It shifts greyhounds into the general Dog Control Act, which has none of the specialised protections that currently safeguard the breed. There is no requirement for veterinary presence, no injury reporting, no traceability, and no integrity oversight. This is not a welfare improvement — it is a welfare downgrade.⁸⁶

- 3.77 The submission of Dr Claire Sheppard made the following point in relation to a ‘welfare void’ as a result of ending greyhound racing:

The "Welfare Void" and Oversight *Good animal welfare is encapsulated by the 'Five Freedoms': nutrition, environment, health, behaviour, and mental state. At present, the veterinary profession is not being utilised to its maximum potential in the development and governance of the industry.*

This Bill compounds the issue by replacing on-track veterinary supervision and mandatory 'whole-of-life' tracking with administrative bureaucracy. We should be strengthening the whole-of-life welfare approach already enshrined in current regulations—from breeding and rearing through to training, racing, and eventual retirement and rehoming—rather than eradicating the breed and the professional oversight that protects it.⁸⁷

- 3.78 The Committee questioned the potential impact on the welfare of greyhounds during the transition period with the Minister for Racing and NRE representatives:

Ms WEBB - *I'm interested in concerns put to us in submissions that shifting things across to the Dog Control Act 2000 after the transition and that restriction to breeding just for domestic pets only doesn't contain sufficient protections in relation to such a specialised breed. In fact, welfare arrangements, which are quite*

⁸⁴ Submission No. 109, Dr Hannah O'Brien, p.3.

⁸⁵ Submission No. 68, Northwest Greyhound Racing Club Committee, p. 4; Submission No. 98, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club Committee, p. 2; Submission No. 100, Sarah Boyd, p. 2; Submission No. 130 Greyhounds Tasmania, p. 2; Submission No. 131, Luke Gatehouse, p. 2.

⁸⁶ Submission No. 130, Greyhounds Tasmania, p. 2.

⁸⁷ Submission No. 87, Dr Claire Sheppard, p. 2.

comprehensive within an industry context and under the current legislative framework, fall away and that may leave greyhounds, after that when they're only covered by the Dog Control Act 2000, to have fewer welfare protections than they currently have. For example, dangerous crossbreeding and things like that might happen. Can you speak to those concerns and how we're dealing with that within this legislation, or if it's not being dealt with in this legislation, how it will be dealt with?

Ms WILSON - Thank you for the question. As you're aware, the framework within this Bill is to amend other pieces of legislation, so it's really important to note that we are amending the Animal Welfare Act 1993 as well as the Dog Control Act 2000. Those acts already have frameworks that deal with animal welfare, particularly the Animal Welfare Act 2000. So all those provisions will apply to the care and control of greyhounds.

There is also currently a process in play to review the Animal Welfare (Dogs) Regulations 2016 which have specific provisions currently pertaining to greyhounds, and that process is continuing. There was an issues paper released and then there will be an outcome from that.

To say that because an industry is not in play that has rules around the industry which are then removed means that there is a gap in terms of animal welfare is -

Ms O'CONNOR - Untrue. They will be treated, won't they, protected in the same way as every other dog under the Animal Welfare Act 1993?

Ms WILSON - is a misunderstanding of how the framework will work post the changes. There are more than adequate controls under the Animal Welfare Act 1993 and under the Dog Welfare [sic Control] Act 2000 to ensure that the pet greyhounds are appropriately managed and if there were incidents of mismanagement of those dogs, there is a capacity for criminal offences.

Mr HALL - That's right. That's why the amendments through this Bill of the Dog Control Act 2000 for the provisions that relate to greyhounds don't completely remove those provisions; they just simply relax some of the requirements around muzzling because it does recognise that greyhounds as a breed are in a special situation and have special requirements. That will continue under the Dog Control Act 2000 and we can also make specific regulations under the Animal Welfare (Dogs) Regulations 2016 that are specific to greyhounds, if that's needed.

Ms WEBB - For the post transition period?

Mr HALL - Post transition, that's right.⁸⁸

3.79 Andrea Dawkins, CEO of the RSPCA Tasmania, also endorsed the unification of the regulation of greyhounds under the same legislation as all other breeds of dogs as a result of the transition:

CHAIR - ... where you talked about breed-specific legislation and your concern about that in particular, we heard from industry participants in their evidence to us today

⁸⁸ Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP and Department for Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania representatives, pp. 7-8.

and also in their submissions, that they're concerned that this Bill would create a welfare vacuum, as they call it. In terms of - they say there are protections in place for greyhounds because they race, so things like stewards, track monitoring, life monitoring and veterinary checks on track and things like that. They're concerned that if we if took that away, because the industry wouldn't exist anymore, that there'd be a vacuum.

You operate specifically in the welfare space. Do you see that there would be a vacuum created in terms of animal welfare for greyhounds in particular? Is that a concern that they would then be treated, as you say, like any other dog?

Ms DAWKINS - Absolutely not. The reason that there are more strict regulations and rules around racing greyhounds is because it's such a high-risk activity. Of course, there needs to be extra eyes on dogs in the racing industry. Apart from the millions of dollars that flow through the government coffers, through taxpayers, to the industry, those animals are in such high-risk activities that there needs to be stronger legislation.

Once animals come into the community - the RSPCA is funded appropriately at the moment, for the first time, I'd say, in our 150-year history - we've got eight inspectors on the road at any given day. We are constantly pushing to improve animal welfare legislation. We've got four amendments before the Minister going through the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (AWAC) at the moment. It's our job - it's my job - to ensure that I advocate for the best possible animal welfare laws, and then our inspectors' rules - our inspectors are there, to make sure that those rules are enacted.

There's also another part of that which, of course, is that community advocacy piece, where we've now got inspectors going into classrooms to talk to students, because we know the best way to get change is to tell young people with open minds who then go back and tell their parents, 'We're not quite doing this right.'

The RSPCA, along with the other organisations that we work with, we really care about education, and we want to make sure that legislation is appropriate, is moving forward and is enacted.

...

You may be aware right now that greyhounds are exempt from dog regs [regulations]. That means that RSPCA inspectors can't run random checks, which we do for every other breeder. We don't have that capacity - we have no power of entry. We're not authorised to do that. Once that changes, we can start to visit more greyhound trainers and make sure they are acting appropriately through the laws. There's nothing that occurs now that won't occur when the breed-specific legislation is removed.⁸⁹

⁸⁹ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, RSPCA Tasmania and the Dogs' Homes of Tasmania, pp. 34-35.

- 3.80 Concern was also raised by a number of submitters⁹⁰ regarding the status of current breeding matters if the Bill is passed. This included dogs who are currently or due to be serviced or whelped before the Bill is passed and existing frozen genetic material. In her submission, Ms Martin suggested the Bill had a lack of information regarding the future status of existing reproductive genetic material from greyhounds:

Stud Dogs

There is no mention of where the already milked straws are, how these can be accessed, if already on ice on the mainland what process to allow continual sale of said straws. If the stud dog can travel between states to trade.⁹¹

- 3.81 The Hobart Greyhound Racing Club submission also mentioned the topic of genetic material:

The Bill is silent on the ownership, storage, destruction, or interstate transfer of semen straws and other genetic material. This omission creates legal uncertainty and exposes participants to inadvertent criminal liability.⁹²

- 3.82 Greyhound owner and trainer Brian Geard more broadly discussed a lack of explanation within the Bill regarding greyhounds who are currently bred:

Breeding and the Proposed Cessation of Breeding

The proposed cessation of breeding raises significant concerns. There is limited detail regarding how existing breeding animals will be managed, what allowances (if any) will be made for breeding greyhounds as companion animals, and how genetic welfare considerations will be addressed. Without clear policy direction, there is uncertainty for participants who have invested responsibly and ethically in breeding programs.⁹³

- 3.83 The Cranbourne Greyhound Racing Club provided a theoretical case study of how industry concerns in this area may eventuate:

A participant has entered into lawful breeding arrangements prior to the Bill's commencement, with contractual commitments and associated animal welfare obligations already in place.

Where transitional provisions do not clearly address existing arrangements, uncertainty may arise regarding compliance expectations, contractual obligations, and welfare responsibilities.

This may increase the risk of inconsistent interpretation or operational uncertainty during the transition period.⁹⁴

⁹⁰ Submission No. 138, Cranbourne Greyhound Racing Club, p. 3 & 7; Submission No. 99, Claire Robins, p. 5.

⁹¹ Submission No. 104, Carol Martin, p. 5.

⁹² Submission No. 98, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, p. 3.

⁹³ Submission No. 111, Brian Geard, p. 1.

⁹⁴ Submission No. 138, Cranbourne Greyhound Racing Club, p. 7.

- 3.84 The issue of specific regulations to deal with frozen genetic material was raised with the Minister for Racing via written questions and her written response provided that:

The current and proposed restrictions around breeding are concerned with animal welfare of juvenile and mature dogs after they have been born. A need for specific provisions relating to frozen genetic material or embryos has not been identified, however there is the capacity to make regulations relating to this if needed (see clause 10 of Schedule 8). Regulations could also be made under the Dog Control Act 2000 or Animal Welfare Act 1993.⁹⁵

- 3.85 The Tasmanian Canine Association Inc (trading as Dogs Tasmania) submitted that the Committee consider an amendment to Clause 7, suggesting that the provision of breeding greyhounds as pets be extended to include breeding for the purposes of ‘participating in canine exhibitions.’⁹⁶

- 3.86 The Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds submitted what they determined to be a key deficiency in amendments proposed to the Dog Control Act 2000 in the Bill. The organisation proposed that muzzling requirements for greyhounds be withdrawn from the Dog Control Act 2000, for implementation in line with the closure of the industry:

The Bill proposes to amend clause 18 of the Dog Control Act 2000, which relates to muzzling of greyhounds. The amendments retain the requirement to muzzle greyhounds.

CPG is of the strong view that clause 18 should be repealed on 1 July 2029, to coincide with the end of greyhound racing in 2029. There is no evidence for maintaining a legal requirement to muzzle greyhounds beyond this date as greyhounds are not a naturally aggressive breed. In fact, greyhounds are known for their gentle nature.

For example, in Victoria the requirement to muzzle pet greyhounds was removed in 2019.

RSPCA advocates against the mandatory requirement to muzzle greyhounds. RSPCA Australia has not identified any evidence of increased safety risks or incidents/issues arising from the absence of mandatory muzzling of pet greyhounds in public places in other countries or in those jurisdictions in Australia where greyhounds do not have to be muzzled.⁹⁷

CPG is of the strong view that in the absence of any evidence for maintaining muzzling requirements for greyhounds, these archaic requirements should be repealed on 1 July 2029.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ Additional information provided by the Minister for Racing, Hon Jane Howlett MP, received 25 February 2026, p.11.

⁹⁶ Submission No. 129, Tasmanian Canine Association Inc (trading as Dogs Tasmania), p. 3.

⁹⁷ Footnote 5 cited in submission No. 142, Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds – <http://kb.rspca.org.au/categories/companion-animals/dogs/adopting-a-greyhound/should-pet-greyhounds-have-to-wear-muzzles>

⁹⁸ Submission No. 142, Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds, p. 7.

Findings:

The Committee finds:

12. No legislative welfare void for greyhounds will be created by the passage of this Bill and they will be protected like any other dog under existing animal laws and regulations.
13. Current breed specific welfare laws and regulations for greyhounds only exist because they participate, or have participated, in the high-risk activity of racing. The passage of the Bill would prohibit this activity and therefore the need for breed specific welfare laws.
14. Industry certainty is required over the legal status and potential use of genetic material and arrangements for breeding dogs, during and following the industry transition. The Greyhound Racing Transition working group, the closure plan and regulations must address these issues.
15. The continued muzzling of greyhounds as domestic pets beyond 1 July 2029 cannot be justified if greyhound racing has ended.

Part 4 – Racing Regulation and Integrity Act 2024 Amended (Clauses 8 to 10)

- 3.87 These clauses relate to the amendment of the *Racing Regulation and Integrity Act 2024*.
- 3.88 Clause 9 gives effect to a new Schedule in the Act that is inserted by Clause 10. Clause 10 outlines the new Schedule 8, with definitions provided for the following terms: commencement day; former legislative scheme; greyhound; greyhound race; greyhound racing closure date; new legislative scheme; owner; registered greyhound; transfer; transition period, and veterinary surgeon.
- 3.89 The Commissioner outlined his role under the Bill:

Mr CARROLL - ... On 10 August 2025, the Premier announced the Tasmanian government will phase-out greyhound racing by 30 June [2029], aligning with the expiry [of] that the Tasracing Proprietary Limited funding deed. Following this announcement, the Premier and the Minister for Racing have written to me requesting that I prepare a comprehensive plan to deliver all operational animal welfare and integrity components of the transition.

In order to ensure the smooth transition and to assist in the process, I've established a working group of suitably qualified industry representatives and animal welfare experts that will be engaged by myself to develop this transition plan.

The proposed bill and the Racing Regulation and Integrity Act provide a legislative pathway for me to develop and oversee the delivery of this transition plan. I will present this transition plan to the minister and this committee and provide reports

quarterly, or as required. I must state that I acknowledge and appreciate that this transition will have a significant impact on the greyhound industry, their families and their communities.

The timeframe of the transition provides an opportunity to deliver a comprehensive and measured transition plan that focuses on the welfare of the participants and greyhounds, including support mechanisms for the participants and the industry, and that's my priority.

There will be appropriate safeguards and integrity measures that will be paramount to achieving these objectives while at the same time supporting the reputation of the Tasmanian racing industry and any flow-on effect to the Tasmanian community.⁹⁹

3.90 In its submission RSPCA Tasmania noted its support for the transitional provisions of the Bill:

Transitional provisions are critical to avoiding welfare gaps.

RSPCA Tasmania particularly supports:

- *Provisions that allow time for collaboration between government, industry and welfare organisations*
- *Flexibility to respond to emerging welfare needs during the transition*
- *Legal certainty that supports long-term planning rather than reactive responses.*¹⁰⁰

3.91 Submission No. 89 comparatively provided an overview of concerns regarding Schedule 8:

Schedule 8 imposes restrictions on transfers, retirement, euthanasia, interstate movement, and breeding.

These provisions assume the existence of:

- *adequate rehoming capacity*
- *veterinary infrastructure*
- *enforcement resources*
- *administrative clarity*

No evidence is provided to substantiate these assumptions.

The Schedule risks producing:

- *welfare bottlenecks*
- *regulatory paralysis*
- *increased pressure on animals and participants*

*It introduces risk where a functioning regulatory framework already exists.*¹⁰¹

Interpretation

3.92 New Schedule 8 provides the interpretations for the Schedule. This includes definitions for greyhound, greyhound race, transition period and importantly greyhound racing closure date.

⁹⁹ Transcript of Evidence, 7 November 2025, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll, p. 25.

¹⁰⁰ Submission No. 23, RSPCA Tasmania, p. 5.

¹⁰¹ Submission No. 89, Private Witness, p. 3.

- 3.93 The NSW Greyhound Breeders, Owners and Trainers Association provided a critique of the inclusion of 1 July 2029 as the closure date for the industry, suggesting this provides a restrictive timeframe which may negatively impact the welfare of greyhounds and participants:

The Bill proposes that greyhound racing in Tasmania cease entirely by 30 June 2029. This is an unrealistic and irresponsible timeframe.

Rehoming Concerns

- Rehoming programs for greyhounds take time, resources and careful planning.
- Thousands of dogs will need to be transitioned out of racing in an orderly manner.
- The proposed timeline does not account for the reality that responsible rehoming can take many years, particularly for older dogs or dogs with special needs.

Rushing this process risks overwhelming rehoming organisations and places unnecessary pressure on both participants and animal welfare groups.¹⁰²

- 3.94 Mark Wild Dogs' Homes of Tasmania CEO, believes the transition process will be manageable for rehoming organisations and stated that:

Mr WILD - ... From our perspective, for this transition to truly succeed, we believe there are a few principles that we need to follow. One is that the rehoming system must be properly resourced, which we've mentioned. Second is that planning needs to be simple, humane and centred on the needs of the dogs. We were chatting before this and they need to be coordinated processes, I believe. Third, we need to honour the promise that every greyhound gets a fair chance at life. We believe if we keep these principles at the heart of the transition then Tasmania can become a national leader in humane greyhound rehoming.¹⁰³

Exercise of powers during transition period

- 3.95 New Schedule 8 gives the Commissioner powers to enter and inspect premises for the purposes of conducting an audit or investigation during the transition period.
- 3.96 Advocates for greyhound welfare Peter Gugger, Christie Hayes and Greg Irons supported the provision of any legislative or regulatory power necessary for the Commissioner to safeguard greyhound welfare during the transition period:

A central safeguard during the transition will be the Racing Integrity Commissioner (RIC).

We strongly urge the Committee to ensure that the legislation fully equips the Commissioner with all powers, functions and resources necessary to oversee the phase-out effectively and humanely. In particular, the Commissioner must be able to:

¹⁰² Submission No. 115, NSW Greyhound Breeders, Owners and Trainers Association, p. 2

¹⁰³ Transcript of Evidence, 28 November 2025, RSPCA Tasmania and Dogs' Homes of Tasmania, p. 24.

- Maintain rigorous monitoring of injuries, deaths, breeding and rehoming outcomes
- Enforce compliance swiftly and decisively where welfare breaches occur
- Intervene proactively if standards deteriorate as industry participation declines
- Access sufficient information, data and inspection powers to detect emerging risks

We note publicly reported concerns and requests from the Racing Integrity Commissioner regarding the adequacy of existing powers during a transition of this nature. We stress that this inquiry presents an opportunity to ensure those concerns are adequately covered in the legislation rather than after problems arise.

In this regard, we note the potential for the legislation to allow for some of the operational detail to be set by regulation or by commissioner-made instruments during the phase out.¹⁰⁴

3.97 Free the Hounds suggests this clause of Schedule 8 needs to go further:

While the Bill provides inspection and audit powers, it does not mandate regular public reporting on welfare outcomes during the transition. FTH submits that discretionary powers alone are insufficient to ensure accountability in a period of industry exit.

FTH recommends that the Bill require mandatory public reporting, at least quarterly or biannually, with independent welfare oversight, on key indicators including:

- Injuries;
- Euthanasia or destruction;
- Rehoming outcomes; and
- Transfers, particularly interstate transfers.

Regular public reporting would:

- Protect greyhound welfare;
- Support the integrity of the phase-out process; and
- Maintain public confidence in the transition.

FTH notes that independent, ongoing oversight is particularly critical when an industry is winding down, as incentives for long-term welfare investment diminish over time.¹⁰⁵

3.98 Stephen Lockley, a longstanding industry participant, shared his concern that section 2 of new Schedule 8 is too broad and could create inequitable interpretations and undertakings:

- Section 2 (3) of the proposed Schedule 8 outlines that the Commissioner may search and inspect the premise at any reasonable time. “Reasonable time” is not defined. This creates:
 - Inconsistent enforcement
 - Potential for unreasonable demands
 - Disputes between owners and inspectors

¹⁰⁴ Submission No. 114, Peter Gugger, Christie Hayes and Greg Irons, p. 4.

¹⁰⁵ Submission No. 36, Free the Hounds, p. 4.

*Legislation should not rely on subjective interpretation by a single official.*¹⁰⁶

- 3.99 Carol Martin also raised concerns that clause 2 of proposed Schedule 8 could instate inequitable controls upon greyhound industry participants throughout the transition:

*This clause seems extremely unreasonable and intrusive. The current regulation already allows for powers of entry, search, inspection and taking of possession. Increased laws that allow authorise warrantless entry ‘without due cause’ onto private property absolutely seems unreasonable, potentially unlawful and questions the morality of the clause.*¹⁰⁷

- 3.100 Hannah Pearce, an industry participant, raised her concerns that the additional powers for the search and inspection of specified premises provided for the Commissioner to appoint under this subclause may be unconstitutional:

The Bill authorizes the Commissioner, during the transition period, to issue notices compelling individuals to allow entry, search, inspection, seizure of documents and audiovisual recording across any land, premises or vehicle where greyhounds are kept, trained, transported or trialed [sic].

These powers are extraordinary in scope. They are not subject to a warrant, do not require reasonable suspicion, and apply to private homes, rural properties and vehicles. Failure to comply constitutes an offence, regardless of whether the person has done anything wrong.

From a rule-of-law perspective, such powers are disproportionate. Established regulatory and constitutional principles require that coercive entry and search powers be justified by necessity and accompanied by independent oversight. This Bill provides neither.

*The effect is to treat lawful participants as presumptive offenders during a period in which their activities remain legal. This undermines public confidence in regulation and creates an adversarial enforcement environment that discourages cooperation and transparency.*¹⁰⁸

- 3.101 Part 2, Division 4 of the Tasmanian Greyhound Rules of Racing provides for the following:

Division 4 - Powers of entry, search, inspection and taking of possession
16 Powers of entry, search, inspection and taking of possession

(1) For the purposes of this rule, ‘premises’ includes land, buildings or any fixed or moveable structure, including any vehicle, regardless of the location of those objects, provided that they are under the control of a person bound by the Rules.

(2) Without limiting the powers pursuant to rule 13, a Controlling Body, or an officer of the Controlling Body or person authorised by a Controlling Body may at any time

¹⁰⁶ Submission No. 72, Stephen Lockley, p. 2.

¹⁰⁷ Submission No. 104, Carol Martin, p. 3.

¹⁰⁸ Submission No. 107, Hannah Pearce, pp. 1-2.

enter upon land or premises owned, occupied or under the control of a person bound by the Rules:

- (a) to inspect and search the premises and any article or thing situated on them;
- (b) to take possession of any article or thing found as a result of a search under this rule and remove from the premises any article or thing and retain it for a period of time they think fit;
- (c) to inspect, examine and test any greyhound believed to be registered with a Controlling Body;
- (d) to inspect, examine and test any greyhound under the care of a registered person; (e) to take a sample from any greyhound registered with a Controlling Body or under the care of a registered person; (f) to inspect any track, racing equipment, kennelling or security arrangements;
- (g) to inspect any medication, preparations, chemicals, instruments, applicators, syringes and any other item or substance which may be capable of use in or on a greyhound;
- (h) to inspect any document and/or record reasonably believed to relate to greyhound racing;
- (i) to take extracts from, or make copies of, download or print out, any documents in relation to greyhound racing discovered in the course of an inspection;
- (j) for any purpose which may reasonably assist in determining whether an offence is being or has been committed, or whether any condition of a registration, or permission granted by a Controlling Body, has been or is being breached.¹⁰⁹

3.102 The Animal Welfare Act 1993 also provides:

16. Power to enter, search and inspect premises

(1) An officer may, without warrant, enter, search and inspect any premises, other than premises or a part of premises being used as a dwelling, if the officer reasonably believes that there is on the premises an animal in respect of which an offence under this Act has been, or is being, committed.

(1A) Despite [subsection \(1\)](#), an officer may, without warrant, enter, search and inspect any premises, including premises or a part of premises being used as a dwelling, if the officer reasonably believes that –

- (a) an emergency exists that –
 - (i) causes, or threatens to cause, injury, illness or distress to an animal on the premises; or
 - (ii) places, or is likely to place, the premises at risk; and

¹⁰⁹ Tasracing Integrity Unit, *Tasmanian Greyhound Rules of Racing, Effective 1 January 2026*, pp. 21-22: - [Tasmanian Greyhound Rules of Racing 01-01-26.pdf](#)

(b) there is on the premises, or in the dwelling, an animal that is in need of assistance.¹¹⁰

Greyhound racing closure plan

3.103 Under its clause 3, Schedule 8 also requires a greyhound racing closure plan be developed and implemented by the Commissioner. This plan is to be approved by the Minister for Racing.

3.104 In a hearing of the Committee on 7 November 2025, the Commissioner outlined his approach at that stage to a transition plan:

Mr CARROLL - ... There are 10 objectives that I seek to establish for the transition plan.

1. The safeguarding of greyhound welfare, including the life-of-animal guarantee and continuing to enhance the animal welfare standards, through the review, update, and implementation of any new rules of racing policy and other safeguards, including any legislation introduced by the Tasmanian government.
2. Support the greyhound racing participants through the transition period and beyond through EAP [Employee Assistance Program] and other wellbeing support programs. That will be a priority.
3. Ensuring the rehoming of greyhounds during the distribution and beyond, including ensuring the Greyhounds as Pets program and other services are fit for purpose and able to support the transition.
4. Establish an active plan for racing to be reduced and phased out over the period from 1 August 2026 through to 30 June 2029, in line with the expiry of the Tasracing funding deed and any legislation introduced by the Tasmanian parliament.
5. Conduct a feasibility study on the economic impact of the reduction of greyhound meetings during and post, the transition on the Tasmanian racing industry, with the results considered as part of the transition plan.
6. Ensure greyhound facilities, including tracks and training facilities, are repurposed with broader community benefits
7. Determining the economic impact of the greyhound industry, in particular, individual greyhound trainers and businesses, and determine any requirements for workforce transition.
8. Establish a legacy plan for greyhound racing industry in Tasmania.
9. Maintain public trust and integrity in decision-making and implementation of the plan; and
10. Stronger and effective communication with stakeholders, in particular members of the greyhound industry, animal welfare groups and the community.

There are five key pillars to the plan that will be developed that include:

¹¹⁰ *Animal Welfare Act 1993* (Tas), s 16.

- animal welfare;
- people;
- clubs, facilities and regions;
- regulatory matters; and
- fiscal considerations.¹¹¹

3.105 Mary Bent, an owner of pet greyhounds, considered the lack of detail regarding the closure plan within the Bill a concern:

*A closure plan is mentioned but has not been developed. Owners, trainers, and the Committee are being asked to trust that it will be “humane and structured,” as the Minister claims, despite having no visibility of its contents.*¹¹²

3.106 Greyhounds Australasia also felt the Bill had a lack of sufficient guidance for the preparation and status of the closure plan:

GA notes that The Bill makes no reference to the Parliamentary Joint Standing Committee and the Parliamentary resolution regarding the JSC requirements for transition oversight.

GA submits that the obligation for the development and implementation of a greyhound racing closure plan being solely placed on the Racing Integrity Commissioner represents a substantial and complex undertaking. This task will require extensive consultation, coordination across agencies, and engagement with industry participants and welfare organisations.

GA recommends consideration of broader legislated mechanisms for the development of the Transitional plan. GA is concerned that placing sole responsibility on the Commissioner risks detracting from their core statutory role overseeing racing integrity and impacting the comprehensiveness of the plan.

*GA further notes that the Bill contains no minimum legislative requirements for the content of the closure plan, including safeguards addressing the orderly transition of greyhounds and affected industry participants. GA submits that such safeguards should be clearly articulated in primary legislation.*¹¹³

3.107 The organisation further submitted that the lack of clarity in the Bill due to the absence of the closure plan leaves ambiguity surrounding the future for industry participants:

While the Bill establishes a racing closure date of 30 June 2029, it provides limited clarity regarding the sequencing and coordination of transition activities leading to that endpoint and beyond. The immediate prohibition on breeding upon royal assent requires participants to make immediate and irreversible decisions regarding breeding stock and genetic material within days of the Bill’s passage. In contrast,

¹¹¹ Transcript of Evidence, 7 November 2025, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll, pp. 26-27.

¹¹² Submission No. 71, Mary Bent, p. 2.

¹¹³ Submission No. 140, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 15.

other critical transition elements are left undefined or deferred to future administrative processes.

GA submits that the absence of a detailed, legislated transition pathway creates material risks of capability gaps, exposes administrative or integrity failure and poor welfare outcomes during the transition period. Participants and regulators alike would benefit from a clearly articulated transition framework embedded in legislation, rather than reliance on future determinations by the Racing Integrity Commissioner without prescribed parameters.¹¹⁴

- 3.108 While opposing the Bill in its substantive form, Greyhound Racing NSW (GRNSW) acknowledged that transition plans are required for any such substantial changes as could be affected with the passage of the Bill. With this in mind, they critique the current provision for the transition plan within the Bill:

As industry participation and funding capacity decline during the transition period, the Bill provides no clear mechanism to ensure that welfare obligations currently underwritten by regulated industry structures can be sustained in practice.

GRNSW submits that transitional controls alone do not constitute a comprehensive welfare framework. Without a legislated long-term safety net, the Bill risks creating welfare vulnerability precisely as industry capacity is deliberately dismantled.¹¹⁵

- 3.109 Dr Kim Barrett, a Tasmanian veterinarian, raised a number of concerns regarding the extent to which the industry will remain able to function throughout the transition period, including within closure plan:

1. *Definition of Transition period*

The legislation does not clearly define whether racing will continue in its current form during the transition period or be deliberately scaled down. This ambiguity creates uncertainty for participants [sic] and animals.¹¹⁶

- 3.110 A need for further detail on the future form and content of the closure plan within the Bill was also supported by Greyhound Racing SA, who used their experience of staged industry reform to guide their recommendations:

Practical implications

GRSA's experience implementing staged regulatory reform demonstrates that transition arrangements should remain adaptive over time, as reform programs rarely proceed exactly as anticipated.

Issues and risks identified

- *The Bill does not specify the scope or level of detail required*
- *Risk that the plan is treated as prescriptive rather than adaptive*

Clarifications suggested

- *Clarify that the plan is an operational framework capable of amendment*
- *Confirm the plan supports, rather than constrains, statutory discretion*
- *Provide high-level guidance on required content without over-*

¹¹⁴ Submission No. 140, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 18.

¹¹⁵ Submission No. 123, Greyhound Racing NSW, pp. 3-4.

¹¹⁶ Submission No. 78, Dr Kim Barrett, p. 6.

prescription¹¹⁷

- 3.111 In her submission Ms Jan Davis noted that the transition period is a high-risk time in terms of animal welfare:

The transition period is the highest-risk time for animal welfare. It is exactly when incentives can shift toward:

- *moving dogs off the radar,*
- *offloading responsibility, and*
- *“workarounds” that keep commercial activity going in disguised forms.*

*Legislation should be drafted with an enforcement mindset: clear duties, real penalties, strong inspection/audit powers, and mandatory reporting that exposes non-compliance early.*¹¹⁸

- 3.112 Animals Australia also considered the potential areas of high concern during the preparation and enactment of the closure plan and endorsed vigilance over the formulation of the plan, its implementation and the actions of the industry:

Increasing the rigour of transition phase activities by specific inclusion in the legislation as written will assist in ensuring a well-managed phase out of greyhound racing in Tasmania. Details addressing mandatory and enforceable rehoming targets by set time points, the requirement for independent veterinary input and governance on welfare decisions, regular audits at set points, and reporting requirements for data such as euthanasia requests (and refusals), injuries and deaths, should be included. Regular reporting to the Minister ensures accountability of all parties involved in the transition period and phase out.

*Similarly, the Working Group must carry increased vigilance for deviations from standard racing activities during the transition period, as industry participant behaviour may change in the knowledge their involvement in the industry is finite. Increased and excessive export and euthanasia of greyhounds, allowing racing tracks and other infrastructure to fall into a state of disrepair and increase the risk of injuries, and non-compliance with welfare requirements must all be subject to markedly increased scrutiny. The required degree of oversight to monitor not only ‘business as usual’ activities, but these additional risks, should also be prescribed in the legislation.*¹¹⁹

- 3.113 The Dogs’ Homes of Tasmania noted its key considerations for a successful transition period to support the welfare of greyhounds during this time:

A successful transition also requires removing regulatory barriers that treat greyhounds as fundamentally different from other dogs.

Aligning greyhound regulation with mainstream dog control frameworks will:

- *Improve welfare standards*
- *Reduce stigma and barriers to adoption*
- *Normalise greyhound[s] as companion animals within the community*

¹¹⁷ Submission No. 139, Greyhound Racing SA, pp. 4-5.

¹¹⁸ Submission No. 27, Jan Davis, p.1.

¹¹⁹ Submission No. 144, Animals Australia, p. 4.

*This change is practical, not symbolic, and directly supports rehoming outcomes.*¹²⁰

- 3.114 FOUR PAWS Australia included greyhound welfare and rehoming arrangements, support for industry workers and participants and regional and community transition as key themes for inclusion in the closure plan:

Key components should include:

1. Greyhound welfare and rehoming programs

- a. Large-scale desexing, veterinary care, rehabilitation and behavioural support for retired and surrendered dogs.
- b. Collaboration with local shelters, rescue groups, veterinary practices and national animal welfare organisations to ensure capacity meets demand.
- c. Clear provisions for traceability, so that all greyhounds bred, raced or registered in Tasmania can be accounted for during and after the transition.

2. Support for workers and participants

- a. Transitional financial assistance, retraining opportunities and career counselling for individuals whose livelihoods have been linked to the greyhound racing industry.

3. Regional and community transition

- a. Redirection of any existing public funding or subsidies for greyhound racing into regional economic development initiatives, including animal care services, community amenities and environmental projects.
- b. Encouraging the repurposing of track and training facilities for community benefit, such as community recreation, green spaces, dog-friendly open spaces, or wildlife and conservation projects, where appropriate.¹²¹

- 3.115 The Free the Hounds (FTH) submission raised concerns around the lack of legislative detail for the transition plan contents:

The closure plan is the backbone of the Bill and will largely determine whether the phase-out is orderly, humane, and publicly accountable. While the Bill requires that a closure plan be prepared and approved by the Minister, it does not specify any minimum content requirements, consultation obligations, or enforceable welfare standards.

From FTH's perspective, this creates a significant risk that the plan may be developed primarily by, or in the interests of, the racing industry rather than being welfare-led.

FTH submits that the Bill should be strengthened to require:

- **Mandatory consultation** with independent veterinary experts, recognised animal welfare organisations, and experienced rehoming organisations in the development and revision of the closure plan, not solely racing or industry bodies.
- **Minimum statutory standards** for the closure plan, including:
 - Clear and detailed rehoming pathways for all greyhounds;
 - Defined responsibilities and funding arrangements for welfare and rehoming at each stage of the transition;

¹²⁰ Submission No. 58, Dogs' Homes of Tasmania, pp. 3-4.

¹²¹ Submission No. 141, FOUR PAWS Australia, p. 2.

- A clear compliance and enforcement strategy, rather than statements of intent.

● **Ongoing transparency**, beyond publication of the plan online, including: - Public reporting on implementation progress; - Mechanisms for review and amendment in response to welfare outcomes.

*FTH emphasises that transparency should be operational and continuous, not limited to the existence of a single approved document. This approach reflects best practice in welfare-focused industry exits and is consistent with advocacy positions FTH has advanced in other jurisdictions.*¹²²

3.116 Industry participant Debbie Eastley also raised concerns in relation to the transition plan:

I note that any transition process would need to ensure:

- continuity of care for existing greyhounds
- clarity around retirement pathways
- support for participants who are responsible for day-to-day welfare
- accurate information about how greyhounds are bred, raised, and managed

*My concern is that misunderstandings about welfare practices may lead to decisions that do not reflect the lived reality of responsible participants.*¹²³

3.117 The RSPCA Tasmania had the following comments on the transition plan:

*RSPCA Tasmania strongly supports the concept of a **just transition**, not only for greyhounds, but also for the people and organisations affected by industry change.*

From an animal welfare perspective, a just transition means:

- Dogs are given **certainty, continuity of care and responsible rehoming pathways**
- Animal welfare organisations are not overwhelmed by sudden influxes of dogs
- Industry participants have time to plan, adapt and engage with transition supports

The Bill provides a framework that balances these considerations. It enables government, industry, and welfare organisations to work collaboratively over a defined period, reducing the risk of unintended harm to animals or people.

*RSPCA Tasmania notes that successful transitions in other jurisdictions have demonstrated that **planned legislative reform**, coupled with community engagement, delivers far better welfare outcomes than abrupt or poorly coordinated change.*¹²⁴

3.118 Mr Stephen Lockley, an industry participant, also supported transparency, consultation and Parliamentary approval as pillars of any successful transition plan:

¹²² Submission No. 36, Free the Hounds, pp. 1-2.

¹²³ Submission No.32, Debbie Eastley, p. 1.

¹²⁴ Submission No.23, RSPCA Tasmania, pp. 2-3.

- Section 3 deals with the Greyhound Racing Closure Plan. The Plan is to be formulated by the Commissioner and approved by the Minister. The Commissioner is not required to consult with anyone in relation to the Plan. The Commissioner has a Greyhound Racing Transition Working Group which the Commissioner can ignore if he wishes. I believe that the Commissioner should be required to have public consultation in relation to the plan and call for submissions on the plan rather than forcing a plan through without any public consultation. Further the plan should be approved by the Parliament given the significant implications of the plan. I also believe that the legislation should require the plan to cover certain topics. These topics should include but not be limited to animal welfare, participants welfare, compensation for participants due to loss of income, employee welfare, and the closure of greyhound racing clubs.¹²⁵

3.119 A number of proforma submissions received echoed this need for transparency and minimum standards:

Require transparency and minimum standards for the closure plan – including mandatory consultation with animal welfare/veterinary expertise, clear welfare/rehoming arrangements, compliance strategy, and public reporting requirements (not just a document published online).¹²⁶

3.120 Further, Ms Jan Davis noted that accountability measures are needed:

To deter avoidance and drive compliance, the law should mandate accountability measures that can't be dodged, including:

- *regular public reporting (eg quarterly/biannual) of key welfare outcomes: injuries, euthanasia, rehoming outcomes, transfers and destinations; and*
- *independent welfare oversight (with veterinary/animal welfare expertise) to audit outcomes during the transition.*

A transition without independent oversight invites mistrust and creates room for poor outcomes to be obscured.¹²⁷

3.121 This was also echoed in proforma submissions:

Mandate clear reporting and independent oversight throughout the transition – including regular public reporting (e.g., quarterly or biannually) of key welfare outcomes (injuries, euthanasia, rehoming, transfers) and independent welfare auditing.¹²⁸

¹²⁵ Submission No. 72, Stephen Lockley, p. 2.

¹²⁶ Submission No. 28, Alicia Law, p.1; Submission No. 29, Fiona Masters, p.1; Submission No. 31, Michael O'Halloran, p.1; Submission No. 33, Victoria Sublette, p.1; Submission No. 37, Margaret Murray, p.1. Submission No. 92, Dr Lee Butterworth, p. 1. See also Submission No. 41. Elliot Fox, p. 4.

¹²⁷ Submission No. 27, Jan Davis, p 2.

¹²⁸ Submission No. 28, Alicia Law, p.1; Submission No. 31, Michael O'Halloran, p.1; Submission No. 29, Fiona Masters, p.1; Submission No. 37, Margaret Murray, p.1; Submission No. 92, Dr Lee Butterworth, p. 1; Submission No. 47. Ellena Brownlow, p. 1. with slight amendment. See also - Submission No. 41. Elliot Fox, p. 4; and Submission No. 33, Victoria Sublette, p.1.

- 3.122 Accountability for the Commissioner was also proposed by the Cranbourne Greyhound Racing Club as a recommendation for an amendment in the Bill to increase oversight and community consultation:

The Bill requires the Commissioner to prepare a closure plan, however, it provides limited clarity regarding consultation requirements, the treatment of club-owned infrastructure, employment transition considerations, and how closure arrangements will interact with existing planning frameworks and community-use agreements. This lack of detail creates uncertainty for clubs, employees, and communities that rely on these facilities.

Greyhound racing clubs are embedded community institutions, and closure planning that proceeds without transparency, structured consultation, and clear governance frameworks risks significant and avoidable disruption to communities, stakeholders, and associated industries.¹²⁹

- 3.123 The Bill's lack of detail relating to the greyhound racing closure plan was repeatedly raised as a concern with the Committee.¹³⁰ The Committee asked via written question to the Minister for Racing as to whether there were any concerns around additional detail being provided in the Bill around the closure plan:

Subject to advice from the Office of Parliamentary Counsel, these additional details could be incorporated into the section without affecting the intent or operation of the provision. The main risk in adding more detail is it may be interpreted as expanding or limiting the scope of the Closure Plan (or the discretion of the Minister or Commissioner) in a way that was not intended or anticipated.¹³¹

- 3.124 The Committee also questioned the Minister for Racing as to whether or not the closure plan could be tabled in Parliament:

As above, subject to further advice from the Office of Parliamentary Counsel, the inclusion of a requirement for the Plan to be tabled in Parliament is unlikely, in itself, to present any issues. Noting that the Bill already provides that the Closure Plan approved by the Minister is to be available for public inspection during the transition period on a website maintained by or on behalf of the Commissioner.

However, prescribing that the Plan be tabled as a disallowable instrument risks treating it as a form of "regulation" or subordinate legislation which is subject to the requirements in the Subordinate Legislation Act 1992. This is inconsistent with the intended purpose of the Plan, which is to serve as a strategic and operational guidance document for decision-makers and stakeholders in the management of the phase out of greyhound racing.¹³²

¹²⁹ Submission No. 138, Cranbourne Greyhound Racing Club, p. 4.

¹³⁰ See for example: - Submission no. 26, private witness, pp.4-5; Submission No. 27, Jan Davis, p.2; Submission No. 32, Deborah Eastley, p. 2; Submission No. 34, Noel Gibson, p. 2.

¹³¹ Additional information provided by the Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP, received 25 February 2026, p. 8.

¹³² Additional information provided by the Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP, received 25 February 2026, p. 8.

3.125 The status of the greyhound racing closure plan within the Bill was also raised with the Commissioner. When queried about its placement in the Bill, he said that the closure plan itself would provide the detail, but that any guidance for the work of his Greyhound Racing Transition Working Group regarding the closure plan would be supported:

Ms WEBB - ... Is there any issue, in your mind, if we were to think about including into that section some very straightforward expectations about that plan, which wouldn't aim to limit it or to particularly prescribe content of it, but were to give confidence about broadly what might be in it? ...

Mr CARROLL - As I said before, I have no issue with the areas you've said that need to be covered off. How that is enshrined is not a decision for me, as neither was what was contained in the legislation. As I said, I'm happy to be held account through myself and the working group as to what we do, what's in the transition plan, even to the extent of if there are directions or suggestions as to the consultation that needs to be undertaken, I'm happy to take that on board. I don't underestimate the impact that this has on all of Tasmania, not just the greyhound participants, so any information that I can obtain, or guidance or direction, I'm happy to take that on board. How that's enshrined, I will leave that up to the legislators to determine.

I would expect that there is potential that there could be amendments to the transition plan. I can't sit here and judge them as to what's occurred as far as legislation is concerned. There could be amendments that are required to the legislation as we approach 30 June 2029. We could get more information as we head down the path towards 30 June 2029 that requires further legislation post-30 June 2029, or direction to either the participants, the community or myself to look at issues that need to be addressed that haven't been considered at this stage. They might not be known for two to three years. What you're saying is not unreasonable. I would expect, as I said, that there is potential for potential amendments in the transition plan as time progresses.¹³³

3.126 The Commissioner also shared an overview of the current inclusions, within a skeleton outline, of the closure plan produced as a working draft in consultation with the Greyhound Racing Transition Working Group. The Commissioner stressed that the document remained a living document, of which the structure and content will change over time before it is finalised:

Mr CARROLL - What I would say is that, and I suppose if I look at key areas - our strategic pillars, if you like, at this stage are: animal welfare; people; clubs; facilities; regions; regulatory matters; fiscal considerations; engagement with racing participants and the general public; legislative framework - it goes on - greyhound racing in Tasmania; modelling of greyhound racing through to 30 June 2029; feasibility and impact; incentive and compensation schemes; governance; local rules; traceability of greyhounds; licencing and regulation; the Tasracing Integrity Unit; the Chief Vet and Animal Welfare Officer; track standards; participant wellbeing support; vocational training for participants; animal welfare; standards; codes;

¹³³ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll, pp. 52-53

*policies; breeding; injuries; recovery; retirement; rehoming; euthanasia; deaths; legacy; budget; publication of the transition plan; the Parliamentary Joint standing Committee [on Greyhound Racing Transition]; approval and review of the transition plan.*¹³⁴

- 3.127 Concerns were also raised with the Committee regarding the mechanism by which the closure plan could be amended overtime once officially affirmed by the Minister, and if provision for this was required in the Bill or in the closure plan itself. The Commissioner submitted what his approach to the amendment of the closure plan would be, as well at the original creation process:

Mr CARROLL - ... if we sought to make an amendment to the transition plan post it being finalised, that we would go to the Minister. I would also come to this committee and raise those issues as to any amendment that needed to be made, or take on feedback of any consideration of anyone from this committee.

Ms O'CONNOR - There'd be members of this committee - I mean, I'm sure everyone would like to understand: what is the process for finalising the transition plan, as far as you understand it?

Mr CARROLL - At this stage my understanding is that we would develop the transition plan and provide a copy in draft to the Minister. The date that we're working to at this stage is 30 June.

Ms O'CONNOR - This year [2026]?

Mr CARROLL - Yes. As far as that's concerned. There will be consultation after that draft with various stakeholder groups that we would expect. We would present this transition plan to this committee. Once we're satisfied that it's final, we would give it to the Minister for final approval.¹³⁵

- 3.128 The Minister for Racing was asked by written questions as to what the process might be in amending the closure plan:

Under the provisions of the Bill as currently drafted, the approved plan itself can provide for a review process. The Plan may also incorporate flexibility and mechanisms for adaptation to changing circumstances.

*In addition, I am advised that clause 3 (4) of the new Schedule 8 clarifies that the Minister can require multiple amendments to the draft Plan prior to its approval.*¹³⁶

Transfer of Greyhounds

- 3.129 Clause 4 this part of Schedule 8 limits the transfer of ownership of greyhounds during the transition period without notification to Tasracing.

¹³⁴ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll, p. 54.

¹³⁵ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll, pp. 54-55.

¹³⁶ Additional information provided by the Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP, received 25 February 2026, pp. 8-9.

- 3.130 Hannah Pearce raised concerns with potential administrative delays regarding Tasracing’s approval for transfers and the impact this may have on greyhounds and their owners:

The Bill restricts the transfer of ownership of registered greyhounds unless Tasracing is notified or written consent is obtained, depending on the recipient.

Transfers are a fundamental welfare mechanism. They allow dogs to be rehomed, retired, managed appropriately as they age, or placed in environments better suited to their needs. Delays or refusals caused by administrative discretion can result in dogs remaining in unsuitable circumstances longer than necessary.

Ownership of animals includes the lawful right to transfer ownership. Regulatory interference with that right must be proportionate and evidence-based. This provision is neither. It substitutes discretionary permission for lawful decision-making without demonstrating that transfers themselves present a welfare risk.

For participants managing multiple dogs at different life stages, such restrictions actively undermine responsible care.¹³⁷

- 3.131 In her submission Jan Davis pointed to what she considers to be some risks within the Bill regarding arrangements for the transfer of greyhounds:

Transfer loopholes (dumping/opaque interstate movement) *Transfer rules are only meaningful if there is **traceability end-to-end**. The law should require:*

- *timely reporting of transfers (not “eventually”),*
- *verification of the receiving party and final destination,*
- *audit-ready records (who/when/where/why), and*
- *powers to investigate and penalise non-compliance.*

If a greyhound can be moved with minimal scrutiny, the community cannot be confident that welfare responsibilities are being met.¹³⁸

- 3.132 This was also echoed in a number of other proforma submissions:

Prevent “dumping” and opaque interstate movement – by strengthening transfer controls with real-time reporting, recordkeeping, audit powers, and clear tracking of outcomes for every greyhound.¹³⁹

- 3.133 Similar sentiment was echoed by Anne Boxhall who stated that:

... stronger protections are needed to prevent greyhounds from being quietly moved out of the state or otherwise disappearing from oversight. Robust transfer controls — including timely reporting, comprehensive record-keeping, audit powers and

¹³⁷ Submission No. 107, Hannah Pearce, p. 3.

¹³⁸ Submission No. 27, Jan Davis, p. 1.

¹³⁹ Submission No. 28, Alicia Law, p.1; Submission No. 29, Fiona Masters, p.1; Submission No. 31, Michael O’Halloran, p. 1; Submission No. 92, Dr Lee Butterworth, p. 1; Submission No. 33, Victoria Sublette, p.1; Submission No. 37, Margaret Murray; p.1. See also Submission No. 41. Elliot Fox, p. 4 and Submission No. 47. Ellena Brownlow, p. 1. with slight amendment.

*clear tracking of outcomes for every dog — are essential to ensure transparency and prevent dumping.*¹⁴⁰

3.134 Free the Hounds raised concerns around the lack of controls in transfer provisions to avoid ‘dumping’ of dogs:

FTH acknowledges that the Bill introduces controls on the transfer and destruction of greyhounds during the transition period. However, consent-based transfer mechanisms alone are insufficient to prevent “dumping” or the loss of visibility of dogs once they leave the Tasmanian racing system.

*Experience in other jurisdictions, including New Zealand, demonstrates that when racing industries contract, greyhounds are often moved interstate, making their outcomes difficult to track and monitor.*¹⁴¹

3.135 Free the Hounds therefore suggested the following:

To address this risk, FTH recommends that the Bill require:

- **Real-time reporting** of all greyhound transfers, including interstate transfers, rather than delayed or internal record-keeping.
- **Comprehensive record-keeping** of: - Destination, - Receiving individual or organisation, - Intended purpose, and - Subsequent outcomes for each greyhound.
- **Proactive use of audit and inspection powers**, rather than reliance on complaints or reactive enforcement.
- **Enhanced transparency around destruction decisions**, including: Mandatory reporting of euthanasia or destruction, Clear documentation of reasons, Independent oversight beyond industry reporting.

*FTH submits that a core principle of the phase-out must be that every greyhound remains visible and accounted for throughout the transition period.*¹⁴²

3.136 In her submission Claire Robins, vice Chair, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, noted:

*The Bill also fails to address co-owned greyhounds, particularly dogs jointly owned by Tasmanian and mainland participants. There is no clarity regarding jurisdiction, transfer rights, or the enforceability of existing ownership agreements.*¹⁴³

3.137 Ms Robins continued:

The greyhound industry operates as a nationally integrated system. Ownership, breeding genetic material storage, and contractual arrangements routinely cross state borders. Co-ownership between Tasmanian and mainland participants is common, as are interstate transfers for racing, breeding and welfare management.

The Bill is drafted as though these arrangements do not exist. It provides no mechanism for resolving conflicts of law, managing co-owned animals subject to

¹⁴⁰ Submission No. 30, Anne Boxall, p. 1.

¹⁴¹ Submission No. 36, Free the hounds, p.2.

¹⁴² Submission No. 36, Free the Hounds, p. 3.

¹⁴³ Submission No. 99, Claire Robins, p. 6.

different regulatory regimes, or enforcing Tasmanian prohibition against interstate actors operating lawfully in other jurisdictions.

*This omission creates immediate enforceability problems. Participants acting in good faith under existing interstate agreements are left without clarity as to which obligations prevail, how disputes are resolved, or whether Tasmanian authorities can lawfully regulate conduct occurring outside the State.*¹⁴⁴

3.138 In response to concerns around part-ownership of dogs¹⁴⁵ raised by industry participants the Minister for Racing stated the following via written questions:

The new Section 11c of the Animal Welfare Act 1993 (as inserted by the Bill) does not prevent a person from owning or part-owning a registered racing dog located on the mainland, nor dealing with such a dog outside of Tasmania. These provisions do not have extra-territorial application.

That is, Tasmanian residents can continue to own racing greyhounds that are registered, kept, trained and raced in other states or internationally, provided the dogs are not raced or located in Tasmania.

A person who leaves Tasmania and relocates to the mainland with their dogs would become subject to the laws in their new State/Territory of residence. They could not be prevented from relocating or be in breach of Tasmanian legislation for conduct that occurs interstate and has no territorial nexus with Tasmania.

Tasmanian legislation will apply where a dog is kept, bred, or trained in Tasmania for the purpose of being raced (or supplied for racing) outside of Tasmania, but only to the extent that the prohibited conduct occurs in Tasmania and relates to a dog located in Tasmania.

*Ultimately, determining jurisdiction and whether Tasmanian legislation applies will depend on where and when the relevant prohibited acts or omissions occurred. These are questions of fact and law that would need to be proved with admissible evidence in any Court proceedings relating to enforcement of the legislation.*¹⁴⁶

3.139 Cranbourne Greyhound Racing Club raised concerns about unintended impacts of a perceived lack of clarity relating to the transfer of greyhounds:

The Bill introduces strict limitations on the transfer of greyhounds during the transition period, including controls on interstate movement, participant transfers, and approval processes.

CGRC notes that the Bill does not clearly distinguish between welfare-driven transfers and transfers associated with ongoing racing or commercial activity. Greyhound management often requires responsive decisions based on health, behavioural considerations, kennel capacity, or rehoming opportunities, and highly restrictive transfer controls may affect the timeliness of these decisions.

¹⁴⁴ Submission No. 99, Claire Robins, p. 6.

¹⁴⁵ See for example: - Submission No. 99, Claire Robbins, p. 6; Submission No. 98, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, p. 5; Submission No. 104, Carol Martin, p. 5.

¹⁴⁶ Additional information provided by the Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP, received 25 February 2026, p. 5.

Situations may arise where greyhounds need to be transferred urgently due to changes in health, suitability, kennel capacity, or rehoming availability. In such circumstances, rigid transfer arrangements may reduce operational responsiveness and could have implications for welfare outcomes.¹⁴⁷

3.140 In answer to written questions the Minister for Racing had the following comments on whether this issue has been considered or addressed:

The proposed Schedule 8 (4) will only operate during the three-year transition period.

During that period, greyhound ownership, transfer and racing will continue to be regulated by Tasracing in accordance with the Tasmanian Greyhound Rules of Racing, which have rules governing animal welfare of greyhounds and transfers of ownership. Imposing further prescriptions and responsibilities on Tasracing could interfere with its normal functions of applying the Rules of Racing to greyhounds during the transition period.

The existing provisions of the Racing Regulation and Integrity Act 2024 enable the Commissioner to provide direction and oversight to Tasracing on greyhound racing governance, which will continue to be the case throughout the transition period.

The Commissioner can also include specific guidance and requirements relating to the transfer of racing greyhounds in the Closure Plan which will be developed in consultation with the Transition Working Group that includes Tasracing representatives.

...

Clause 10 is to apply an additional check on transfers and to remove doubt about the need for Tasracing consent. However, it is not intended to interfere with or overburden Tasracing in the performance of its normal functions under the Rules of Racing.¹⁴⁸

Retirement of greyhounds

3.141 Section 5 of Schedule 8 requires the owner of a registered greyhound to notify Tasracing within 30 days after the occurrence that either a greyhound has not raced for a period of 12 months, or if a greyhound reaches the age of six years. Such notification results in the animal no longer considered as registered under the Rules of Racing and can no longer be registered. Greyhounds that have not raced for a continuous period of 12 months may be reregistered under the Rules of Racing only if the greyhound was unable to race due to injury, from which a veterinary surgeon has since been satisfied that the greyhound has adequately recovered.

¹⁴⁷ Submission No. 138, Cranbourne Greyhound Racing Club, p. 3.

¹⁴⁸ Additional information provided by the Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP, received 25 February 2026, p. 9.

- 3.142 Greyhounds Australasia stated opposition to the provisions relating to deregistration provided for in the Bill, suggesting they will result in a decrease in welfare standards compared to provisions of the Bill:

GA expresses concern that compulsory retirement and deregistration provisions do not expressly require compliance with existing welfare safeguards, particularly mandatory sterilisation prior to rehoming. GA submits that deregistration without enforceable welfare conditions is inconsistent with industry regulation and best-practice animal management.¹⁴⁹

- 3.143 The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals New Zealand (SPCA NZ) recommended that reconsideration be given to the age at which greyhounds are required to be retired:

We note our concern regarding the proposed maximum age for mandatory retirement of six years, as evidence indicates that greyhounds older than 39 months are at increased risk of injury. This warrants careful reconsideration to ensure that welfare risks are not prolonged unnecessarily during the transition period.¹⁵⁰

- 3.144 Carol Martin considered section 5 of proposed Schedule 8 in line with the consideration of greyhounds who do not currently race, but are used for breeding purposes, and how requirements for retiring and deregistration may impact animals:

This clause has not taken into consideration the greyhounds, post 6 years age that are current broodbitches and stud dogs, hence should not be deemed retired and deregistered.

Greyhounds deregistered are required to be immediately placed in wind-down, de-sexed and complete dental care.

Whilst there is a current 'retirement' assistance program from Tasracing to participants, this covers only a fraction of the costs. With the immediate retirement and deregistering, many owners will find this financially crippling, leading to ever increased mental stress.

As there is absolutely no mention of any compensation within the proposed bill, is this required 'retirement and deregistering' of greyhounds over 6 years clause, been deliberately included, so government may avoid any later compensation to owners of their registered greyhounds?

By enforcing retirement and deregistering, it removes potential liability for any claim on registered dogs, as they will already be unregistered.¹⁵¹

Use of interstate and overseas greyhounds

- 3.145 This part of the proposed new schedule limits the use of interstate and overseas greyhounds. This limitation dictates that permission must be sought from

¹⁴⁹ Submission No. 140, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 16.

¹⁵⁰ Submission No. 127, The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals New Zealand, p. 2.

¹⁵¹ Submission No. 104, Carol Martin, p. 4.

Tasracing, in the form of written consent, to race an overseas or interstate greyhound in Tasmania during the transition period.

- 3.146 Stephen Lockley raised concerns with the proposed monitoring capacity of Tasracing to approve the use of interstate or overseas greyhounds in Tasmania. He suggested that guidelines depicting Tasracing's considerations on this matter should be made publicly accessible to assist industry participants:

- Section 6 (4) outlines that Tasracing must not consent to an interstate greyhound participating in a Tasmanian Greyhound Race unless adequate arrangements for the wellbeing of the greyhound are in place or if it is not consistent with the Greyhound Racing Closure Plan. Tasracing should be required to publicly release guidelines on when they will and will not consent to an interstate greyhound participating in a Tasmanian Greyhound Race.¹⁵²

- 3.147 Carol Martin in her submission considered there to be a lack of clarity regarding the functional arrangements for consent from Tasracing:

There needs to be consideration and legislation that ensures that there is an immediate response for owners and trainers to receive the written consent response.

Without clear and concise guidelines and immediate response timeframes, this will be a distinct disadvantage to any owner or trainer wishing to bring a greyhound into Tasmania for specific special events. Nominations are only available for a limited time, along with arranging the very limited travel options to bring the greyhound to the state, any delay will mean missing deadlines for event entry, hence will lead to discrimination to some owners and trainers. This will also have a flow on effect within the betting environment where potentially great mainland greyhounds will not be present on certain feature events.¹⁵³

- 3.148 The use of interstate greyhounds was mentioned by Launceston Greyhound Racing Club:

The proposed bill does not define what requirements will be mandated to obtain 'written consent' to race or transfer a greyhound into the state. Nor does the proposed bill allocate time frames for Tasracing to ensure timely consent, or an appeals process if Tasracing choose to decline request, or a set of conditions to warrant a decline.

Time delays in allowing these greyhounds to race can be discriminative to owners/trainers wishing to enter for a specific race and set of events. Without timely consent granted, this can delay the new trainer from entering said greyhound and hence inhibit them from entering.

This could be seen as discrimination without clear cause.

As these greyhounds are registered in another state, they would generally be entering Tasmania to race in a set number of special events whereby at the end of the events, are generally returned to previous trainer and/or owner. Other

¹⁵² Submission No. 72, Stephen Lockley, p. 2.

¹⁵³ Submission No. 104, Carol Martin, p. 4.

greyhounds enter the state for longer periods of time -however when the greyhound retires from racing, it is returned to owner. Given the greyhound is already registered in another state, it appears extremely unclear why this clause has been included in proposed bill.¹⁵⁴

- 3.149 In answer to written questions the Minister for Racing said the following about the requirements to obtain Tasracing's written consent for a greyhound brought into the State for racing:

The intent is not to impose unnecessary prescriptions or overburden the functioning of Tasracing in its normal role of regulating this activity.

Clause 6 (4) requires Tasracing to be satisfied that adequate arrangements have been made to ensure greyhound health and welfare while in the State and to act consistently with Closure Plan approved by the Minister.

*The Closure Plan can also include specific guidance and requirements relating to Tasracing consent to interstate greyhounds racing in Tasmania.*¹⁵⁵

- 3.150 Submission 26 also raised concerns around interstate transfers of greyhounds:

*Another concern is **interstate transfers**: Will Tasracing consent in general for owners to send their racing dogs to an interstate trainer so the dog's racing career can continue outside Tasmania? If not, the owner might feel trapped – they can't race locally after 2029, but also can't easily sell the dog to an interstate racer. The dog then must retire in Tasmania whether or not it is still young and capable. This could diminish the market for Tasmanian greyhounds and potentially devalue them, which again can affect welfare if owners feel their once-valuable athletes are now a liability. In short, the transfer rules aim for accountability, which is good, but must be implemented with flexibility and sufficient support to avoid **bureaucratic bottlenecks** that hinder good outcomes for the dogs.*¹⁵⁶

- 3.151 A number of submissions¹⁵⁷ questioned whether section 6 of proposed new Schedule 8 is constitutional. This argument suggests banning the importation and exportation of greyhounds in and out of Tasmania, without the approval of Tasracing, limits fair trade. Some submitters argued Section 92 of the Australian Constitution prohibits this limitation. Section 92 is as follows:

¹⁵⁴ Submission No. 120, Launceston Greyhound Racing Club, pp. 3-4.

¹⁵⁵ Minister for Racing, Hon Jan Howlett MP, letter to Committee Chair Kristie Johnston MP, received 25 February 2026.

¹⁵⁶ Submission No. 26. P.5.

¹⁵⁷ See for example: - Submission No. 78. Dr Kim Barrett, p. 3; Submission No. 87, Melbourne Greyhound Racing Association, p. 3; Submission No. 89, Private witness, p. 6; Submission No. 110, Graeme Barber, p. 6; Submission No. 130, Greyhounds Tasmania, p. 2; Submission No. 140, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 25.

92 Trade within the Commonwealth

*On the imposition of uniform duties of customs, trade, commerce, and intercourse among the States, whether by means of internal carriage or ocean navigation, shall be absolutely free.*¹⁵⁸

- 3.152 The topic of constitutionality was raised in public hearings with Tasmanian greyhound industry representatives:

Ms RATTRAY - In regard to the issues that have been raised about the potential conflict with section 92 of the Australian Constitution ... Has there been any reaching out or any understanding of that potential conflict with the Australian Constitution around trade between states? Given that if this legislation passes, then there is no opportunity to breed dogs in Tasmania and perhaps send them to the mainland for racing like there is in the Australian Capital Territory, where they are able to breed and then race in other jurisdictions ...

Mr CLARK - ... It will have a massive impact - that cease of breeding, the part of that legislation, the movement of the dogs. A lot of trainers who have three or four of their own dogs but they have multiple dogs, they train for interstate. They come down for decade-long Hobart 1000, for instance - people plan out, it's not just ad hoc.

Ms RATTRAY - Launceston Cup.

...

Ms O'CONNOR - Have you got advice?

Mr GATEHOUSE - Yes.

Ms O'CONNOR - Legal advice? You've commissioned advice from a constitutional expert?

Mr GATEHOUSE - Yes.

Ms O'CONNOR - That this Bill would be in breach of section 92 of the Constitution?

Mr GATEHOUSE - Not that it would be in breach; it could be in breach.¹⁵⁹

- 3.153 Further, to what some submissions deemed as potential constitutional concerns, Greyhounds Australasia provided evidence that the closure of the Tasmanian industry is inherently interconnected to the existing Australasian network of greyhound racing clubs, which is not sufficiently addressed within the Bill as drafted:

The transition process will inevitably involve continued interaction with Australasian greyhound regulatory systems, including the Australian and New Zealand Greyhound Stud Book. The Bill does not address how these integrations will be maintained during transition particularly post cessation of racing. This omission creates the risk

¹⁵⁸ Section 92 of the Australian Constitution, accessed via the Parliament of Australia, https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Senate/Practice_and_Procedure/Constitution/chapter4#chapter-04_92.

¹⁵⁹ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Luke Gatehouse, Claire Robins, Ben Englund, Ben Clark and John Newson, pp. 14- 15.

*of administrative disconnection, undermining traceability, data integrity and welfare monitoring at a critical time.*¹⁶⁰

3.154 The Minister for Racing was, via written questions, asked to address the concerns of constitutionality of the Bill's restriction on the movement of greyhounds:

The Bill was drafted in the Office of Parliamentary Counsel by lawyers with specialised legislative drafting expertise.

The framework for the Bill was developed by the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania, in consultation with the Commissioner, with the lead drafting instructor also being a lawyer with experience in the development of complex Acts – for example, the Biosecurity Act 2019 – which involved consideration of Commonwealth, State and international laws.

Constitutional issues were carefully considered in the development of the Bill which:

- prohibits activities occurring in Tasmania to protect animal welfare and prevent harm to dogs, not to restrain trade or commerce between Australian States and Territories;*
- is not protectionist of an industry in Tasmania to the detriment of another State or Territory;*
- does not prohibit the movement of non-racing greyhounds to and from Tasmania; and*
- in the transition period, regulates only the breeding of racing greyhounds in Tasmania to support an orderly phase out of racing, with additional welfare safeguards relating to the movements of greyhounds into the State for racing, and the euthanasia of racing dogs.*

Post the transition period, the activity of racing dogs in Tasmania and the associated activities of keeping, breeding or supplying any dog in Tasmania for commercial dog racing will be prohibited under the Animal Welfare Act 1993 to prevent animal cruelty, while still allowing the breeding and sale of pet dogs (including greyhounds).

State legislation legitimately restricts trade and commerce in things like fireworks, alcohol and firearms to protect public health and community safety. There are also State biosecurity laws which protect Tasmania from the importation of pests and diseases from other States and Territories. These legitimately place controls on the movement of goods between Tasmania and the mainland.

*Clive Palmer's failed High Court challenge to Western Australia's border closures during the COVID-19 pandemic confirmed that the protections regarding trade and commerce in the Constitution do not confer immunity from all regulation, nor prevent States making laws which impose a different regulatory burden where it is reasonably necessary to achieve a legitimate object of the law (see *Palmer v Western Australia* (2021) 272 CLR 505).*

¹⁶⁰ Submission No. 140, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 19.

The “legitimate object of the law” underpinning this Bill is protection of animal welfare and the prevention of cruelty to dogs in Tasmania, which is a State Government responsibility. Each State and Territory has its own specific laws governing the management of animals and animal-related industries within their jurisdiction to prevent cruelty.¹⁶¹

Destruction of greyhounds

3.155 Clause 7 of proposed new Schedule 8 applies penalties to the destruction of greyhounds during the transition period without the written consent of Tasracing, unless undertaken by a veterinary surgeon in an emergency to relieve the greyhound of suffering or distress due to illness or injury or otherwise authorised under any other Act. Tasracing can only consent to the destruction of a greyhound where satisfied it is to be carried out humanely and that the destruction is necessary on animal welfare grounds.

3.156 Throughout the work of this Inquiry and the substantive Committee, submitters raised concern with the use of ‘destruction’ as the terminology to describe the euthanasia of greyhounds. NRE representatives formally put on the record the legislative rationale for this decision:

Mr HALL - ... The reason why we didn't go - that change was not made in relation to the term 'destruction' was because it's the term used in the Dog Control Act 2000. If we used a different term in this Bill which amends the Dog Control Act 2000, it creates a legal inconsistency and creates doubt about whether we're talking about the same terminology. Essentially, it created a legal uncertainty. The safest option was to retain that term of destruction.¹⁶²

3.157 Concerns were raised by Submission 26 in relation to the implementation of the consent process for the destruction of greyhounds:

- **Euthanasia (Destruction) Provisions:** *One of the most important welfare-related transition rules is the restriction on euthanasia of greyhounds during the phase-out. The Bill specifies that an owner **must not destroy (euthanize) a healthy registered greyhound during the transition period without Tasracing’s written consent.** Consent would only be given if euthanasia is necessary on genuine welfare (health or behavioural) grounds, and any destruction must be done humanely by a veterinarian (with an exception that in true emergencies a vet can act to alleviate suffering without prior approval). The principle here is commendable and one that our Club strongly supports: no greyhound should be destroyed simply because it is no longer needed for racing. This rule is clearly designed to prevent any mass culling of greyhounds as the ban date approaches.*

*We agree with the intent — indeed, the greyhound community does not want to see any healthy dogs put down. However, the **implementation needs attention.***

¹⁶¹ Additional information provided by the Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP, received 25 February 2026, pp. 6-7.

¹⁶² Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP and the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania, p. 16.

Requiring written consent from the racing authority before euthanasia could be problematic if not handled with urgency and compassion. Consider if an owner has a greyhound with severe behavioural issues that make it unsafe as a pet (this is rare, but it can happen with any dog). If all adoption avenues fail and a veterinarian recommends euthanasia as the kindest option, the owner would have to apply to Tasracing for permission. It is not specified how quickly Tasracing must respond. Any delay prolongs the situation – perhaps the dog stays in a kennel for weeks waiting, which is not ideal for its welfare or for those caring for it. To improve this, the process for obtaining euthanasia consent should be made simple and prompt, involving veterinary certification that it's necessary.

Moreover, who bears the cost? Typically, if an owner surrenders a difficult greyhound to an animal shelter, the shelter (often RSPCA or similar) might make the euthanasia decision and bear the cost if needed. Under these rules, owners might be stuck with dogs they cannot safely rehome and cannot themselves euthanize without legal risk. There should be a safety valve in the system – for example, the closure plan might include funding for a sanctuary or special-care facility for greyhounds that genuinely cannot be rehomed but are healthy. That way, euthanasia truly becomes a last resort and is overseen properly.

In the ACT transition, I recall that the vast majority of greyhounds were saved and rehomed, but a handful with severe injuries or unsuitability for pets did have to be euthanized under veterinary advice. Those cases were emotionally difficult for all involved. Having a formal consent requirement might add an extra layer of trauma for owners who already must make a heartbreaking decision – they effectively have to ask permission to do what a vet has said is necessary. I would advise a bit of sensitivity in how this rule is communicated and executed so that it doesn't feel like punishment to the owner who, in those rare cases, is often devastated at losing their animal.

Overall, the euthanasia restriction is a positive measure to encourage rehoming, but it must be paired with supportive measures: help owners find alternatives, provide for special-needs dogs, and ensure any decisions are made swiftly by welfare experts. We wouldn't want owners to resort to illegal or unethical means due to frustration with a cumbersome process – so it's in everyone's interest to make this work cooperatively.¹⁶³

3.124 The Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds proposed penalties for the illegal destruction of greyhounds be strengthened:

As the industry is being shut down, there will be significant incentives for greyhound racing industry participants to get rid of their dogs by any means.

CPG has already published evidence that this has been occurring in Tasmania, and that penalties given by TasRacing are inadequate and provide little deterrent effect.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶³ Submission No. 26, Private Witness, pp. 6-7.

¹⁶⁴ Footnote 6 cited in Submission No. 142, Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds, p. 8 - <https://greyhoundcoalition.com/racing-regulation/>

Given the additional incentives to reduce expenses in relation to their greyhounds, it is certain that the risk to greyhounds of being killed will increase significantly. CPG applauds the Tasmanian Government for introducing the Clause 7(1) offence provision. However, restricting penalties to only financial fines does not provide sufficient deterrent.

CPG strongly believes that any person killing greyhounds outside the provisions of the Act should face the possibility of imprisonment. The subclause 7(1) penalty provision must therefore be amended to include a period of imprisonment.¹⁶⁵

- 3.125 Greyhounds Australasia provided support for the regulation of the destruction of greyhounds, but submitted that a review of Tasracing's capacity to operationalise the clause should be undertaken:

*GA supports the requirement that destruction of greyhounds be limited to genuine animal welfare reasons. GA recommends review of Tasracing euthanasia policies and operational capacity to appraise suitability and ensure they are appropriate, transparent and scalable during the transition period.*¹⁶⁶

- 3.126 Greyhound Racing SA suggested the regulation of euthanasia provided in this section may need to be adapted to allow for potential emergency exceptions:

Practical implications

Euthanasia decisions are often urgent and welfare-driven. Administrative processes must operate in real time.

Issues and risks identified

- *Prior consent requirements risk delaying necessary welfare decisions*
- *Owners may hesitate due to perceived regulatory risk*
- *High volumes of consent requests may reduce regulatory focus on higher-risk cases*

Clarifications suggested

- *Explicit recognition of veterinary discretion in urgent circumstances*
- *Streamlined or standing consent arrangements for defined welfare scenarios*
- *Clear guidance on approval processes and response expectations*¹⁶⁷

- 3.127 In written questions, the Minister was asked whether consideration had been given to including explicit recognition of veterinary discretion in urgent circumstances:

The Government has committed to ensuring that no healthy greyhound is euthanised due to the phase-out. This is enforced through the Bill.

The amendment to the Racing Regulation and Integrity Act 2024 requires euthanasia of a greyhound to have written consent of Tasracing and can only be for animal

¹⁶⁵ Submission No. 142, Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds, p. 8.

¹⁶⁶ Submission No. 16, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 16.

¹⁶⁷ Submission No. 139, Greyhound Racing SA, pp. 5-6.

welfare reasons. It does not apply to the destruction (euthanasia) of a greyhound by a veterinarian in an emergency to relieve pain and suffering.

This is an added safeguard that was specifically recommended by the Commissioner. Importantly, it is in addition to, and does not affect, the existing processes and laws applying to the euthanasia of dogs under other legislation such as the Dog Control Act 2000, Animal Welfare (Dogs) Regulations 2016 and the Animal Welfare Act 1993.¹⁶⁸

Breeding of greyhounds

3.128 Part 8 of proposed Schedule 8 prescribes penalties for the breeding of greyhounds for the purposes of racing during the transition period. Greyhounds are only able to be bred as domestic pets during this period.

3.129 RSPCA Tasmania commented on its support for breeding controls:

Any provisions that limit or progressively reduce breeding activity are strongly supported from an animal welfare standpoint.

Reducing the number of dogs entering the system as racing winds down:

- *Improves the likelihood of successful rehoming*
- *Reduces pressure on welfare and rescue organisations*
- *Aligns dog numbers with realistic community adoption capacity*

*This is a key safeguard for ensuring the transition remains humane.*¹⁶⁹

3.130 The breeding exception was raised as a concern by Anne Boxhall:

*Any allowance for dogs to be classified as domestic pets must be tightly constrained and fully traceable, with approvals, records and auditing in place so it cannot be misused as a loophole.*¹⁷⁰

3.131 A number of proforma submissions also commented on the need to tighten the breeding exception further:

*Tighten the breeding exception and ensure enforceable traceability – so the “domestic pet” exception cannot be exploited as a workaround. Any exception should be tightly regulated with approvals, records, and auditing.*¹⁷¹

3.132 Animals Australia went on to further discuss how sanctions for non-compliance could be strengthened:

This is of particular note regarding whelping a litter i.e. Part 4 Section 8, where the penalty of a maximum 50 penalty units equates to only A\$10,250 at the time of

¹⁶⁸ Additional information provided by the Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP, received 25 February 2026, p. 10.

¹⁶⁹ Submission No. 23, RSPCA Tasmania, pp. 4-5.

¹⁷⁰ Submission No. 30. Anne Boxall, p. 1.

¹⁷¹ Submission No. 28 Alcia Law, p. 1; Submission No. 29, Fiona Masters, p. 1; Submission No. 31, Michael O’Halloran, p. 1; Submission No. 33, Victoria Sublette, p. 1; Submission No. 37, Margaret Murray; p. 1; Submission no. 92, Dr Lee Butterworth, p. 1. See also: - Submission No. 41. Elliot Fox, p. 4; Submission No. 47. Ellena Brownlow, p. 1. with slight amendment.

writing; sale of a litter of racing greyhound puppies would often still prove profitable, even taking this fine into account. Strengthened financial consequences for intentional deviation from planned phase out activities must be considered, to serve as effective deterrents.¹⁷²

- 3.133 Racing industry participant Graeme Barber, requested the Committee examine the potential of allowing breeders to continue to breed greyhounds to sell or supply to interstate industry participants:

I request that the Joint Standing Committee further consider the very restrictive amendment with a view to examining the opportunity for current greyhound breeders to be able to continue to breed racing greyhounds for sale to the Australian market. Breeders have for many years, some many decades, invested heavily in their breeding stock to produce some of the most outstanding race dogs in Australia. Whilst greyhound racing may cease in Tasmania, it is not un-reasonable to allow those registered breeder's [sic] to continue to recover their financial outlay by breeding good quality racing greyhounds for sale to mainland states. If that process was given further consideration I am of the opinion that it would not place any further burden on future re-homing problems as these dogs would be sold at a young age to mainland owners and trainers.¹⁷³

Authorisation in relation to greyhound racing on closure date

- 3.134 Proposed Schedule 8 provides the scope for authorisation in relation to greyhound closure date under clause 9. Clause 9 states that on or after 30 June 2029, all permits, licences, registrations and other forms of authorisation that allow greyhound racing will be automatically cancelled.
- 3.135 Greyhounds Australasia raised concern the full implication of Schedule 8, clause 9 is unknown:

GA expresses reservation regarding clause 9(2)(c), particularly the lack of clarity around the ongoing legal status of registered race clubs and incorporated associations following the automatic cancellation of authorisations, with the immediate implementation of the legislative amendment on 30 June 2029.¹⁷⁴

Regulations

- 3.136 The proposed new Schedule also allows for the making of consequential and transitional regulations to support the greyhound racing phase out during the transition period.
- 3.137 The RSPCA Tasmania submission noted that it supports appropriate regulation making powers noting:

However, we emphasise that any regulations made should:

- *Maintain animal welfare as a primary consideration*
- *Be developed with consultation from animal welfare organisations*

¹⁷² Submission No. 144, Animals Australia, p. 3.

¹⁷³ Submission No. 110, Graeme Barber, p. 6.

¹⁷⁴ Submission No. 140, Greyhounds Australasia, p. 16.

- Avoid creating incentives that inadvertently compromise welfare outcomes.¹⁷⁵

3.138 Dr Barrett, a Tasmanian veterinarian, raised concern with subclause 2(c) of clause 10, which provides a general scope for regulations outside of the specificity included in the previous subclauses:

Section 10(c) states that regulations “can authorise any matter form [sic] time to time determined, applied or regulated by any person or body specified in the regulations.”

This clause grants extraordinarily broad authority to:

- Determine any matter at any time
- Apply regulations to any person or body
- Regulate activities without specific legislative constraint

Concerns:

- Lack of transparency regarding how this power will be exercised
- Absence of accountability mechanisms
- Potential for arbitrary application during transition period
- Risk of further economic and mental stress on participants [sic] without clear guidelines

This represents a significant delegation of legislative power to the executive without clear parameters or safeguards.¹⁷⁶

3.139 NRE Tasmania provided an explanation for the inclusion in the Bill of a regulation making power:

Ms O’CONNOR - *Can I ask about the regulation making powers that'll be in place - and I think Ms Rattray asked about this in part earlier - what kind of regulations might be attached to this legal framework? Have any been foreseen?*

Mr HALL - *It's really just there as a safeguard in case - and there almost always is - something unforeseen or some outcome that you had. There is an ability there in the transition to provide some defences or provide some additional. That's in the three-year transition period under Schedule 8 of the Racing Regulation and Integrity Act, which will sunset, essentially, at the end of that. After that it'll be the Animal Welfare Act or the Dog Control Act and there's the ability to make regulations under there generally for the welfare or management of dogs.*

Ms O’CONNOR - *Can you foresee that there'll be any need to engage with the industry around changing the rules of greyhound racing?*

Ms WILSON - *I couldn't answer that question. That's really a matter for the commissioner. He's not responsible for the Rules of Racing, but in terms of the transition plan, that would be a matter for the commissioner and Tasracing.¹⁷⁷*

¹⁷⁵ Submission No. 23, RSPCA Tasmania, p. 5.

¹⁷⁶ Submission No. 78, Dr Kim Barrett, p. 7.

¹⁷⁷ Transcript of Evidence, 28 November 2025, Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP, and Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania representatives, p 54.

Findings:

The Committee finds:

16. Clarity about desexing requirements for ex-racing greyhounds and the implications for breeding for domestic purposes, should be addressed in the transition plan.
17. The closure date of 1 July 2029 provides three years for transition, which the Commissioner and rehoming organisations advises is adequate time for properly consulted transitional arrangements to be put in place for the welfare of animals and participants.
18. Strong powers provided in the Bill in relation to compliance, inspection and audit, are required to ensure the welfare of dogs during the transition period. These are of similar scope to powers which already exist under the rules of racing and animal welfare legislation.
19. Clause 10 of the Bill, schedule 8 (3) inserted, could specify a non-exhaustive list of matters that must be included in the closure plan and a requirement that consultation is undertaken in its development.
20. The closure plan can be amended to deal with issues or needs that emerge during the transition period.
21. That the matters outlined by the Racing Integrity Commissioner for current consideration in a draft closure plan are extensive and cover the breadth of matters raised with the Committee in submissions on the Bill.
22. Parliamentary oversight of the transition will continue, including through the work of this Committee.
23. Parliamentary oversight could be enhanced by tabling the closure plan in both Houses of Parliament.
24. Deficient data and records keeping by Tasracing puts animal welfare and industry participant outcomes at risk during the transition period. Ongoing auditing by the Racing Integrity Commissioner is required to ensure that data is accurate for the welfare of animals and industry participants.
25. The transition period will require greater ongoing resources for the Office of the Racing Integrity Commissioner to ensure statutory responsibilities are met.
26. Current penalties relating to the unlawful destruction of greyhounds are insufficient as a deterrent.

Part 5 – Racing Regulation and Integrity Act 2024 Further Amended (Clauses 11 to 28)

3.140 These clauses make further amendments to the *Racing Regulation and Integrity Act 2024* and will take effect after 30 June 2029. These clauses remove unnecessary references to greyhound racing in the Act as once the greyhound industry ceases, the Act will only need to cover the regulation of horse racing in Tasmania. Due to the limited evidence received on clauses 11 to 28, the Committee has no comment on the clauses.

Part 6 – Repeal of the Act (Clause 29)

- 3.141 This Clause provides that the Act is repealed on the first anniversary of the day on which the last un-commenced provision of this Act is commenced.
- 3.142 The Committee received no evidence on this clause and has no comment on this clause.

4 OTHER ISSUES

- 4.1 Chapter 4 considers other matters raised with the Committee, including potential absences or inadequacies within the Bill. Compensation, and rehoming matters are considered.

Compensation for industry participants

- 4.2 One issue raised in numerous submissions¹⁷⁸ was the matter of compensation for greyhound owners and other participants in, or adjacent to, the industry who will no longer be able to race their dogs or facilitate their related business. The Committee notes it is proposed that compensation will be included in the Commissioner's greyhound transition closure plan and is a key consideration for participants.
- 4.3 Issues raised in relation to compensation included the devaluing of privately owned infrastructure, equipment and stock¹⁷⁹ with little resale value in Tasmania,¹⁸⁰ genetic assets,¹⁸¹ and loss of livelihood.¹⁸²
- 4.4 Greyhound trainer Sharyn Marshall wrote the following:

In the discussions prior to the legislation being rushed through the lower house there was talk of compensation and rightly so . Many trainers have spent many thousands of dollars over the years providing airconditioned kennelling, exercise runs, dog trailers etc as well as the huge feed and vet bills .

However when the bill was hastily sent to the legislative council I did not see any detail mentioning how this compensation was to be calculated or distributed to ensure the hounds are continued to be kept in the standard and condition they are used to . Or indeed any mention of compensation at all.

Without help with the cost associated with providing for these dogs for the remainder of their life how will we keep them safe and well?¹⁸³

- 4.5 Greyhound Clubs Australia, an incorporated association which represent all Australian greyhound clubs, also criticised the lack of compensation provided for in the Bill:

¹⁷⁸ See for example - Submission No. 25, Sharyn Marshall, pp. 5-6; Submission No. 32, Debbie Eastley, p. 2; Submission No. 34, Noel Gibson, p. 2; Submission No. 38, Tom Englund, p. 7; Submission No. 44 Tash Croft pp. 4-5; Submission No. 46 Michael Pearce pp. 2 & 6; submission No. 48 Stephen Gerrard, p. 1; Submission No. 84 Diane McCulloch, p. 2.

¹⁷⁹ See for example - Submission No. 131, Luke Gatehouse, p. 3; Submission 104, Carol Martin, p. 5; Submission No. 115, NSW Greyhound breeders, Owners and Trainers Association, p. 4; Submission No. 130, Greyhounds Tasmania, p. 3.

¹⁸⁰ Submission No. 84, Diane McCulloch, p. 2.

¹⁸¹ Submission No. 131, Luke Gatehouse, p. 3.

¹⁸² See for example - Submission No. 100, Luke Gatehouse, p. 3; Submission No. 115, NSW Greyhound breeders, Owners and Trainers Association, p. 4; Submission No. 130, Greyhounds Tasmania, p. 3.

¹⁸³ Submission No. 25, Sharyn Marshall, pp. 5 - 6.

No consideration for loss of any form is considered, weighted or factored into this rushed agenda driven policy. Properties specifically set-up for greyhound training, breeding and development will ultimately lose purpose under this Bill and yet not one consideration has been provided for these participants and the sudden financial loss they face. Business and income models that rely on greyhound racing will clearly suffer detriment from this policy; however, the Bill fails to adequately address the social and economic impacts. If this Bill is expected to be the one legislation that manages and addresses this policy, then its inadequacies are extensive and highlights the sheer lack of understanding towards greyhounds and the greyhound racing community by those at the helm. While some may view these issues as oversights resulting from the rushed and cavalier approach taken in advancing the policy, others might interpret them as signs of poor judgement or lack of diligence.¹⁸⁴

4.6 Stefan Wells also mentioned in his submission the need for compensation for industry participants:

The bill also needs to be amended to include a section relevant to the Welfare of Participants during the phase out period and post any closure date. There is nothing contained within the bill to explain how the Government will ensure Participants are looked after both from a financial position and from a health and wellbeing position. At the moment, the bill basically says they will be out of a job and profession post closure and its totally on them to make a new future for themselves and their families, despite it being the Government putting them in this position. There is no talk of compensation for loss of earnings, for facilities like kennel blocks etc that will become redundant, no mention of retraining programmes, health [sic] provision let along [sic alone] providing someone that they can speak to to [sic] answers questions, queries etc.

It has been drafted to ensure their [sic] is protection for the race dogs (most of which is already in place) though not a thing or a penny for the participants themselves. This needs to be urgently addressed as the Government has a duty of care towards to participants [sic] whose livelihoods [sic] and way of life they are wrongly taking away.¹⁸⁵

4.7 Debbie Eastley advocated for a transition plan that considers fair and reasonable compensation for racing participants:

A transition affecting long-standing participants would have significant impacts on:

- *family livelihoods*
- *generational knowledge*
- *regional communities*
- *people whose primary income or identity is tied to the industry*

Any transition process would need to consider:

- *the economic effect on families and small operators*
- *the role of greyhound activities in regional communities*
- *the intergenerational nature of involvement*

¹⁸⁴ Submission No. 145, Greyhound Clubs Australia, p. 4.

¹⁸⁵ Submission No. 24, Stefan Wells, p. 1.

- the need for clear practical arrangements for participants.¹⁸⁶

4.8 Noel Gibson also raised the issue of compensation:

While the Committee's Terms of Reference mention fair and reasonable compensation for affected participants, the Bill itself does not provide any details or guarantees regarding compensation. This omission leaves participants uncertain about their future and the support they can expect during the transition. For example, maintaining a kennel and equipment for the life of the dogs can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars per year, and without clear compensation provisions, many participants face significant financial risk.¹⁸⁷

4.9 Graeme Barber submitted support for compensation, including options for industry participants to leave the industry prior to 30 June 2029:

There needs to be clear legislation making referral to a compensation scheme. Such scheme must give participants an early opportunity to leave the code as not every person will be willing to hang around until the cessation date of 30th June, 2029.¹⁸⁸

4.10 The matters considered above were also reflected in other submissions.¹⁸⁹

4.11 Greyhound racing volunteer Carol Timbrell, provided her own views on elements which should be considered for inclusion within compensation and transition plans to support greyhounds and industry participants:

2.2. Participants must be compensated financially, mentally and socially and their ongoing concern and care for their dogs acknowledged

Owners relinquishing dogs must be able to choose who adopts their dogs and assess the suitability of the property where they are to be kept. They should be able to follow up and visit their dogs for as long as it takes for them to be satisfied that they are safe and healthy, and to seize them back if they are unhappy with the placement.

Participants must be supported to keep as many dogs as they can accommodate.

Mental health services will be required to support people who have lost their identity and social connections, their hobbies and sense of worth. I will miss the connections and routines that make up my life volunteering with retired and racing greyhounds.¹⁹⁰

4.12 Tom Englund was another participant who commented on the need for compensation provisions in the Bill:

Also, of particular concern to industry participants, is the fact there is no provision in the Bill for compensation

Owners/trainers and breeders spend many thousands of dollars on their properties and infrastructure

¹⁸⁶ Submission No. 32, Debbie Eastley, p. 2.

¹⁸⁷ Submission No. 34, Noel Gibson, p. 2.

¹⁸⁸ Submission No. 110, Graeme Barber, p. 5.

¹⁸⁹ See for example - Submission No. 130, Greyhounds Tasmania, p. 3; Submission No. 91. Ross Work, p. 2; Submission No. 98, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club Committee, p. 3.

¹⁹⁰ Submission No. 88, Carol Timbrell, p. 2.

This includes, kennel facilities, vehicles, trailers, irrigation systems, hydro baths, walking machines, cool rooms, fridges freezers, ultrasound machines, magnetic blankets, running yards muzzles, leads, collars etc.

All these items are required in the day-to-day care of greyhounds

How will compensation be quantified, in a fair and reasonable manner, for all participants?¹⁹¹

- 4.13 Dr Megan Alessandrini supports compensation for industry participants, but submits that this needs to be matched with regulation to ensure only the appropriate provision of compensation:

***Exit package-** If individuals are unable to continue in their occupation involving owning, breeding and training greyhounds, they should be given fair and reasonable compensation distributed equitably to those leaving greyhound racing on a permanent basis. It is not appropriate for id deals relocating interstate to attract compensation. This could lead to the ludicrous unintended outcome of individuals moving from state to state and receiving a compensation payment each time.¹⁹²*

- 4.14 Carol Martin provided estimates of the cost of some of the activities associated with greyhound ownership and how these should be considered in relation to the matter of compensation:

Compensation - Greyhounds

Nowhere within the proposed bill has there been any mention of the enormous cost to the owners, trainers and breeders and what the compensation package would look like.

Given that the average cost to raise a greyhound pup to 12 months of age is approximately \$5,000 and that racing dogs, dependant on breed, ability and history can range from \$10,000 to \$200,000 per dog, it should be a consideration for the proposed bill and for the government treasury.

Broodbitches can range from \$10,000 to \$50,000, the pups in excess of \$10,000.

Stud dogs can earn unlimited depending on progeny.

Race dogs stake money can also be unlimited depending on the greyhound.¹⁹³

- 4.15 The Launceston Greyhound Racing Club noted that the bill should not pass without compensation clauses including the following considerations:

1: Immediate (2026) compensation for the breeding prohibited, broodbitches, stud dogs along with the breeding, whelping and rearing infrastructure.

2: Compensation (2029) for greyhounds, greyhound infrastructure, greyhound equipment (sample only: ultra sound machines, hydro baths, walking machines, bedding, collars, leads, muzzles, greyhound rugs, fridges, freezers, storage units, custom trailers and vans)

¹⁹¹ Submission No. 38, Tom Englund, p. 7.

¹⁹² Submission No. 97, Megan Alessandrini, p. 3.

¹⁹³ Submission No. 104, Carol Martin, p. 5.

3: Compensation consideration (dependant on time frames and participant requests) for industry participants to relocate to the mainland.¹⁹⁴

- 4.16 Appearing before the Committee, Ben Englund raised how the process of determining compensation will be complex and that, thus far, industry participants had not observed or been involved in any work which encourages them:

Mr WINTER - ... What level of work would be required to adequately understand the level of compensation? What sort of things would need to be incorporated, and how long would it take to actually work out the level of compensation you might be required to receive?

Mr ENGLUND - It's a large body of work. You're not just talking about trainers. You're talking about breeders, owners, rarers, whelpers. If the industry is abolished, you're talking about the flow-on effects that affect all the small businesses that supply the industry. That's a huge body of work. None of it's been undertaken, and if it has we haven't seen it for whatever reason. It's not something that can be rushed through in a couple of months. This has been pushed and pushed and pushed to try to catch us off-guard. We've been chasing our tail ever since the announcement.

As you can appreciate, prior to the announcement, we were very comfortable. Very comfortable. Doing what we do. Since that announcement, we've been chasing our tail ever since.¹⁹⁵

- 4.17 When asked to address the matter of compensation in the Bill in light of the submissions received, the Minister for Racing and NRE representatives provided the following:

Mr WINTER - ... Minister, why is industry stakeholder compensation not included in the Bill, and does the Government intend to bring forward an amendment to address compensation and the value of the proposed compensation?

Ms HOWLETT - Look, as I stated before, honourable member, as far as compensation, that is part of what the Commissioner is working through with the working group. He will work through as to what that compensation looks like.

Mr WINTER - So there's no - specifically around the amendment, you're not considering an amendment to incorporate compensation as part of this?

Ms WILSON - Through you, Minister: I think that the intention was to put it into the transition plan. We are working through an orderly transition which is staged. The capacity to address issues in the transition plan is really important because it will involve the Commissioner, the working group and consultation. That's our best-practice approach to ensure that matters are appropriately dealt with and that advice is provided to the Minister based on the transition plan. There could be unexpected or - I think that I've used the word before - unintended consequences if

¹⁹⁴ Submission No. 120, Launceston Greyhound Racing Club, p. 4.

¹⁹⁵ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Luke Gatehouse, Clairs Robins, Ben Englund, Ben Clark and John Newson, pp. 16-17.

you put in a legislative mechanism as compared to a more flexible but still-legislated transition plan.

Ms HOWLETT - I'd also like to add - as I stated earlier, in a brief conversation that I had this morning, I was advised that the industry is still formulating its representative on the Commissioner's working group. It's not confirmed yet as to who that person is, but at least it looks like someone is prepared to go on the working group.¹⁹⁶

4.18 In hearings the Committee questioned the Minister for Racing about what compensation might look like:

Ms O'CONNOR - Okay. If we just go to the question of compensation, the New Zealand model, for example, compensates participants, I think, on a per dog basis. We've got industry participants here who, it's been agreed at the table this morning, some of whom are breeding up. What is the Government's current position on how a compensation arrangement might work for the industry? We can all acknowledge it should be just and equitable and allow for a dignified exit, but what's the model that the Government's currently examining?

Ms HOWLETT - The Racing Integrity Commissioner and his working group are in consultation and are working through what compensation will look like.

Ms O'CONNOR - Do you agree it's less than desirable, just from a public purse point of view, to have a compensation model that compensates people per dog, given that that would be rewarding bad behaviour for some participants because they have gone and bred up following the delay on this Bill?

Ms HOWLETT - Absolutely. That is what the Commissioner and the working group will work through. How that compensation looks I'm not sure, because they're working through that, but part 4, section 3 of the Bill states that the Commissioner is to prepare and submit to the Minister a draft plan for the closure as soon as practical, and that plan will detail compensation and other financial incentives to support greyhound racing participants in the transition.¹⁹⁷

4.19 The Commissioner also discussed the matter of compensation, including how the delay of the Bill could affect these considerations:

Ms O'CONNOR - One of the matters you referenced earlier in relation to the breeding of dogs was perhaps a perception among some industry participants that there could be compensation relating to the number of dogs that they have, for example, which I understand is the New Zealand model. What's the thinking on that and would you agree that it's important that we discourage the excess breeding of greyhounds during this period?

Mr CARROLL - I think I've made my position well known. It is that the control of more dogs in Tasmania is a concern first and foremost for the number of dogs that are required to be rehomed throughout the transition period. I'm unsure - I know the

¹⁹⁶ Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP and Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania representatives, pp. 16-17.

¹⁹⁷ Transcript of Evidence, 10 February 2026, Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP and Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania representatives, p. 13.

Dogs' Home and the RSPCA were in before. The reality is, as we currently sit, we will struggle to rehome the number of dogs that we presently have in Tasmania. Efforts have been made to reach out to other states as to what that may look like and what assistance we may need. There is a significant cost associated with rehoming each dog. The issue of compensation regarding the number of each dog that each person has is certainly something that we acknowledge.

At the moment, the issue of compensation, regarding any matter, hasn't been one that we've really discussed in depth as to what that will look like. We're waiting to see what happens as far as the legislation that's passed. There's a feasibility study that's currently being conducted by Tasracing as to the impact of the greyhound transition, so we will wait to see what is contained in that report. I know that there's been some thought that's been conducted through my office, that's not correct. That's a Tasracing issue.¹⁹⁸

- 4.20 Finally, on the matter of compensation, the Commissioner submitted that a staged implementation would be most suitable in this instance:

Ms WEBB - ... Do you see a compensation plan, or however it's framed, as being done concurrently with the transition plan? Or would the transition plan be important to complete and have established first, and within that, it would point to then the development of compensation arrangements and what the compensation plan might look like. You know, are they one-step, two-step, or is it a concurrent process?

Mr CARROLL - I think it would be a step program, to be fair. I think it would be unfair on the participants to actually determine what a compensation plan will or won't look like right now. In fact, my initial thought is - and certainly, there'll be a lot of discussions held with people far more important than me as far as this is concerned - it would be dangerous to actually lock in what any compensation plan may or may not look like right now, until we actually avail ourselves with all the evidence and impacted areas and parties that may be required to be addressed in any compensation plan.

That may take two, three years. I make no apology for that. I think the issue of compensation is one that needs to be addressed, but it needs to be addressed in a manner that is well-researched. We may have some concept and idea of what it may look like even after the feasibility study, but what I don't want to occur is that we're retrofitting compensation plans four or five years down the track regarding this matter. I think the reality is that compensation will form part of the transition plan. What that looks like I can't say at this stage.

Ms WEBB - Compensation will be in the transition plan but not in its complexity and as a final product? It will be referenced in terms of a process?

Mr CARROLL - Correct, yes.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁸ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll, p. 55.

¹⁹⁹ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll, p. 63.

Findings:

The Committee finds:

27. There is a strong case for a just and equitable compensation package for industry participants
28. Greater clarity and certainty is required on the matter of compensation for industry participants in the Bill, through the closure plan and the operation of the working group.
29. Tasracing is conducting a feasibility study on the impacts of the greyhound racing transition.
30. Consideration of compensation must be included in any transition/closure plan.
31. Compensation may be required and funded at different stages of the transition.

Rehoming concerns

- 4.21 A number of greyhound owners raised concerns around the rehoming of greyhounds. Noel Gibson outlined his concerns:

The requirements for rehoming organizations are unclear, and the Bill does not adequately address the legislative frameworks needed for a fair transition. As someone who has worked closely with GASTAS [sic] and rehomed many greyhounds, I am concerned that the Bill allows for changes without proper consultation with the industry, potentially undermining the welfare of the animals and the integrity of the rehoming process.²⁰⁰

- 4.22 Tash Croft and Michael Pearce had similar concerns about the rehoming of greyhounds:

One of my greatest concerns is that the proposed legislation restricts or undermines existing, successful rehoming pathways while offering no credible alternative.

*Programs such as GAP already operate at capacity. In Tasmania, rehoming relies heavily on **private, trainer-led efforts**, local networks, and personal responsibility. This bill assumes that formal organisations can absorb every retired greyhound — that assumption is simply false.*

There is no clear plan addressing:

- where the funding will come from,
- how long-term care will be managed,
- or what happens to dogs that are slow to rehome.

Poorly planned policy will result in worse welfare outcomes, not better ones.²⁰¹

- 4.23 The RSPCA Tasmania also commented on the rehoming capacity of GAP:

²⁰⁰ Submission No. 34, Noel Gibson, p. 2.

²⁰¹ Submission No. 44, Tash Croft, p. 3; Submission No. 46, Michael Pearce, p. 4.

Currently, the number of dogs bred for racing exceeds the rehoming capacity of the industry-funded Greyhounds as Pets program; as a result, several charities step in to fill the void. The Dogs' Homes of Tasmania is the primary rehoming organisation outside of GAP, with the RSPCA also operating a rehoming program. Both organisations are heavily committed to either community surrenders and pound contracts, or, in the case of the RSPCA, to enforcing the Animal Welfare Act and seizing animals as required.²⁰²

4.24 Ben Englund outlined a number of risks he saw with the rehoming of greyhounds outside of the racing industry:

- **Lack of owner expertise:** Greyhounds have unique physiological, dietary, and behavioural needs that inexperienced owners may struggle to meet.
- **Overwhelmed rehoming organisations:** Rehoming groups may lack capacity to absorb a sudden influx of dogs, leading to overcrowding and stress.
- **Health risks:** Retired greyhounds are prone to specific health conditions requiring ongoing veterinary care.
- **Behavioural challenges:** Transitioning from racing environments to domestic settings requires structured support to prevent anxiety and surrender.
- **Loss of accountability:** Removing lifetime traceability eliminates enforceable monitoring of welfare outcomes.
- **Potential exploitation:** Greyhounds may be acquired by unregulated breeders or resellers, increasing the risk of neglect or abandonment.²⁰³

4.25 Dr Barrett, a Tasmanian veterinarian, also prosecuted the necessity for set standards for rehoming processes if the transition is to occur:

The legislation should establish enforceable, consistent standards for all approved rehoming organizations, including:

- *Transparent euthanasia reporting requirements*
- *Minimum space and exercise requirements*
- *Behavioral (sic) assessment protocols*
- *Veterinary oversight requirements*
- *Regular compliance auditing*²⁰⁴

4.27 Mr Geard, an industry participant, also provided support for the need for clarity within the Bill regarding rehoming processes for greyhounds:

Re-homing Requirements

While re-homing is an essential aspect of greyhound welfare, the Bill lacks detail on minimum standards, funding support, and capacity expectations for re-homing organisations. Without adequate resources and oversight, these

²⁰²Submission No. 23, RSPCA Tasmania, p. 4.

²⁰³ Submission No. 67, Ben Englund, pp. 3-4.

²⁰⁴ Submission No. 78, Dr Kim Barrett, p. 6.

*organisations may be placed under significant strain, potentially impacting outcomes for the dogs involved.*²⁰⁵

- 4.28 Greyhounds Australasia expressed concerns that the current strong welfare focus of Tasmanian rehoming organisations could be diminished due to the increased load during the transition period:

*The Bill does not adequately address the practical challenge of rehoming the existing racing greyhound population within the available timeframe. Tasmania's adoption agencies have achieved strong outcomes through controlled placement rates, rigorous assessment of adoptive homes and structured post-placement support. The concentrated rehoming demand generated by industry closure risks overwhelming these systems, placing pressure on placement standards and suitability assessments.*²⁰⁶

- 4.29 Lesley Jolly, an owner of retired greyhounds raised several concerns that she felt should be addressed in relation to the potential rehoming process if the greyhound racing transition, facilitated by the Bill, is to occur:

- *Where will funding come from to cover the costs of retiring greyhounds? (vet checks, neutering which is currently required under racing regulations, feeding and care)*
- *Will there be a central management body, ensuring the well-being of transitioning dogs – such as dogs with ongoing health or behavioural issues?*
- *Who will decide which 'rehoming groups' will meet 'standards of care' for transitioning racing greyhounds? This could create serious welfare concerns, particularly as there have already been issues with some rehoming groups.*²⁰⁷

- 4.30 In relation to the rehoming of greyhounds the Launceston Greyhound Racing Club raised the following concerns:

There should be a mandatory and compulsory register (fully transparent to the public and not hidden behind red tape) of every greyhound entering these re-homing establishments, time kept prior to rehoming, when certification for green collar and behavioural reports are completed, at a minimum.

*There needs to be guarantees to the greyhound industry participants that no greyhound will be euthanised due to time, housing or convenience. The process and legislated requirements should all be consistent for every re-homing establishment, the same as it is with Greyhounds as Pets (GAP) rules, regulations, reporting and requirements.*²⁰⁸

- 4.31 Dr Alessandrini also emphasised the need for increased support for rehoming facilities to adequately support the transition:

Rehoming of Tasmanian greyhounds- *while the precise number of greyhounds to be rehomed by animal welfare organisations in Tasmania is not known, it may be*

²⁰⁵ Submission No. 111, Brian Geard, p. 1.

²⁰⁶ Submission No. 140, Greyhounds Australasia, pp. 18-19.

²⁰⁷ Submission No. 66, Lesley Jolly, p. 3.

²⁰⁸ Submission No. 120, Launceston Greyhound Racing Club, p.5.

as many as 1500. For this reason it is imperative that the transition period facilitates a gradual process of rehoming. Many of these dogs will require lengthy rehabilitation as they are unfamiliar with stairs, children and the comforts of living with people. They will also need veterinary attention as they frequently have poor dental health, skin and ear conditions, as well as muscular skeletal problems. This all takes time and money.

Resourcing- Funding provision needs to be made for maintaining these additional dogs and preparing them for their new lives as companion animals. Charities cannot continue to provide for these additional particularly needy dogs as they have done to date without financial assistance. This should not be provided to GAP as it is an instrument of Tas Racing already receives generous funding.²⁰⁹

4.32 Peter Gugger, Christie Hayes and Greg Irons' joint submission also endorsed increased resources for organisations who will assist in rehoming greyhounds:

Community groups and volunteers have carried much of the responsibility for rehoming former racing dogs, often with limited resources and little formal support. The transition period must not intensify that burden or rely on goodwill alone to manage foreseeable welfare outcomes.

Legislation that is genuinely fit for purpose should ensure that:

- *Welfare responsibilities remain clearly defined and enforceable*
- *The public interest, not industry convenience, remains the guiding principle*
- *The phase-out does not externalise costs — moral or financial — onto community organisations²¹⁰*

4.33 While further information regarding rehoming will arise as a result of the transition plan, RSPCA Tasmania and the Dogs' Homes of Tasmania have provided preliminary figures to the Commissioner's Greyhound Racing Transition Working Group regarding the potential amounts needed to facilitate their participation in the rehoming scheme to ensure the welfare of greyhounds in their care:

Ms DAWKINS - *Mark and I have a slightly different view on this because I was looking at it from the perspective of let's get these dogs out. What I asked in my submission was for all that work, including dental, plus \$500 per dog. That \$500 would get us started and then we'd start working on -*

...

Dental was the big one for us because it can be up to \$2,000 and that can be very chilling for somebody who wants to adopt an animal. It's more than it is for any other dogs.

Mr WINTER - *That's comprehensive - the cost is \$500 plus dental. It sounds like, Mark, you might have a slightly different view.*

²⁰⁹ Submission No. 97, Megan Alessandrini, p. 3.

²¹⁰ Submission No. 114, Peter Gugger, Christie Hayes and Greg Irons, p. 5.

Mr WILD - In the wash, it probably all comes out pretty similar, but our figures are around \$3,500 per dog. We operate on a cost basis of about \$70 per dog, per day, and, on average, greyhounds are with us for about 50 days.

Mr WINTER - That's a pretty big difference.

Mr WILD - Yes.

Mr WINTER - It might be really obvious to you guys why that's different, but is it okay for you to explain to the committee about the difference?

Ms DAWKINS - Because I believe I could mount a community fundraising campaign. I didn't want the cost to prohibit the passing of this legislation. It puts all the responsibility onto my shoulders and onto the RSPCA's shoulders, but it worked with the labradoodles - there was no way that was ever going to be funded by anyone but the community. I'd be hoping to build on that model and that success to be able to do the same.

Mr WINTER - Do you agree with Mark's assessment, then, of the costs?

Ms DAWKINS - Absolutely.

Mr WINTER - It's around three-and-a-half, is the cost, but also -

Ms DAWKINS - At least.

Mr WINTER - Community support of around \$3000 per dog, plus with the subsidy from the Government.

Ms DAWKINS - Exactly.²¹¹

Findings:

The Committee finds:

32. More than one thousand ex-racing greyhounds will need to be rehomed during and following the transition period.
33. The rehoming of ex-racing greyhounds will be a substantial complex and costly endeavour both during and following the transition period.
34. Local rehoming organisations have expressed a willingness and capacity to undertake the task of rehoming ex-racing greyhounds but will require extra sustained resourcing.
35. Currently, non-industry rehoming organisations are not funded to rehome greyhounds exiting the industry and they have relied on community funding to do this important work to date.
36. Re-homing organisations will need to be adequately funded by Government to assist with the humane transition of dogs out of greyhound racing both during the transition period and at the closure until all dogs are rehomed.

²¹¹ Transcript of Evidence, 11 February 2026, RSPCA Tasmania and Dogs' Homes of Tasmania, pp. 37-38.

Dissenting Statement of Hon Tania Rattray MLC, Independent Member for McIntyre

The Independent Member for McIntyre in the Legislative Council, Ms Tania Rattray, dissents from the Joint Standing Committee into **Greyhound Racing Transition - Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill 2025 Inquiry**.

A motion by the Honourable Member for Murchison, Ms Forrest to refer the bill to the Joint Standing Committee was supported by the Legislative Council. I believe Legislative Council Members expected the Committee would facilitate a fulsome inquiry approach to stakeholder input into the transition arrangements in the bill with an expectation to address compensation, future breeding time frames and welfare issues for both animals and humans would be front and centre of the Committees focus. To have these matters for the Commissioner of Racing Integrity and a handpicked working group to make important determinations and ultimately recommendations for the Government to consider would not be well received by the industry participants and those in the Tasmanian community who support the continuation of Greyhound Racing in our state.

The committee approach felt one of haste with an urgency for the Committee to report back to the Legislative Council to bring on the debate. I acknowledge given the uncertainty for the greyhound code participants and those from the community who want to see the legislation passed a timely decision would be desirable.

In response to these matters, I provide the following comment for my opposition to a number of the recommendations as listed below.

Recommendation 1. - Adequate broad consultation has not been undertaken prior to the announcement or during the committee inquiry process to support the phasing out of greyhound racing to proceed.

Recommendation 2. - Clauses 1 & 2 enact the Bill of which I do not support regardless of any amendment commencement date at 2(1).

Recommendation 5. - Unable to support this amendment to the Dog Control Act 2000 which in my view requires significant consultation with the greyhound participants to thoroughly explore and identify any unintended consequences. For example, the question arises of how can a previously racing greyhound be muzzled on 30th June 2029, then unmuzzled on 1st July 2029?

Recommendation 6. - No support for Part 5 of the Bill as closure of the Greyhound Racing code is not supported.

Recommendation 7. - Not supported as closing of the Greyhound Racing code is not supported.

Recommendation 8. - Not supported as closing of the Greyhound Racing code is not supported.

Recommendation 10. - Should the Bill be supported to the committee stage I consider that compensation to industry participants be included as a Clause in the Bill.

Recommendation 13. - Any new Deed developed to support the racing industry should include Greyhound Racing should the Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill 2025 not pass the Parliament.

In conclusion receiving the final report draft by email from the Committee Secretary on Saturday 21st March at 4.10pm and the requirement to align the recommendations with this dissenting report by Monday 23rd March in my opinion does not meet sound Parliamentary committee standards.

Parliament House
HOBART
23 March 2026



Hon Tania Rattray

MEMBER FOR MCINTYRE

Dissenting Statement of Mr Dean Winter MP, Labor Member for Franklin

Tasmanians believe in treating people fairly. They do not support shutting down industries – especially when there is no justification for doing so.

The passage of this Bill would be the first time the Tasmanian Parliament has voted to shut down an industry in our lifetimes.

The Liberals went from providing their full support for greyhound racing on 17 July 2025 to shutting it down on 10 August 2025. This Bill is a result of a terrible, unjustifiable sellout of good people by Premier Rockliff so he could form government. In this dissenting report, I outline that:

- The Government has not presented evidence of animal cruelty or any real basis for shutting it down.
- Running two codes of racing will cost as much as it costs to run three. Therefore, there will be no budget saving from this proposed shut down.
- There will be massive, uncapped costs for compensation for greyhound participants. Greyhounds can be worth up to \$50,000, while trainers have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars into their kennels, training facilities and transport vehicles. The Racing Integrity Commissioner’s audit has found there are currently more than 1,000 greyhounds in the system.

The consequences of this are grave for democracy with thousands of people disenfranchised and abandoned by the sellout, while the economic impact potentially reaches more than 6,000 racing participants.

The Bill should be rejected outright.

Process and scope of inquiry

The majority of members held a predetermined view to shut down greyhound racing and wished to complete this report as quickly as possible. Unfortunately, their rush to return this report to the Legislative Council has meant the committee has not diligently undertaken the work referred to it.

The Chair held the first meeting at a time both Ms Rattray and I had already indicated we were unavailable, just five days after the Legislative Council’s referral.

In every other inquiry I have been part of, the Chair would work to find a time when all members were available – especially for the first meeting. In the absence of the two members who have been longstanding supporters of greyhound racing, the

Committee set the terms for submissions and timeframes for consideration of the inquiry. Both were fundamentally flawed.

The Committee determined:

“The Committee notes that this inquiry is not examining the policy decision of the greyhound racing phase out but the contents of the proposed legislation to enable the transition process to occur.”

Had the Committee allowed me to be present at the meeting, I would have outlined why this was a critical error. By telling the public not to submit evidence in relation to the merits of the policy itself, the Committee wilfully ignored what I consider having been a crystal clear request from the Legislative Council to consider not just the detail of the Bill, but the merits of it.

In its 10 December 2025 debate to refer the Bill to this Committee, questions and issues raised by Members of the Legislative Council in setting up this inquiry included:

- Eligibility for compensation (owners, trainers, breeders, clubs, employees, suppliers)
- Whether the compensation fund is capped
- The total cost to government and taxpayers
- Whether the Bill creates unfunded liabilities
- Whether Tasmania has the capacity to rehome all greyhounds affected by the phase out
- How surrendered or retired dogs will be managed during the transition
- Whether the government should fund large scale rehoming programs
- Flow on effects to harness and thoroughbred racing
- Economic impacts on regional towns where greyhound racing is a major employer
- Whether track closures will affect multi code facilities
- Whether the Bill should require a regional transition plan
- Whether the government has provided evidence of systemic cruelty
- Whether the Bill is proportionate to the alleged issues
- Whether alternative reforms (e.g., stronger integrity measures) were considered

While evidence was incidentally collected surrounding some of these questions, the deliberate limitations placed on this inquiry has resulted in Committee reporting in what must be near-record time (105 days), having not actually done what it was asked to do.

For example, the thoroughbred and harness racing codes, which are unlikely to survive in the long term if this Bill passes, did not submit or participate in this inquiry. Had the inquiry included an assessment of the merits and impacts of the policy, I believe they would have.

Further evidence of the rushed and incomplete process included:

- The Committee chose which witnesses it would call to its hearings before it had even called for submissions, let alone read them.
- There were 148 submissions to this inquiry. 147 had been received when Members had just one business day to read them all before hearings commenced.
- Consultation commenced in the days before Christmas. This timing was unnecessarily rushed and inconsistent with established consultation standards. It did not demonstrate respect for passionate stakeholders on either side of the debate – all with a significant interest in the outcome.
- There are several witnesses, based on the merit of their submissions, that I believe would have been called and added value to the inquiry had the committee undertaken a normal process of receiving and considering the submissions *before* determining a list of witnesses to be invited to hearings.
- Witnesses, including the Racing Minister, were asked about submissions they could not possibly have seen as they had been accepted and made public by the committee only minutes before the hearings started.

Ms JOHNSTON - ... Minister, Tasracing's submission - and I appreciate you might not have had the opportunity to see it, I will pass it over, it is a two-page submission - is going online and it should be up online, I think, as of now?

Ms HOWLETT - I've not seen it, sorry.

- Greyhounds Australasia was included in a 45 minute hearing on 6 March 2026, after it specifically wrote to the Committee asking to be heard. By this stage, the draft report had already been written. No evidence from its testimony, nor its supplementary submission, was included in the final report.

The merits of the policy

While the Committee advised the public it would not consider the merits of the policy to shut down greyhound racing, that is fundamentally what matters in this debate.

The reason the government is pursuing the shutdown of an entire industry is critical to understand.

The Minister for Racing has, on more than a dozen occasions, been asked why the government has decided to shut down greyhound racing. The Minister has refused, on every occasion, to explain.

During the House of Assembly debate on the Bill, Premier Rockliff could only cite animal welfare concerns from the 2015 *Four Corners* report (which were not in Tasmania) and declining public support as reasons for the policy.

If even the Government — the proponent of this ban — cannot explain its reasoning, how can the shutdown be justified?

Animal welfare

Across the hearings, submissions and questions on notice, no evidence of animal cruelty was presented to the Committee. The Racing Integrity Commissioner and Tasracing did not outline any substantiated cases of cruelty, which the proponents of this Legislation say is the reason for the industry needing to be shut down.

The Committee heard no evidence of systemic mistreatment, no evidence of unlawful training practices, and no evidence of welfare breaches that would justify the closure of an entire industry.

In fact, the Committee met greyhound participants who explained their love and care for their dogs and the welfare improvements they have made over the past 10 years.

Despite this, the majority report proceeds on the premise that the industry must be shut down, even though the evidence before us did not establish a factual basis for such an extreme legislative intervention.

Compensation

The Committee has recommended compensation is explicitly referred to in the Bill as an element of the closure plan. This is an extraordinary admission given that those same members wanted to rush this Bill through the Parliament with no public consultation or understanding of what compensation would be required.

However, simply adding the concept of compensation into the Bill is pointless. Given the state of the budget, the massive cost likely to be required to compensate properly and the government's track record of dishonesty, how could anyone believe the government even if it does promise specific compensation?

Unless there is detail around what level of compensation is being offered within the Bill itself, participants will have no trust that they will receive anything.

Economic and Financial impacts

The Committee also received no credible evidence that closing greyhound racing will save public money. On the contrary, the Government was unable to quantify the cost of compensation, the cost of rehoming, or the cost of expanded regulatory oversight during the transition. The Committee was repeatedly told that compensation is likely to be “significant”, “complex”, and “ongoing”, yet no modelling, estimates or fiscal analysis was provided.

However, the Committee did receive evidence from Tasracing’s CEO, Andrew Jenkins, that his organisation would require the same level of funding to run two racing codes as he does for all three codes.

Mr WINTER - ... What's the expectation from Tasracing's board about the amount of funding that's going to be required from 2029 onwards? Are we looking at a similar amount of money or are we looking at a reduction in total that you'll be requesting?

...

Mr JENKINS - I would expect, Mr Winter, that our submission will be for funding in the order of what is currently in place. What's often –

Ms O'CONNOR - Sorry, just to be clear, do you think the harness and thoroughbred codes should have the greyhound money?

...

Mr JENKINS - I would expect so, yes. Obviously, it's not finalised yet, Chair, but based on our early thinking, yes, it would be in the order of what is currently being received. As you would appreciate, there are a number of costs that, simply by removing one code, it doesn't mean that a third of our organisation or a third of our infrastructure and other costs are removed.

In line with that evidence, Mr Jenkins provided the following financial analysis demonstrating that greyhound racing performs substantially better than the other two racing codes and operated with a relatively small \$3.2 million loss in 2024-25.

Code contributions to FY25 result

Tasracing has reviewed the FY25 financial results and where reasonably possible, allocated revenues and costs to each code of racing, the Greyhounds as Pets program and the newly integrated integrity function (operating from 1 Feb 2025).

Revenues and costs that had no reasonable basis for allocation have been aggregated into "Unallocated". Examples include Board and Executive costs, hr functions, finance and legal costs, insurance etc.

Code funding includes all stake money, riding and driving fees, code bonuses and code contributions to animal welfare.

	Greyhound	GAP	Harness	Thoroughbred	Integrity	Unallocated
Race Field Fees	\$8,129,421	\$0	\$3,376,662	\$10,470,359	\$0	\$0
International Fees	\$269,647	\$0	\$133,853	\$521,385	\$0	\$0
Other Revenue	\$25,955	\$38,678	\$309,516	\$1,974,214	\$1,833,043	\$2,850,309
Total Revenue	\$8,425,023	\$38,678	\$3,820,032	\$12,965,958	\$1,833,043	\$2,850,309
Code Funding	-\$7,374,146	\$0	-\$9,639,377	-\$19,922,911	\$0	\$0
Labour	-\$857,900	-\$619,077	-\$817,440	-\$2,281,056	-\$1,010,864	-\$5,107,549
Depreciation	-\$742,131	-\$12,265	-\$898,731	-\$2,866,796	-\$2,521	-\$266,124
Other Expenses	-\$2,664,453	-\$271,584	-\$3,734,177	-\$9,484,649	-\$764,039	-\$5,978,420
Total Expenditure	-\$11,638,630	-\$902,927	-\$15,089,724	-\$34,555,412	-\$1,777,424	-\$11,352,094
Total	-\$3,213,607	-\$864,248	-\$11,269,693	-\$21,589,454	\$55,619	-\$8,501,785

The net cost of operations for FY25 was \$45,383,168. Tasracing received \$36,716,302 in line with the Funding Deed, \$7,303,611 under the POCT Deed and recognised \$155,673 in training grants during the year leading to a net loss of \$1,207,582 in FY25

Conclusion

The majority report asserts that the Bill is necessary to protect animal welfare and manage transition risks. However, the evidence presented did not substantiate these claims.

The Committee's task was to examine the Bill and the policy that underpins it—not to endorse a policy decision made without consultation, without modelling, and without a clear understanding of its consequences.

In the absence of evidence of cruelty, adequate financial or economic analysis, and a clear plan for the future of the broader racing sector, I cannot support the majority's conclusions.

Findings

The character of greyhound racing participants

1. I have spent the past six months in and around the greyhound racing industry. I have met some of the most wonderful, happy, passionate and beautiful Tasmanians I could ever meet. They love their dogs like their own children and they would do anything for them.

There is no evidence of animal welfare breaches within Tasmanian greyhound racing

2. The Committee did not receive evidence of animal cruelty occurring within the Tasmanian greyhound racing industry. None have been presented since the shutdown was announced.
3. Tasracing's evidence confirmed welfare incidents have been minimal and within expected parameters for regulated racing and compare favourably to other states.
4. The Bill cannot be justified on the basis of animal cruelty, because no such evidence was presented.

The financial implications of closing greyhound racing are mostly unknown

5. The Committee heard compensation may be required at multiple stages, for multiple categories of participants, but no modelling has occurred.
6. The Government could not explain how much the transition will cost taxpayers, nor how these costs compare to the current funding arrangements.
7. The Committee received no evidence that closing greyhound racing will save taxpayers money. In fact, the evidence suggests the opposite: the transition will be expensive, complex and ongoing. The new racing funding deed will cost as much as the existing deed, but the industry will lose 40% of racing turnover and tens of millions of dollars in economic activity.
8. The Government expects advice on the new Racing Deed in May 2026, meaning the Legislative Council will be asked to assess the Bill without knowing the financial framework that will replace the current deed.

The impact on the broader racing industry is unknown

9. The Committee received no detailed evidence about how the closure of greyhound racing will affect thoroughbred and harness racing. It is unknown.
10. The Racing Integrity Commissioner advised the transition will require increased resources, but the Government has not explained how these will be funded or sustained.
11. The Government's own economic analysis shows Tasmanian racing is worth over \$200 million annually and involves more than 6,000 people. If this Bill is passed it is, at best, unclear what future the other two codes have.

Recommendations

1. The Legislative Council should reject the Bill in its entirety.
2. The Government should abandon this policy and instead get to work rebuilding the racing industry.

**Parliament House
HOBART
23 March 2026**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dean Winter". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'D'.

**Dean Winter
MEMBER FOR FRANKLIN**

Appendix A - List of Submissions

1. Laura E Kennedy
2. Angela Bennett
3. Eliza Allan
4. Private witness No. 4
5. Chris Undy
6. Mande Bijelic
7. Jane Lewis
8. Private witness No. 8
9. Mike Ives
10. David Wallace
11. Julia
12. John Archer
13. R.W. McKellar-Ellis
14. Sue Denehey
15. Michael Chaffer
16. Debbie Davis
17. Jon Othitis
18. Rosalyn Newton
19. Private witness No. 19
20. Paul Whitmore
21. Lisa Bouten
22. Adrian Pickin
23. RSPCA Tasmania
24. Stefan Wells
25. Sharyn Marshall
26. Private witness No. 26
27. Jan Davis
28. Alicia Law
29. Fiona Masters
30. Anne Boxhall
31. Michael O'Halloran
32. Debbie Eastley
33. Victoria Sublette
34. Noel Gibson
35. Alison Hookey
36. Free the Hounds
37. Margaret Murray
38. Tom Englund
39. Christine Dorchak
40. Private witness No. 40
41. Elliot Fox
42. Private witness No. 60
43. Anne Hendley
44. Tash Croft
45. Private witness No. 45
46. Mike Pearce
47. Ellena Brownlow
48. Stephen Gerrard
49. Private witness No. 49
50. Linda Emmerton
51. Lee Thomas
52. Megan Ambrus
53. Sylvia Schiavoni
54. Private witness No. 54
55. Anni Wilson
56. Robyn Osborne
57. Tasmanian Dog Walking Clubs
58. Dogs' Homes of Tasmania

59. Private witness No. 59
60. Heinz Ahlemeyer
61. Catherine McFadyen
62. Wynter Greene
63. Claire Pettit
64. June Phillips
65. Kate Tenni
66. Lesley Jolly
67. Ben Englund
68. Northwest Greyhound Racing Club
69. Marianne Stansfield
70. Janene McCarthy
71. Mary Bent
72. Stephen Lockley
73. Private witness No. 73
74. Josh Gatehouse
75. Serena Lloyd
76. Ruth Howard
77. Tasracing
78. Dr Kim Barrett
79. Gerard Alford and Melissa Kitto
80. Steven O'Brien
81. Angela Darch
82. Craig Jones
83. Dr Katrina Ward, Dr T Stafford and Dr V Russell
84. Diane and Lewis McCulloch
85. Private witness No. 85
86. Dr Claire Sheppard
87. Melbourne Greyhound Racing Association
88. Carol Timbrell
89. Private witness No. 89
90. Cameron Betts
91. Ross Work
92. Dr Lee Butterworth
93. Michael Stringer
94. Kara Rickson
95. Private witness No. 95
96. Shaunagh Wood
97. Megan Alessandrini
98. Hobart Greyhound Racing Club Committee
99. Claire Robins
100. Sarah Boyd
101. Frank Feeney
102. Dr Sally Rickson
103. Ivan John Fehlberg
104. Carol Martin
105. Jamie Devine
106. Janet Ramsay
107. Hannah Pearce
108. Murray Bridge Greyhound Racing Club Inc
109. Dr Hannah O'Brien
110. Graeme Barber
111. Brian Geard
112. Brennan Ryan
113. Jared Marshall
114. Peter Gugger, Christie Hayes and Greg Irons
115. NSW Greyhound Breeders, Owners and Trainers Association

116. Ross and Cheryl Freeman
117. David Booth
118. Sylvia Mace
119. Humane World for Animals
120. Launceston Greyhound Club
121. Michelle Collis
122. Tracey Watts
123. Greyhound Racing New South Wales
124. Angela Rowe
125. Responsible Wagering Australia
126. Tull Luttrell
127. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals New Zealand (SPCA NZ)
128. JMR
129. Tasmanian Canine Association (Trading as Dogs Tasmania)
130. Greyhound Tasmania
131. Luke Gatehouse
132. Gary Fahey
133. Jenny Geard
134. Private witness No. 134
135. Robin Grubb
136. Roy Rickson
137. Greyhound Clubs Victoria
138. Cranbourne Greyhound Racing Club
139. Greyhound Racing SA
140. Greyhounds Australasia
141. FOUR PAWS Australia
142. Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds
143. Patrick Daniels
144. Animals Australia
145. Greyhound Clubs Australia
146. Colin Howlett OAM
147. Jane McNicholl
148. Greyhounds Australasia supplementary submission

Appendix B - List of witnesses

Tuesday 10 February 2026, Parliament House, Hobart	
Witness	Organisation (if applicable)
Minister for Racing, Hon. Jane Howlett MP Deidre Wilson, Acting COO, NRE Anita Yan, Deputy COO, NRE Stephen Hall, Principal Adviser – Legal Services, Biosecurity Tasmania	Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania
Andrew Jenkins, CEO	TasRacing

Wednesday 11 February 2026, Parliament House, Hobart	
Witness	Organisation (if applicable)
Luke Gatehouse Ben Clark John Newson Clare Robins Ben Englund	Greyhounds Tasmania Greyhounds Tasmania Launceston Greyhound Racing Club Hobart Greyhound Racing Club Northwest Greyhound Racing Club
Andrea Dawkins, CEO Mark Wild, CEO	RSPCA Tasmania Dogs' Home Tasmania
Sean Carroll	Commissioner for Racing Integrity

Friday 6 March 2026, Parliament House, Hobart	
Witness	Organisation (if applicable)
Simon Stout, CEO	Greyhounds Australasia

Appendix C - Minutes of the Committee

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON GREYHOUND RACING TRANSITION MONDAY, 15 DECEMBER 2025

The Committee met in Committee Room 3, Parliament House, Hobart at 3:01 p.m.

Members Present:

Ms Johnston (Chair)
Mr Vermey
Ms Webb
Ms O'Connor

APOLOGIES

Ms Rattray and Mr Winter were apologies.

MINUTES

The minutes of the last meeting on 28 November 2025 were agreed to as an accurate record (Ms Webb).

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

The Committee resolved to note the following correspondence received by the Chair (Mr Vermey):

- Carol Timbrell email received 9 December 2025

REFERRAL FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

The Committee discussed the referral from the Legislative Council in relation to the Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill 2025.

BILL INQUIRY

The Committee discussed the draft program and noted that Ms Rattray had indicated an amendment of the submissions closing date to 6 February 2026.

Resolved, to agree to the following amended inquiry timeline:

- Submissions open 20 December 2025
- Submissions close – 6 February 2026
- Meeting to accept submissions - 10 February 2026
- Public hearings - 10 February 2026
- Chairs draft – 24 February 2026
- Committee draft 26 February 2026
- Report deliberative meetings 6 & 10 March 2026
- Tabling 17 March 2026 (Ms Webb).

The Committee discussed potential witnesses, and invitations to submit. Ordered, That a letter be sent to each of the following individuals and organisations seeking a submission to the Inquiry, with a deadline for submissions of Friday, 6 February 2026, and that these witnesses also be invited to attend a hearing on 10 March 2026: -

- Luke Gatehouse, Greyhounds Tasmania
- John Newson, Launceston Greyhound Racing Club
- Clare Robins, Hobart Greyhound Racing club
- Ben Englund, North West Greyhound Racing Club
- RSPCA Tasmania
- Dogs Home Tasmania
- Brightside Animal Sanctuary
- Hobart Dog Walking Club

- TasRacing
- Minister for Racing, Hon Jane Howlett MP
- Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania
- Sean Carrol, Commissioner for Racing Integrity. (Ms Webb)

The Committee *Resolved*, that the witnesses appear at the public hearing for the following times and in the following order: -

- Industry representatives, 1.5 hours
- Welfare organisations, 1.5 hours
- TasRacing, 45 minutes
- Minister & NRE, 1 hour
- Commissioner, 1 hour. (Ms Johnston)

The Committee discussed the media release and advertisement.

Resolved, that the media release and advertisement be published (Ms O'Connor).

At 3.46 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 10 February 2026.

Confirmed,

**JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON
GREYHOUND RACING TRANSITION
TUESDAY, 10 February 2026**

The Committee met in Committee Room 2, Parliament House, Hobart, at 9:01 a.m.

Members Present:

Ms Johnston (Chair)
Ms O'Connor
Ms Webb
Mr Winter

APOLOGIES

Ms Rattray and Mr Vermey were apologies.

MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Resolved, the minutes of the last meeting, as read, were accepted as an accurate record (Ms O'Connor).

The Committee discussed the arrangements for the undertaking of the Inquiry. Mr Winter placed on the record his concerns with the meeting and hearing schedules, submission period, advertisement for submissions and publication process for submissions, which could not be raised at the meeting on 15 December 2025 as he was unable to attend. Ms Webb placed on the record her concerns regarding the lack of accessibility to submissions for witnesses prior to their attendance before hearings of the Inquiry today.

BILL INQUIRY

RECEIPT OF SUBMISSIONS

Ordered, that the following submissions be received and published in full, with the personal contact details of individuals being removed (Ms Johnston):

Submission No. 1: Laura E Kennedy
Submission No. 2: Angela Bennett
Submission No. 3: Eliza Allan
Submission No.5: Chris Undy
Submission No. 6: Mande Bijelic
Submission No. 7: Jane Lewis
Submission No. 9: Mike Ives
Submission No. 10: David Wallace
Submission No. 12: John Archer
Submission No. 13: R.W.McKellar – Ellis
Submission No. 14: Sue Denehey
Submission No. 15: Michael Chaffer

Submission No. 16: Debbie Davis
Submission No. 17: Jon Othitis
Submission No. 18: Rosalyn
Newton
Submission No. 20: Paul Whitmore
Submission No. 21: Lisa Bouten
Submission No. 22: Adrian Pickin
Submission No. 23: RSPCA
Tasmania
Submission No. 24: Stefan Wells
Submission No. 25: Sharyn
Marhsall
Submission No. 27: Jan Davis
Submission No. 28: Alicia Law
Submission No. 29: Fiona Masters
Submission No. 30: Anne Boxhall
Submission No. 31: Michael
O'Halloran
Submission No. 32: Debbie Eastley
Submission No. 33: Victoria
Sublette
Submission No. 34: Noel Gibson
Submission No. 35: Alison Hookey
Submission No. 36: Free the
Hounds
Submission No. 37: Margart
Murray
Submission No. 38: Tom Englund
Submission No. 39: Christine
Dorchak
Submission No. 41: Elliott Fox
Submission No. 42: Jane
Longbourne
Submission No. 43: Anne Hendley
Submission No. 44: Tash Croft
Submission No. 46: Mike Pearce
Submission No. 47: Ellen
Brownlow
Submission No. 48: Stephen
Gerrad
Submission No. 50: Linda
Emmerton
Submission No. 51: Lee Thomas
Submission No. 52: Megan Ambrus

Submission No. 53: Sylvia
Schiavoni
Submission No. 55: Anni Wilson
Submission No. 56: Robyn
Osbourne
Submission No. 57: Tasmanian
Dog Walking Club
Submission No. 58: Dogs Home
Tasmania
Submission No. 59: Heinz
Ahlemyer
Submission No. 61: Catherine
McFadyen
Submission No. 62: Wynter Greene
Submission No. 63: Claire Pettit
Submission No. 64: June Phillips
Submission No. 65: Kate Tenni
Submission No. 66: Lesley Jolly
Submission No. 67: Ben Englund
Submission No. 68: North West
Greyhound Racing Club
Submission No. 69: Marianne
Stansfield
Submission No. 70: Janene
McCarthy
Submission No. 71: Mary Bent
Submission No. 72: Stephen
Lockley
Submission No. 74: Josh
Gatehouse
Submission No. 75: Serena Lloyd
Submission No. 76: Ruth Howard
Submission No. 77: Tasracing
Submission No. 78: Dr Kate Barrett
Submission No. 79: Gerard Alford
and Melissa Kitto
Submission No. 80: Steven O'Brien
Submission No. 81: Angela Darch
Submission No. 82: Craig Jones
Submission No. 83: Dr Katrina
Ward
Submission No. 84: Diane and
Lewis McCulloch

Submission No. 86: Dr Claire Sheppard
Submission No. 87: Melbourne Greyhound Racing Association
Submission No. 88: Carol Timbrell
Submission No. 90: Cameron Betts
Submission No. 91: Ross Work
Submission No. 92: Dr Lee Butterworth
Submission No. 93: Michael Stringer
Submission No. 94: Kara Rickson
Submission No. 96: Shaunagh Wood
Submission No. 97: Megan Alessandrini
Submission No. 98: Hobart Greyhound Racing Club committee
Submission No. 99: Claire Robins
Submission No. 100: Sarah Boyd
Submission No. 101: Frank Feeney
Submission No. 102: Dr Sally Rickson
Submission No. 103: Ivan John Fehlberg
Submission No. 104: Carol Martin
Submission No. 105: Jamie Devine
Submission No. 106: Janet Ramsey
Submission No. 107: Hannah Pearce
Submission No. 108: Murray Bridge Greyhound Racing Club Inc
Submission No. 109: Dr Hannah O'Brien
Submission No. 110: Graeme Barber
Submission No. 111: Brian Geard
Submission No. 112: Brennan Ryan
Submission No. 113: Jared Marshall
Submission No. 114: Peter Gugger, Christie Hayes and Greg Irons

Submission No. 115: NSW Greyhound Breeders, Owners and Trainers Association
Submission No. 116: Ross and Cheryl Freeman
Submission No. 117: David Booth
Submission No. 118: Sylvia Mace
Submission No. 119: Humane World for Animals
Submission No. 120: Launceston Greyhound Club
Submission No. 121: Michelle Collis
Submission No. 122: Tracey Watts
Submission No. 123: Greyhound Racing New South Wales
Submission No. 124: Angela Rowe
Submission No. 125: Responsible Wagering Australia
Submission No. 126: Tull Luttrell
Submission No. 127: The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals New Zealand (SPCANZ)
Submission No. 129: Tasmanian Canine Association Inc (Trading as Dogs Tasmania)
Submission No. 130: Greyhounds Tasmania
Submission No. 131: Luke Gatehouse
Submission No. 132: Gary Fahey
Submission No. 133: Jenny Geard
Submission No. 135: Robin Grubb
Submission No. 136: Roy Rickson
Submission No. 137: Greyhound Clubs Victoria
Submission No. 138: Cranbourne Greyhound Racing Club
Submission No. 139: Greyhound Racing SA
Submission No. 140: Greyhound Australasia
Submission No. 141: FOUR PAWS Australia

Submission No. 142: Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds
Submission No. 143: Patrick Daniels
Submission No. 144: Animals Australia
Submission No. 145: Greyhound Clubs Australia
Submission No. 146: Colin Howlett OAM

Ordered, That the following submissions be received and published with details redacted as requested by the submission authors (Ms Johnston):

Submission No. 4: Name withheld
Submission No. 8: Name withheld
Submission No. 11: Julia
Submission No. 26: Name withheld
Submission No. 40: Name withheld
Submission No. 54: Name withheld
Submission No. 60: Name withheld
Submission No. 89: Name withheld
Submission No. 95: Name withheld
Submission No. 128: JMR

Ordered, That the following submissions be received and kept confidential (Ms Johnston):

Submission No. 19: Name withheld
Submission No. 45: Name withheld
Submission No. 49: Name withheld
Submission No. 73: Name withheld
Submission No. 85: Name withheld

Submission No. 134: Name withheld

Resolved, that the Secretariat contact Michelle Collis regarding the publication of the photos present in her submission (Ms Johnston).

BILL INQUIRY CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED
The Committee received and noted the following correspondence:

- Simon Stout, CEO, Greyhounds Australasia email dated 30 January 2026.

Resolved, to further discuss Mr Stout's request regarding attendance before a public hearing after the conclusion of oral evidence tomorrow, Wednesday 11 February 2026. (Ms Webb).

....

**BILL INQUIRY
PUBLIC HEARING**

At 9.33 a.m. Hon Jane Howlett, MP, Minister for Racing, Ms Diedre Wilson, Acting Chief Operations Officer, Department of Natural Resources (NRE), Ms Anita Yan, Deputy Chief Operations Officer, NRE and Stephen Hall, Principal Adviser, Legal Services, Biosecurity Tasmania, were called. Ms Wilson, Ms Yan and Mr Hall made the statutory declaration, and all witnesses were examined by the Committee in public.

At 10.30 a.m. the witnesses withdrew.
Suspension of sitting from 10.32 a.m. to 10.44 a.m.

**BILL INQUIRY
PUBLIC HEARING**

At 10.45 a.m. Andrew Jenkins, CEO, Tasracing was called, made the statutory declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

At 11.26 a.m. the witness withdrew.

OTHER MATTERS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROCESS

The Committee discussed the process for Questions on Notice and Additional Information requests as a result of the hearing. Witnesses at both hearing sessions agreed to take a number of Questions on Notice which were asked and accepted verbatim and will be reflected as such in the Transcript of Evidence.

The Minister and her support team also accepted to take on Notice requests for additional information and questions regarding technical elements of the Bill. The Chair noted that the process for the latter questions will be discussed further after the conclusion of the next hearing, to consider appropriate timelines for questions from Members and for responses from the Minister.

At 11.28 a.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 11 February 2026.

Confirmed,

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON GREYHOUND RACING TRANSITION

WEDNESDAY, 11 February 2026

The Committee met in Committee Room 2, Parliament House, Hobart, at 9.00 a.m.

Members Present:

Ms Johnston (Chair)
Ms O'Connor
Ms Rattray
Ms Webb
Mr Winter

APOLOGIES

Mr Vermey was an apology

BILL INQUIRY

PUBLIC HEARING

At 9.00 a.m. Luke Gatehouse, Greyhounds Tasmania, Ben Clark, Greyhounds Tasmania, John Newson, Launceston Greyhound Racing Club, Clare Robins, Hobart Greyhound Racing Club and Ben Englund, Northwest Greyhound Racing Club, were called, made the statutory declaration and were examined by the Committee in public.

At 10.30 a.m. the witnesses withdrew.

Suspension of sitting from 10.30 a.m. to 10.45 a.m.

BILL INQUIRY

PUBLIC HEARING

At 10.45 a.m. Andrew Dawkins, CEO RSPCA Tasmania, Mark Wild, CEO Dogs' Home Tasmania, were called, made the statutory declaration and were examined by the Committee in public.

At 11.16 a.m. the witnesses withdrew.

Suspension of sitting from 11.16 a.m. to 11.30 a.m.

BILL INQUIRY

PUBLIC HEARING

At 11.30 a.m. Sean Carroll, Commissioner for Racing Integrity, was called, made the statutory declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

At 12.37 p.m. the witness withdrew.

BILL INQUIRY

The Committee discussed the inquiry timeline.

Resolved, to agree to the following amended inquiry timeline (Ms Johnston):

- Questions on Notice (QoN) and Additional Information (AI) for Minister due to Secretary – COB 16 February 2026
- Committee resolve to sending QoN and AI via email – 4pm 17 February 2026
- Chair’s draft – 24 February 2026
- Committee draft – 26 February 2026
- Responses to QoN – 2 March 2026
- Additional public hearing – 6 March 2026
- Report deliberative meetings – 10 March 2026, 1, April 2026, 2 April 2026
- Reporting date – 14 April 2026

Resolved, that the Minister for Racing, Hon Jane Howlett MP with representative of NRE Tasmania, and Greyhounds Australasia be each invited to present evidence to the Committee at the additional public hearing on 6 March 2026 and that, if upon receipt of the responses to Questions on Notice and Additional Information requests from the Minister and NRE the Committee feels its queries have been appropriately addressed, the hearing session of the Minister and NRE will be cancelled. (Ms Johnston)

OTHER MATTERS

Resolved, to accept a document in confidence (Ms Johnston).

At 1.01 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Friday 6 March 2026.

Confirmed,

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON GREYHOUND RACING TRANSITION

FRIDAY, 6 MARCH 2026

The Committee met in Committee Room 3, Parliament House, Hobart, at 9.59 a.m.

Members Present:

Ms Johnston (Chair)
Ms O’Connor
Ms Rattray
Mr Vermey
Ms Webb
Mr Winter

APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

BILL INQUIRY

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

- a) Submission from Jane McNicholl, received on 6 February 2026

Resolved, that the submission be received and published (Ms Webb).

- Additional submission provided by Greyhounds Australia - “Greyhound Australasia, Supplementary Submission, 6 March 2026,”

Resolved, that the above supplementary submission be received and published (Ms Webb).

- b) Answers to questions – Minister for Racing Hon Jane Howlett MP received 25 February 2026
- c) Answers to questions – Dogs’ Homes of Tasmania received 2 March 2026
- d) Answers to questions – Sean Carroll, Tasmanian Racing

Integrity Commissioner dated 2 March 2026

- e) Answers to questions – Andrew Jenkins, CEO, Tasracing dated 2 March 2026
- g) Answers to questions – Greyhounds Australasia dated 2 March 2026

Resolved, that the above answers to questions be received, published and incorporated into the Committees report as necessary (Ms O'Connor).

- f) Email from Sean Carroll, Racing Integrity Commissioner dated 2 March 2026

Resolved, to write to Mr Carroll agreeing to accept the information on a confidential basis (Ms Johnston).

- f) Additional information provided by the Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll received 5 March 2026

Resolved, that the information be received (Ms Johnston).

Suspension of sitting 10.02 a.m. to 10.03 a.m.

BILL INQUIRY

PUBLIC HEARING

At 10.03a.m. Simon Stout, CEO, Greyhounds Australasia was called, made the statutory declaration and was examined by the Committee in public.

Mr Stout tabled a document to the Committee “Greyhound Australasia, Supplementary Submission, 6 March 2026,” which the Committee accepted into evidence.

At 10.43 a.m. the witness withdrew.

Suspension of sitting from 10.43 a.m. to 10.53 a.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 & 1 February 2026 were agreed to as an accurate record (Ms Webb).

CORRESPONDENCE OUTGOING

- a) Correspondence to CEO of Greyhounds Australasia, sent on 16 February 2026
- b) Questions on Notice – Mark Wild, Dogs Homes of Tasmania, sent on 17 February 2026
- c) Questions on Notice and Additional Information requests – Minister for Racing and NRE Representatives, sent 17 February 2026
- d) Questions on Notice and Additional Information requests – Andrew Jenkins, Tasracing, sent 17 February 2026
- e) Questions on Notice and Additional Information requests – Sean Carroll, Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, sent 17 February 2026

Outgoing correspondence noted (Ms O'Connor).

BILL INQUIRY

REPORT DELIBERATION

The Committee considered the Chairs draft report. The following sections were considered: =

Chapter 1: Appointment and Conduct of the Inquiry was considered:

Paragraphs 1.1 – 1.6.

Paragraph 1.7 amended.

Paragraph 1.8.

Chapter 2: Background of the Bill was considered:

Paragraph 2.1.

Paragraph 2.2 amended.

Paragraphs 2.3.

Paragraph 2.4 amended

Paragraph 2.5 & 2.6.

New paragraph x to follow 2.6 was inserted.

Paragraph 2.7 to 2.9.

Paragraph 2.9 omitted.

Paragraph 2.10 amended.

Paragraphs 2.11 – 2.20.

New paragraphs to follow 2.21 were inserted in relation to previous two petitions tabled in the Legislative Council and the number of on-track and off-track injuries.

Chapter 3: Examination of the Bill

Part 1 – Preliminary (Clauses 1 & 2) was considered:

Paragraphs 3.1 to 3.3.

Paragraph 3.4 amended.

Paragraph 3.5.

Paragraph 3.6 amended.

Paragraph 3.7.

Paragraph 3.8 amended.

Paragraph 3.9 amended.

New paragraphs to follow 3.9 were inserted in relation to responses received about breeding data.

Paragraph 3.10 amended.

Paragraph 3.11 amended.

Paragraph 3.12 omitted.

Sitting suspended from 11.59 a.m. – 12.49 p.m.

Members Present: Ms Johnston, Ms Rattray, Ms O'Connor, Ms Webb and Mr Winter.

New paragraph x to follow two new paragraphs inserted after 3.10 (New 3.12).

Paragraph 3.13.

Paragraph 3.14 and 3.15 amended.

Paragraph 3.16.

Paragraph 3.17 amended. Part of this RSPCA quote to be inserted in rehoming section.

At 1:04 p. m. Mr Vermey returned to the Table.

Paragraph 3.18 agreed to.

Paragraph 3.19 amended.

Paragraphs 3.20 to 3.21.

Paragraph 3.22 removed for consideration elsewhere

Paragraphs 3.23 & 3.24 omitted.

Paragraph 3.25 amended and proposed to be moved to another section.

Paragraph 3.26 to 3.28.

New paragraph x to follow 3.28 was inserted in relation to the drafting process of the Bill.

The Committee considered findings for this section.

The Committee considered the following recommendation: -

That Clause 1 and Clause 2 of the Bill be agreed to with amendment to the commencement date at 2 (1).

Part 2 – Animal Welfare Act 1993 Amended (Clauses 3 & 4) was considered:

Paragraphs 3.30 & 3.31.

Paragraph 3.32 and 3.33 omitted.

Inserted New Paragraph 3.32 agreed to as amended.

New paragraph proposed to follow 3.32

At 2.21 p.m. Ms Rattray left the Table.

Suspension of sitting 2.21 p.m. to 2.27 p.m.

Members Present: Ms Johnston, Ms O'Connor, Ms Webb and Mr Winter.

At 2:28 p.m. Mr Vermey returned to the Table.

At 2:29 p.m. Mr Vermey left the Table.

The Committee reconsidered the above paragraphs.

At 2:33 p.m. Mr Vermey returned to the Table.

Paragraphs 3.34 to 3.39

Paragraph 3.40 amended and part to be moved elsewhere in Part 4.

Paragraph 3.41 amended.

Paragraph 3.42 & 3.43 omitted.

Paragraph 3.44.

Paragraph 3.45 & 3.46 amended.

Paragraph 3.47 amended and proposed to be moved to follow new paragraph 3.39.

Paragraphs 3.48 – 3.49.

Paragraph 3.50 proposed to be moved to section 7.

Paragraph 3.51.

Paragraph 3.52 amended.

Paragraph 3.53.

Paragraph 3.54 omitted.

Paragraph 3.55 amended.

Paragraph 3.56 amended.

Proposed New Paragraph to follow 3.55.

At 3:11 p.m. Mr Vermey left the Table.

Paragraph 3.57 & 3.58 amended.

At 3:16 p.m. Mr Vermey returned to the Table.

Findings considered and amended.

Recommendations considered and amended.

Part 3 – Dog Control Act 2000 Amended (Clauses 5 to 7) was considered:

Paragraph 3.63 & 3.64.

Paragraph 3.65 amended.

Paragraphs 3.66 & 3.67 omitted.

Paragraph 3.68 to 3.72.

Paragraph 3.73 & 3.74 omitted.

Paragraph 3.75 to 3.78.

Paragraph 3.79 amended and postponed for reconsideration.

Paragraph 3.80 & 3.81.

Paragraph 3.82 amended.
Paragraph 3.83 omitted.
Paragraph 3.84 amended.
Paragraph 3.85 considered.
At 4:16 Ms Webb left the Table.
At 4:17 Mr Vermey left the Table.
Quorum lost.
Quorum present at 4.18 p.m. when Mr Vermey returned to the Table.
At 4:21 p.m. Ms Webb returned to the Table.
The Committee further considered paragraph 3.85.

OTHER MATTERS

There were no other matters.
At 4.24 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Tuesday 10 March 2026.

Confirmed,

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON GREYHOUND RACING TRANSITION TUESDAY, 10 MARCH 2026

The Committee met in Committee Room 3, Parliament House, Hobart, at 9.02 a.m.

Members Present:

Ms Johnston (Chair)
Ms O'Connor
Ms Webb
Mr Winter

Via Teams:

Ms Rattray

APOLOGIES

Mr Vermey was an apology.

BILL INQUIRY

REPORT DELIBERATION

The Committee continued to consider the Chairs draft report.

The Committee considered the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 3.85.
Paragraph 3.86 was amended.
Paragraphs 3.87.
Paragraph 3.88 omitted.
Paragraph 3.89.
Paragraph 3.90 was amended.
Paragraph 3.91 was moved to follow 3.89.
Paragraph 3.92 was omitted.
Paragraphs 3.93 and 3.94 were amended.
paragraph 3.95.
Findings for Part 3 were considered.
Recommendation for Part 3 were considered.
Part 4 – Racing Regulation and Integrity Act 2024 Amended (Clauses 8 to 10) was considered:
Paragraphs 3.100 and 3.101.
New paragraph x to follow paragraph 3.101 was inserted.
Paragraph 3.102 to 3.105.
New Paragraph x to follow 3.105 was inserted.
Paragraphs 3.106 to 3.111.
Two new paragraphs were inserted to follow paragraph 3.111 in relation to the Greyhound Racing Rules search powers and the Animal Control Act search powers.

Suspension of sitting 10.30 a.m. to 10.44 a.m.

New paragraph x to follow paragraph 3.112 was inserted about objectives for the Transition plan.

Paragraphs 3.113 to 3.116

Paragraph 3.117 omitted.

Paragraph 3.118 amended.

Paragraphs 3.119 and 3.120 moved from chapter three omitted.

Paragraphs 3.121, 3.122 & 3.123 amended.

Paragraphs 3.124 to 3.126.

Paragraph 3.127 amended.

Paragraphs 3.128 to 3.129.

At 11.31 a.m. Ms Rattray left the meeting.

Paragraph 3.130 amended.

Paragraph 3.131.

Paragraph 3.132 amended.

Paragraph 3.133.

Paragraph 3.134 omitted.

New paragraph x to follow paragraph 3.133 inserted.

Paragraph 3.135 & 3.136 amended.

Paragraph 3.137.

Paragraph 3.138, 3.139 & 3.140 amended.

Paragraph 3.141 omitted.

Paragraph 3.142 amended.

Suspension of sitting 11.59 a.m. to 12.01 p.m.

Paragraph 3.143 amended.

Paragraph 3.144 omitted.

Paragraphs 3.145 & 3.146.

Paragraph 3.147 amended.

Paragraph 3.148 to 3.150.

Paragraph 3.151 omitted.

Paragraph 3.152 & 3.153.

Paragraph 3.154 amended.

Paragraph 3.155 omitted.

At 12.12 p.m. Ms Rattray returned.

Paragraph 3.156 amended.

Paragraph 3.157.

Paragraph 3.158 omitted.

Paragraphs 3.159, 3.160 & 3.161 amended.

Paragraph 3.162.

Paragraph 3.163.

Paragraph 3.164 omitted.

Paragraphs 3.165 and 3.166.

Suspension of sitting 12.31 p.m. to 1.32 p.m.

Members present: - Ms Johnston, Ms Webb, Ms O'Connor and Mr Winter. Via Teams: Ms Rattray.

Paragraph 3.167 to 3.169.

Paragraph 3.170 amended.

Paragraph 3.171 omitted.

Paragraph 3.172 & 3.173 amended.

Paragraph 3.174 moved to follow 3.172

Paragraph 3.175.

Paragraph 3.176 amended.

Paragraphs 3.177 to 3.179

Paragraph 3.180 omitted.

Paragraph 3.181.
Paragraph 3.182 amended.
Paragraphs 3.183 & 3.184.
Paragraphs 3.185 & 3.186 amended.
New paragraphs x to follow 3.186 inserted.
Paragraph 3.187 omitted.
Paragraph 3.188.
Paragraphs 3.189, 3.190 & 3.191 amended.
Paragraphs 3.189 & 3.190 inserted to follow 3.191 under Regulations heading.
Suspension of sitting from 3.09 p.m. to 3.14 p.m.
Paragraph 3.192 omitted.
Paragraph 3.193.
New paragraph x to follow 3.193 inserted.
The Committee considered its findings for this section.
The Committee considered its recommendations for this section.
Suspension of sitting 3.09 p.m. to 3.14 p.m.
Paragraph 3.194.
Paragraph 3.195 omitted.
Committee comment considered.
The Committee considered the recommendation that Part 5 of the Bill be agreed to.
Paragraph 3.196 & 3.17

The Committee considered the recommendation that part 6 of the Bill be agreed to.
The Committee considered Chapter 4:
Paragraphs 4.1 to 4.4
Paragraph 4.5 amended.
Paragraphs 4.6 to 4.9.
Paragraph 4.10 moved to follow 4.13.
Paragraph 4.11 omitted.
Paragraph 4.12 amended.
Paragraph 4.13.
Paragraph 4.14 omitted.
Paragraph 4.15.
Paragraph 4.16 omitted.
Paragraph 4.17.
Paragraph 4.18 omitted.
Paragraph 4.19.
Paragraph 4.20 & 4.21 amended.
Paragraphs 4.22 to 4.23.
Paragraph 4.24 omitted.
Paragraph 4.25.
Paragraphs 4.26 & 4.27.
Paragraph 4.28 omitted.
Paragraphs 4.29 & 4.30.
New paragraphs x to follow 4.30 inserted.
Paragraph 4.31 amended.
Paragraphs 4.32 & 4.33.
Paragraph 4.34 omitted.
Paragraphs 4.35 to 4.37.
New paragraph inserted before 3.19 and after 3.19.

Findings amended in Part 1.

NEXT MEETING

The Committee *Resolved*, to hold an additional meeting on 19 March 2026 at 1. p.m. to try to finalise the draft report. It is then proposed that the Committee Table its report on 24 March 2026 if complete.

OTHER MATTERS

There were no other matters.

At 4.32 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 19 March 2026.

Confirmed,

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON GREYHOUND RACING TRANSITION THURSDAY, 19 MARCH 2026

The Committee met in Committee Room 1, Parliament House, Hobart, at 1.05 p.m.

Members Present:

Ms Johnston (Chair)
Ms O'Connor
Ms Rattray
Ms Webb
Mr Winter

APOLOGIES

Mr Vermey was an apology.

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held 6 March 2026 and 10 March 2026 were agreed to as an accurate record (Ms O'Connor).

CORRESPONDENCE

INCOMING

The Committee considered the following correspondence received:

- Letter for Simon Stout, CEO, Greyhounds Australasia dated 16 March 2026.

Resolved, that the letter be received and published (Ms Webb).

OUTGOING

The Committee considered the following outgoing letter:-

- To Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner, Sean Carroll in regards to a private briefing expanding upon information provided by answers to questions.

Noted, that the letter has been sent and *Resolved*, to consider a time for any further briefing at a later meeting.

At 1.06 p.m. Ms Rattray came to the Table.

BILL INQUIRY

REPORT DELIBERATION

The Committee continued to consider the Chairs draft report.

Paragraphs 2.7 and 2.8 agreed to.

New paragraph x inserted to follow paragraph 2.3

Paragraph 2.14 agreed to as amended.

Paragraph 2.2 agreed to as amended.

The Committee discussed an email provided by Ms O'Connor from Tasracing CEO, Andrew Jenkins, in relation to on and off tracks injuries for greyhound racing for 2026.

Resolved, to note the above email and write to Mr Jenkins to request this information be formally provided to the Committee by letter for inclusion in the Committee's report.

Paragraph 2.25 agreed to.

The Committee considered two potential versions of paragraphs 3.10.

Resolved, to include the second version of this paragraph.

Paragraphs 3.11 and 3.12 agreed to.

Paragraph 3.13 agreed to as amended.

Paragraphs 3.56, 3.73 and 3.91 agreed to.

Question being put – That paragraphs 1.1 to 1.8 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 4	Noes 1
<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	
<i>Ms Rattray</i>	
<i>Ms Webb</i>	

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question was put – That Chapter 1 stand as part of the Committee's Report

The Committee divided

Ayes 4	Noes 1
<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	
<i>Ms Rattray</i>	
<i>Ms Webb</i>	

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put - That paragraphs 2.1 to 2.25 be agreed to.

The Committee divided.

Ayes 4	Noes 1
--------	--------

<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
--------------------	------------------

Ms O'Connor

Ms Rattray

Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the affirmative.

Question put - That Chapter 2 stand as part of the Committee's report.

The Committee divided

Question put - That Chapter 2 stand as part of the Committee's report.

The Committee divided

Ayes 4	Noes 1
<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	
<i>Ms Rattray</i>	
<i>Ms Webb</i>	

And it was resolved in the affirmative.

Question put – That paragraphs 3.1 to 3.31 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3	Noes 2
<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Ms Rattray</i>
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
<i>Ms Webb</i>	

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

The Committee considered the report findings.

Question put – That Findings 1 to 8 as amended be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

The Committee Resolved to only insert Committee recommendations at the beginning of the Committee report.

Question put – That paragraphs 3.32 to 3.59 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Findings 9 to 11 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That paragraphs 3.60 to 3.86 be agreed to.

The Committee divided.

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Findings 12 to 15 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That paragraphs 3.87 to 3.139 be agreed to

The Committee divided

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Findings 16 to 26 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put that paragraph 3.140 be agreed to as amended.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That paragraphs 3.141 to 3.142 be agreed to.

The Committee divided.

Ayes 3	Noes 2
<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Ms Rattray</i>
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
<i>Ms Webb</i>	

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.
Question put that Chapter 3 stand as part of the Committee's report.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3	Noes 2
<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Ms Rattray</i>
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
<i>Ms Webb</i>	

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.
Question put – That paragraphs 4.1 to 4.20 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3	Noes 2
<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Ms Rattray</i>
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
<i>Ms Webb</i>	

It was resolved in the Affirmative.
Question put that paragraphs 4.21 to 4.33 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 4	Noes 1
<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
<i>Ms Rattray</i>	
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	
<i>Ms Webb</i>	

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Findings 32 to 36 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 4	Noes 1
--------	--------

<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	
<i>Ms Rattray</i>	
<i>Ms Webb</i>	

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Chapter 4 stand as part of the Committee's report.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3	Noes 2
<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Ms Rattray</i>
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
<i>Ms Webb</i>	

Question put - That Findings 27 to 31 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 4	Noes 1
<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	
<i>Ms Rattray</i>	
<i>Ms Webb</i>	

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Ayes 3	Noes 2
--------	--------

<i>Ms Johnston</i>	<i>Ms Rattray</i>
<i>Ms O'Connor</i>	<i>Mr Winter</i>
<i>Ms Webb</i>	

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

The Committee considered the Report Recommendations.

Question put - That Recommendation 1 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put - That Recommendation 2 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put -That Recommendation 3 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 4 Noes 1
Ms Johnston Mr Winter
Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Recommendation 4 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 4 Noes 1
Ms Johnston Mr Winter
Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Recommendation 5 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Recommendation 6 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Recommendation 7 be agreed to.

The Committee divided.

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Recommendation 8 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3 Noes 2
Ms Johnston Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor Mr Winter
Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Recommendation 9 be agreed to.

The Committee divided.

Ayes 3	Noes 2
Ms Johnston	Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor	Mr Winter
Ms Webb	

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Recommendation 10 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3	Noes 2
Ms Johnston	Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor	Mr Winter
Ms Webb	

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Recommendation 11 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 4	Noes 1
Ms Johnston	Mr Winter
Ms Rattray	
Ms O'Connor	
Ms Webb	

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Recommendation 12 be agreed to.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3	Noes 2
--------	--------

Ms Johnston	Ms Rattray
-------------	------------

Ms O'Connor	Mr Winter
-------------	-----------

Ms Webb

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put – That Recommendation 13 be agreed to.

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Question put that the Report be the Report of the Committee.

The Committee divided

Ayes 3	Noes 2
Ms Johnston	Ms Rattray
Ms O'Connor	Mr Winter
Ms Webb	

And it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Resolved, that any Member wishing to provide a dissenting report provide said report to the Committee Secretary by 5 p.m. Monday 23 March 2026.

Resolved, that the Committee table its Final Report on Wednesday, 25 March 2026.

OTHER MATTERS

There were no other matters.

At 2.21 p.m. the Committee adjourned until a date to be determined.