

Founded in 2005, Lawyers for Animals Inc. (“LFA”) is a (not-for-profit) animal law think tank based in Melbourne. We are committed to alleviating animal suffering through education and law. Since mid-2013, LFA has partnered with Fitzroy Legal Service to provide Australia's first Animal Law Clinic: a free legal advice service assisting clients whose interests are likely to coincide with those of the animal(s) legally concerned. During 11 years of operation, LFA has accreted knowledge and practical experience of the animal welfare system, including the role and practice of RSPCA Victoria (“RSPCA”).

LFA recognises the enormous and unenviable burden borne by RSPCA – a charity – in attempting to fulfil a government function: law enforcement. LFA submits that as a non-government, charitable body, RSPCA is fundamentally incapable of ongoing animal cruelty law enforcement, whereas Victoria Police is. There are three main reasons for this:

1. Perpetual resource deficiencies. RSPCA receives about one third of its annual Inspectorate budget from government. Their total Inspectorate budget allows employment of ten full-time inspectors on average – with only one rostered on weekends. Based on there having been 10,740 cruelty reports received in 2014-15, that means an average of four cruelty reports per day for each Inspector to thoroughly investigate, prosecute or otherwise resolve, as well as to organise care of vulnerable animals. That is simply impossible. Hence, large numbers of cruelty reports are necessarily ignored or not properly investigated or prosecuted. Little wonder that despite 10,740 cruelty reports, only 69 cruelty prosecutions were finalised by RSPCA in 2014-15 (0.64%). RSPCA relies on charitable donations and bequests to cover the two-thirds shortfall in what is already a totally inadequate Inspectorate budget. To attract donations/bequests and ongoing government funding, RSPCA attempts to maintain public confidence by projecting strength and stability. Underneath, the stresses of financial deficit and being inherently unsuited to law enforcement erodes its integrity and morale. Staff and animals suffer the consequences. The Government is not directly blamed for the failures to enforce animal cruelty laws, so they do not feel the full force of public fury when animals suffer unnecessarily over prolonged periods – such as under Bruce Akers' and Heather Healey's care. Without such public pressure, the Government is less inclined to prioritise resources appropriately. The city of New York faced a very similar situation before the ASPCA and NYPD devised a joint-solution, now also endorsed by the Animal Legal Defense Fund, see:
 - <http://www.asPCA.org/about-us/press-releases/nypd-aspca-partnership-reports-record-breaking-number-animal-cruelty-arrests>
 - <http://www.asPCA.org/animal-protection/nypd-partnership>
 - <https://www.policeone.com/police-jobs-and-careers/articles/6719145-NYPD-takes-over-after-ASPCA-closes-enforcement-unit/>
2. Lack of power and public attitudinal change. Animal cruelty reporting is expanding commensurate with increased public awareness of animals' right not to suffer and society's growing intolerance of animal cruelty. Animal cruelty is regarded by offenders and (to a decreasing extent) the general public, as child abuse and domestic violence once were: private matters between a person and their 'property'. Unless responsibility for animal cruelty law enforcement is transferred to a dedicated, adequately resourced squad within Victoria Police, examples of failure to protect animals will increase. In contrast to Victoria Police, RSPCA Inspectors have extremely limited powers of entry to residences and/or arrest; no weapons or other training to equip them to deal with situations of violence; and no public imprimatur for strong law enforcement.

3. Lack of financial indemnity. No law enforcement agency – police or otherwise – can operate effectively when it is not indemnified for debts resulting from civil proceedings, occasioned by its enforcement work. On 10 September 2015, RSPCA was refused leave to appeal against a judgment ordering it pay \$1.167m compensation for what His Honour Judge Bowman of the County Court had determined was a negligent destruction of cattle undertaken in May 2003 [RSPCA v Holdsworth [2015] VSCA 243]. This one case has substantially impacted on RSPCA's budget – which was already in deficit, requiring it to obtain a bank loan which must now be repaid. It is likely to have undermined RSPCA's confidence in enforcing animal cruelty laws, especially following its unsuccessful prosecution of the parties in the Ballarat Magistrates' Court in 2005. The financial risks are simply too great and (apparently) uninsurable, at least by RSPCA. All law enforcement agencies should be indemnified by the governments to which they are responsible.

With our last few words, we outline a constructive alternative for the Review's consideration:

- creation of a dedicated Animal Cruelty Investigation Squad (“ACIS”) within Victoria Police;
- creation of an Office of Animal Welfare within the Department of Justice to oversee ACIS and fulfil many functions of the former Bureau of Animal Welfare, keeping it independent from the Department of Agriculture; and
- removal of RSPCA's Inspectorate powers and funding, permitting it to refocus on animal care.

Victorians don't expect human welfare charities to enforce our criminal laws, so it's high time we stopped expecting the RSPCA to enforce our animal cruelty laws.