

2011

Animal Law - Clients With Four Legs, Fur and Feathers?

Jackson Walkden-Brown

Bond University, Jackson_Walkden_Brown@bond.edu.au

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epublications.bond.edu.au/nle>

Recommended Citation

Walkden-Brown, Jackson (2011) "Animal Law - Clients With Four Legs, Fur and Feathers?," *The National Legal Eagle*: Vol. 17: Iss. 1, Article 5.

Available at: <http://epublications.bond.edu.au/nle/vol17/iss1/5>

This Journal Article is brought to you by the Faculty of Law at ePublications@bond. It has been accepted for inclusion in The National Legal Eagle by an authorized administrator of ePublications@bond. For more information, please contact [Bond University's Repository Coordinator](#).

Animal Law - Clients With Four Legs, Fur and Feathers?

**Senior Teaching Fellow
Jackson Walkden-Brown
Faculty of Law
Bond University**

There is nothing so powerful in the world as an idea whose time has come.

The Honourable Michael Kirby AC CMG

Animal law... huh?

The term ‘animal law’ conjures up images of our four-legged and furry friends battling it out in a courtroom with curly white wigs and long black robes. Or perhaps, upon reading the title of this article, you imagined a little piglet sitting in a lawyer’s office reading *Women’s Weekly* whilst waiting for a consultation? Indeed, I spent the last hour attempting to sketch a cartoon depicting this very image, but failed miserably and have cowered away from allowing my artistic failings to see the light of day in a publication.

As an animal law teacher, I am often asked ‘what is animal law?’ I usually respond by firstly pointing out that animal law is, in fact, concerned with the behaviour of humans as much as it is concerned with animals. A student studying animal law is introduced to a range of practical and theoretical perspectives on the way in which humans interact with, and think about, animals. The central focus is legal regulation and the ethical dimensions of animal welfare and rights. The animal law journey takes place upon a windy road, with many twist and turns. Assumptions regarding the moral worthiness of animals are questioned. Ideas of human dominance are challenged. And proposals for legal reform are encouraged.

In an attempt to suitably answer the question of ‘what is animal law?’, I thought it best to first outline the sort of topics that are covered in an animal law course. In doing so, I have also provided background information regarding the recent emergence of animal law as a subject in Australian universities. Then, the legal status of animals has been explained and some of the inequalities in the law governing animals have been explored. The article closes with a discussion of the role of lawyers in the so-called ‘animal protection movement’, as well as some observations about the future of animal law in Australia.

Animal law’s rise to fame

The first animal law course in Australia was taught in 2005.¹ Since that time, eight other Australian law schools have introduced the subject into their curricula.² While this figure sounds relatively modest, it is in fact one-third of the law faculties in the country. Australian animal law scholars

and teachers often point to the astounding growth of animal law in the United States as an indicator of things to come down under.³ There has been a steep increase in animal law courses in US law schools since its relatively modest beginnings in the late 1980s. At latest count, there are more than 120 animal law subjects offered in the US, including at renowned institutions like Harvard, Stanford, Columbia and New York University. There is also an extremely well developed research culture in the US, exemplified by the existence of a specialist animal law research centre,⁴ three legal journals dealing specifically with animal law,⁵ several animal law textbooks,⁶ countless legal profession committees focused on animal law,⁷ and regular animal law conferences.⁸

Broadly speaking, an animal law course involves a blend of two teaching methods. On one side of the blackboard there is what is often referred to as a ‘black-letter’ law approach. In essence, this involves a careful examination of the legislation and cases that deal with animals and animal industries. On the other side of the blackboard lies a more contextual approach, drawing on other disciplines to promote a broader evaluation of the legal status of animals.

After investigating the theoretical aspects of the relationship between humans and animals, animal law students are taken on an expedition through a vast array of different topics, including criminal and cruelty offences, companion animals, animals in entertainment (e.g. circuses and zoos) and sport (e.g. horse racing, recreational hunting, rodeos), intensive farming practices, live export of animals, animal experimentation and research, animals in the wild, environmental impacts of agriculture, international developments in animal welfare regulation, and animal advocacy and law reform. The relevant law in each of these topics stems from a diverse range of legal disciplines.⁹

Hey, hands off my animal!

The starting point for any venture into the world of animal law is an examination of the legal status of animals. Quite simply, animals exist as the ‘property’ of human beings. Regardless of whether the animal is a pet, a farm animal, an animal in a science laboratory or an animal on roller skates in a circus – their legal status remains the same.¹⁰ The law views an animal in much the same way it views the shoes on your feet, the iPhone in your pocket, or the couch you are laying on while you read this article.

Once this relatively simple idea is understood, one is left wondering as to the nature and extent of this proprietary interest, and how it impacts the way we treat animals. There are some animal advocates who argue that very little progress in the quest to stop the exploitation of animals is possible until their property status is removed. Others are not as concerned by the legal status of animals and advocate that improvement in animal welfare is possible regardless of their status in law.

Many questions arise when we think about our relationship with animals. Are animals conscious of what is happening around them? Do animals feel pain in the same way as humans? Are some animals more conscious of humans and their surroundings than others? Do some animals deserve more protection than others? Should we balance human interests with animal interests before deciding to use an animal for a particular purpose or do animals have inherent value beyond their utility for humans? Why do we cuddle

some animals, but eat and hunt others? These are the sort of questions that we must ask ourselves in order to form a view on whether or not we think the laws affecting animals are adequate.

Two of the most important principles of Western law that underpin every aspect of our treatment of animals are liberty and equality. Liberty entitles one to be treated in a certain way because of what one is, especially one's mental capability. For example, a chimpanzee is conscious, probably self-aware, understands symbols, uses a sophisticated language and can solve complex problems. Do these 'human-like' features require that we treat chimpanzees in a certain way? Do these features require that we treat chimpanzees better than other animals about whom we do not know enough to know if they have these features? In other words, does a chimpanzee deserve more protection than a fish? Most would say yes.

You may have heard of Jeremy Bentham, the famous utilitarian philosopher. Bentham suggested the following to assist with these sorts of enquiries, '[t]he question is not, Can they reason? Nor, Can they talk? But, Can they suffer?'

What do you think Bentham meant by the term 'suffer'? Does an animal suffer in the same way as a human? Regardless of your answer to this question, it is likely you agree that an animal should not be made to suffer unnecessarily. But what if the result of the animal's suffering is a meal for your family or leather for your school shoes? What if the result of the suffering is the development of a cure for a terminal disease or the discovery of something new about the species that prevents its own extinction? What if the suffering allows you to be entertained for an evening or provides you with a fashionable clothing item to wear to the entertainment event?

Equality demands that likes be treated alike. In essence, equality requires a comparison. For example, consider a pair of twin beagle puppies. One was sold to a loving home in which he was treated like a member of the family for the duration of his life. The other was sold to a medical research facility in which she was housed in a small cage and subjected to painful experiments to test the side effects of various medications for the duration of her life. Does this offend equality? The same type of dog is being treated in very different ways because of where s/he is, and because there is a potential benefit for humans in the second scenario. Why does the law punish an individual for committing an act of animal cruelty in his or her backyard, but condone the very same cruel act if it is committed under the roof of a research laboratory?

Let us consider another example. It is now widely known that the vast majority of egg-laying chickens in Australia spend their lives in cages with a surface area less than the size of an A4 piece of paper. A battery hen, as they are most often called, has no exposure to sunlight for her entire life. She has no material to build a nest and can never beat her wings or bathe in dust as nature intended. Now, imagine that you visited a friend after school tomorrow and learned that she kept a cat in her garage in exactly the same conditions as a battery hen for the duration of the cat's life. Would you consider the actions of your friend to be cruel? The law certainly would. Why does the law punish an individual for committing an act of animal cruelty in his or her garage, but condone the very same cruel act if it is committed under the

roof of an intensive farming facility?

The most famous philosopher concerned with the protection of animals is the Australian utilitarian scholar, Peter Singer. Singer's book *Animal Liberation*, published in 1975, is considered the founding document of the modern animal protection movement. Singer asserts that animals, like humans, are sentient beings. That is, they have the ability to suffer and/or experience pleasure. It is this characteristic that, in Singer's view, entitles animals to equal moral consideration. He does not consider that the capacity of all animals and all humans to suffer is the same. Rather, he requires an assessment of the extent to which each suffers in any given circumstance, with priority being given to relieving the greater suffering.¹¹

As we will see in the next section of this article, the fundamental utilitarian notion of balancing human needs and pleasures with animal pain and suffering is central to all legal systems that regulate the treatment of animals. The difference with Singer's approach is that he is concerned with maximising the satisfaction of all sentient beings. This calculation, in Singer's view, would put most of our current pain-inflicting treatment of animals off limits.

There are other prominent philosophers that go further than Singer. For instance, American philosopher Tom Regan criticises Singer's model for permitting the possibility of justifiable animal exploitation by humans. Regan's 'rights' model, by contrast, suggests that animals have inherent value and should never be treated as a means to an end – not even in circumstances where an animal's suffering results in a significant benefit to humans.

Now that I have asked a lot of questions and provided very few answers, I will attempt to describe the basics of the legal framework that regulates animals in this country.

Laws? What laws?

Australia is governed under a system based on a separation of power between three arms of government, namely, the executive, judiciary, and legislature. While a detailed explanation of legal institutions is not possible here, it is the legislature (parliament) that is largely responsible for making laws that regulate animals and animal industries in Australia. The judiciary (courts) also make laws that impact animals in limited circumstances. For example, while the legislature would be responsible for enacting the *Dangerous Dogs Act 2011*, the court might be called upon to make a ruling as to whether a particular event was an 'attack' for the purpose of an offence provision in the legislation. In this scenario, the judge's explanation of what constitutes an 'attack' would become part of the law in this area.¹²

To properly appreciate the regulatory framework governing animals, it must also be understood that the Australian system of government outlined above operates at both a state and federal level. The technical term for this is 'federalism'. While both levels of government have a role to play, animal welfare regulation is predominantly the responsibility of state and territory governments. This is due to the way in which the Australian Constitution divides power between the two levels of government.

In simple terms, the Constitution outlines various areas ('heads of power') in which the Commonwealth Parliament is entitled to legislate. Anything that does not fall within one of those prescribed areas is left to the state and territory parliaments to regulate. While there is the capacity for the

Commonwealth to enact laws in some very limited and specific areas of animal welfare regulation, there is no head of power that specifically refers to the welfare of animals.¹³ Accordingly, the vast bulk of animal welfare legislation is drafted by state and territory parliaments.

The primary purpose of the animal welfare legislation in each state and territory is to establish penalties for animal cruelty offences.¹⁴ Animal cruelty ordinarily applies to actions which involve an infliction of pain that is unnecessary or unjustifiable.¹⁵ Further, a key aspect of the animal welfare legislation in all states and territories is the exemption of farming practices from the cruelty provisions.¹⁶ The significance of this fact cannot be overstated. While such exemptions embody Australia's long-standing reliance on the agricultural industry, they also serve to provide for a regulatory system that is, according to animal protection advocates, inherently discriminatory against the animals that we serve on a plate at meal times.

Rather than being directly governed by legislation, each sector of the animal agricultural industry is regulated by a set of guidelines called a 'code of practice' (COP). Compliance with a COP will ordinarily rule out the possibility of a conviction of animal cruelty.¹⁷ The primary concern that animal protection advocates have with COPs is that they are ordinarily not compulsory and are often drafted by the relevant industry itself, constituting a seemingly clear conflict of interest. This apparent conflict is exacerbated by the fact that compliance with the COPs is enforced by the government departments responsible for agriculture rather than a separate animal welfare department.

Before concluding this discussion of the regulatory framework, it is worth mentioning that the Federal Government has, despite the constitutional limitations explained above, become increasingly influential in animal welfare matters in recent years. This influence has primarily been wielded on a policy platform entitled the 'Australian Animal Welfare Strategy' (AAWS).¹⁸ The stated purpose of the AAWS is to provide 'direction for the development of future animal welfare policies, based on a national consultative approach and a firm commitment to high standards of animal welfare'.¹⁹

There is general consensus that some involvement of the Commonwealth Government is required to facilitate a measure of consistency in regulatory regimes across the country. However, there is also a concern amongst animal protection advocates that the AAWS has caused more harm than good by promoting bare minimum standards of care in the COPs that it promotes for adoption at a state and territory level.

Our love affair with cats and dogs

Humans share the planet with approximately 9,700 species of birds, 4,700 species of mammals, 4,800 species of amphibians, 6,000 species of reptiles, and more than 23,000 species of fish! Animals are central to our lives in so many ways. My fondest memories of childhood are lying next to our pot-belly stove on a winter night with my fox terrier, Tess, under my arm and my beautiful cat, Fluffball, nestled into the back of my neck. Most of us have similar stories.

According to the Australian Companion Animal Council, Australia has one of the highest incidences of pet ownership in the world, with an estimated 33 million pets living in slightly more than eight million households.²⁰ For most, the

family pet is considered a 'member of the family'. We shudder when we read a newspaper report informing us that 250,000 homeless pets are euthanised in Australia every year.²¹

As explained in the previous section, our pets are protected by animal cruelty legislation in each state and territory. In Queensland, for instance, the *Animal Care and Protection Act 2001* prescribes that an individual can be fined up to \$100,000 and/or imprisoned for up to two years for deliberate animal cruelty.²²

Most Australians are deeply concerned when they read a story in the newspaper about a cruelty case involving a companion animal. And there is no shortage of such cases. In the 2009-10 period for instance, the Royal Society for the Protection of Animals (RSPCA) charged 253 people nationwide with a combined total of 1014 offences, and achieved 185 convictions. In the same period, the organisation investigated more than 53,500 cruelty complaints.²³ Thousands of those involved cases of extreme neglect, but only the most extreme are prosecuted due to the significant financial costs and other burdens of running a legal case. Serious questions, left for another day, need to be asked about the appropriateness of a charity being responsible for funding and operating cruelty prosecutions.

Our encounters with pets are, however, only a very small component of our actual daily contact with animals. The majority of Australians also consume animals at every meal, wear animal skin (leather) and wool on their feet and bodies, and use products on a daily basis that have been tested on animals or inconspicuously contain parts of an animal's body. This begs the question, how is it that we can sit at the dining room table with one hand on the head of our beloved dog, while our other hand grips a knife that is cutting into the flesh of another animal? This is not an easy question to answer. But it is central to the study of animal law.

Prominent legal scholar and animal advocate Gary Francione refers to the ostensible inequity between economic and non-economic animals as a matter of 'moral schizophrenia'.²⁴ Another scholar describes the problem underlying the challenge of equal consideration as being plain old economic discrimination.²⁵ The basic proposition being that human concern for the wellbeing of an animal decreases when there are financial gains at stake. When one considers that 56 billion animals are killed each year in the meat, dairy and egg industry,²⁶ it becomes clear that the financial gains in question are significant. The concept of 'necessary suffering', entrenched in law, is used to defend the inconsistencies in animal welfare regulations that reflect the economic value of animals as a commodity. Where one draws the line as to what constitutes necessary suffering is, of course, the six million dollar question.

I will provide a simple example to explain the point further. What if I was to tell you that there was presently an animal cruelty case in the Queensland courts regarding a mass breeding facility for Labradors. The case involved two men who owned and operated a large rural property that had enormous sheds housing approximately 1,500 pedigree dogs continually breeding puppies for sale in Australia and overseas. The cruelty offences that the men were charged with involved keeping the female breeding dogs in steel 'stalls' their entire lives in which they could hardly move. In fact, the stalls were so small that each dog's body actually touched the steel on three of four sides, and all the dogs

could do is sit and stand. There were hundreds of dogs in each shed.

The welfare inspectors had documented that the dogs spent hours on end biting the steel bars for mental stimulation and exhibited uncharacteristic behaviour like repetitive head swaying. The inspectors also uncovered evidence that the Labrador puppies had their tails cut off with a pair of pliers and their sharp teeth clipped with a similar instrument to avoid the puppies injuring each other. Both procedures were carried out with no anaesthetic. If I was then to ask you what you think is the appropriate punishment in the circumstances, what would be your response? Presumably most people reading this article would consider a short term of imprisonment or a substantial fine to be a fitting punishment for these seemingly horrendous acts of cruelty.

What if I was then to tell you that this is the way pigs are raised in intensive production facilities to produce bacon in this country. The only difference being that instead of, as in the example, hundreds of animals being housed in each shed, there are thousands of animals in each shed in an intensive pig production facility. A pig feels pain, loneliness, and boredom in the same way as any breed of dog. Why then does the law condone what are seemingly quite unnatural and cruel farming methods? The answer is simple. Bacon tastes good and the aforementioned farming practices are extremely profitable.

What use are lawyers anyway?

Former President of the Australian Law Reform Commission, Professor David Weisbrot AM, recently proclaimed that animal protection may just be ‘the next great social justice movement’.²⁷ Were this premonition to come true, it is certain that lawyers will play an instrumental role, as they have in all significant social justice movements in the past. To do so, however, they must be well versed in the intricacies of animal welfare regulation and the underlying theories of justice upon which the law is based.

The significance of the recent inclusion of animal law into the sphere of legal disciplines cannot be overstated. The very small group of Australians that call themselves ‘animal lawyers’ is sure to expand significantly in years to come. Environmental lawyers are joining the ranks as they learn that, according to the United Nations, animal industries are the single largest contributors to global greenhouse emissions – more so than traffic.²⁸ Human rights lawyers are also joining the ranks as they learn that 22,000 children under the age of five die of starvation-related causes every day,²⁹ while the world’s cattle alone consume enough grain to feed the entire human population.³⁰

The recent publication of three animal law textbooks has provided a significant boost to the growing pool of Australian legal scholarship available, as well as being instrumental in affording legitimacy to the legal arm of the animal protection movement.³¹ The launch of the first Australian animal law journal in 2008 was also a significant step in boosting the credibility of the subject area in legal circles.³²

Founded in 2004, Voiceless, an animal protection institute based in Sydney, is considered by many to be the spearhead of the animal law movement in Australia. In 2009 Voiceless released the *Animal Law Toolkit* to ‘introduce students, academics, legal practitioners, law firms and animal protectionists to key issues in the field’.³³ Responsible for building the first legal team within an animal protection

organisation, Voiceless has also invested over one million dollars in grants for a wide array of projects aimed at improving the lives of Australian animals. Various other organisations with a focus on animal law have sprouted up all over the country in recent years. Some of the more prominent ones include:

- (a) The Barristers Animal Welfare Panel (BAWP)³⁴
- (b) Brisbane Lawyers Educating and Advocating for Tougher Sentences (BLEATS)³⁵
- (c) TLGL awyers³⁶
- (d) Pro Bono Animal Legal Service (PALS)³⁷
- (e) Animal Welfare Community Legal Centre (AWCLC)³⁸
- (f) NSW Young Lawyers Animal Law Committee³⁹
- (g) Northern Rivers Community Legal Centre Animal Law Project.⁴⁰

Established animal protection organisations such as the RSPCA, Animals Australia and Animal Liberation also continue to provide invaluable sources of information for students, academics, and lawyers to draw on.

Finally, the recently launched Animal Justice Fund (AJF) is certain to have a major impact on animal protection in Australia. The AJF, administered by Animals Australia, is a multi-million dollar fund ‘established to promote the cause of animal welfare through strategic litigation ... and the prosecution of persons or businesses who commit offences against animals used in intensive farming’. The AJF, enabled by Tasmanian benefactor Jan Cameron,⁴¹ will provide significant financial rewards to employees/informants who provide information and/or evidence exposing animal cruelty that leads to a successful prosecution.⁴²

The road ahead

Pre-eminent political and ideological leader Mahatma Gandhi once said that ‘[t]he greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated’. Australia has a unique opportunity to prove itself to be a world leader in animal welfare reform, but at present, any such claim is, quite simply, untrue. But there can be no doubt that the movement concerned with advancing the cause of animals has gained significant momentum in recent years.

Animal law is changing lives. Indeed, the Honourable Michael Kirby AC CMG revealed that he immediately ceased eating meat after launching Australia’s first animal law textbook, acknowledging that he ‘could no longer pretend that [he] did not know how sentient animals with feelings were slaughtered’.⁴³ But there is much work still to be done. Entrenching animal law as a staple offering in law schools across the country will ensure that the Australian adage of a ‘fair go’ is slowly, but surely, extended to animals.

References

- ¹ The course was taught by Geoffrey Bloom at the University of New South Wales School of Law.
- ² Bond University, Southern Cross University, Griffith University, Wollongong University, University of Sydney, Monash University, Australian National University and Flinders University.
- ³ See for example Steven White, ‘The Emergence of Animal Law in Australian Universities’ (2007/2008) 91 *Reform* 51. Steven White teaches animal law at Griffith University in Queensland and is co-editor of the first animal law textbook in Australia, *Animal Law in Australasia* (2009).
- ⁴ The National Center for Animal Law Studies operating out of the

- Lewis & Clark School of Law in Portland, Oregon <<http://legacy.lclark.edu/org/cals>>.
- ⁵ *Journal of Animal Law* (Michigan State University College of Law), *Journal of Animal Law and Policy* (Stanford Law School), and the *Animal Law Review* (Lewis & Clark Law School).
 - ⁶ Examples include: David Favre, *Animal Law: Welfare, Interests and Rights* (2008); Bruce Wagman et al, *Animal Law: Cases and Materials* (2010); and Cass Sunstein and Martha Nussbaum, *Animal Rights: Current Debates and New Directions* (2004).
 - ⁷ See Voiceless, *Animal Law Toolkit* (2009) for an extensive list of these professional committees <http://www.voiceless.org.au/Law/Misc/The_Animal_Law_Toolkit.html>.
 - ⁸ For example, the annual Animal Law Conference and the triennial Future of Animal Law Conference. There is also a strong network of animal law students in the United States, primarily driven by the Animal Legal Defense Fund. National essay and mooting competitions, online discussion forums, and internship opportunities ensure that animal law students are well connected and provided access to job opportunities that can be pursued before and after graduation from law school.
 - ⁹ Traditional legal practice areas encountered include administrative law, constitutional law, property law, criminal law, contract law, tort law, intellectual property law, consumer protection law, tax law, and even family law!
 - ¹⁰ The technical legal term for this property status is *personal chattel*.
 - ¹¹ For a comprehensive examination of Peter Singer's arguments see Steven White, 'Exploring Different Philosophical Approaches to Animal Protection in Law'; extracted in Peter Sankoff and Steven White (eds), *Animal Law in Australasia* (2009).
 - ¹² For a detailed discussion of how law is made in both legislatures and courts see Michelle Sanson et al, *Connecting With Law* (2010), 87-110.
 - ¹³ In fact, there are very few western countries that explicitly recognise animals in a constitutional document. For a discussion of this point see Steven White, 'Regulation of Animal Welfare in Australia and the Emergent Commonwealth: Entrenching the Traditional Approach of the States and Territories or Laying the Ground for Reform?' (2007) 35 *Federal Law Review* 347, 363-364. The principal areas controlled by the Commonwealth Government include fisheries, live export of animals, and the import and export of threatened and endangered species.
 - ¹⁴ See *Animal Welfare Act 2001* (Qld), *Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979* (NSW), *Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985* (SA), *Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1986* (Vic), *Animal Welfare Act 1993* (Tas), *Animal Care and Protection Act 2001* (Qld), *Animal Welfare Act 1999* (NT), *Animal Welfare Act 2002* (WA).
 - ¹⁵ See for example section 18(2) of the *Animal Care and Protection Act 2001* (Qld) which defines animal cruelty as including 'pain that, in the circumstances, is unjustifiable, unnecessary or unreasonable'.
 - ¹⁶ The other most notable exemption from the animal cruelty provisions in the various state and territory Acts is the field of scientific experimentation on animals. There are various other exemptions that exist in most jurisdictions such as the slaughter of animals according to religious faith, Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander custom or tradition, hunting, and control of feral and pest species.
 - ¹⁷ See for example section 16 of the *Animal Care and Protection Act 2001* (Qld) which provides that 'a code of practice is admissible in evidence in a proceeding for an offence against this Act if it is relevant to the act or omission to which the proceeding relates'.
 - ¹⁸ The AAWS was launched in 2005 by the Federal Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and was supported by fairly significant government funding.
 - ¹⁹ Australian Government, Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, *The Australian Animal Welfare Strategy* (2005) <<http://www.daff.gov.au/animal-plant-health/welfare/aaws/online/vision>>.
 - ²⁰ Australian Companion Animal Council, *Pet Ownership Statistics* (18 January 2011) <http://www.acac.org.au/pet_care.html>.
 - ²¹ Rachel Browne, 'Truth About Cats and Dogs: 250,000 Killed Every Year', *The Sydney Morning Herald* (online), 6 June 2010 <<http://www.smh.com.au/environment/animals/truth-about-cats-and-dogs-250000-killed-every-year-20100605-4lr4.html>>.
 - ²² *Animal Care and Protection Act 2001* (Qld), section 18.
 - ²³ Christine Jackman, 'The Claws Come Out', *The Australian* (online), 12 January 2011 <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/features/the-claws-come-out/story-e6frg8h6-1225986370370>.
 - ²⁴ For a discussion of Francione's ideas on this point see his website <<http://www.abolitionistapproach.com>>.
 - ²⁵ Siobhan O'Sullivan, 'Australian Animal Protection Laws and the Challenge of Equal Consideration'; in Peter Sankoff and Steven White (eds), *Animal Law in Australasia* (2009).
 - ²⁶ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, FAOSTAT 2008 <<http://faostat.fao.org/>>.
 - ²⁷ David Weisbrot, 'Comment' (2007/2008) 91 *Reform* 2.
 - ²⁸ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2006, *Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options* <<ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/010/a0701e/a0701e.pdf>>.
 - ²⁹ UNICEF, 2008, *Statistics by Area: Child Survival and Health* (18 January 2011) <<http://www.childinfo.org/mortality.html>>.
 - ³⁰ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2006, *Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options* <<ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/010/a0701e/a0701e.pdf>>.
 - ³¹ See Peter Sankoff and Steven White (eds), *Animal Law in Australasia* (2009); Malcolm Caulfield, *Handbook of Australian Animal Cruelty Law* (2008); and Deborah Cao, *Animal Law in Australia and New Zealand* (2010).
 - ³² *The Australian Animal Protection Law Journal* is a peer-reviewed biannual publication and has included articles covering a wide range of issues that arise in animal protection law.
 - ³³ It includes, among other things, a summary of all relevant cases and a sample letter for students seeking to petition their law school to introduce the subject to the curriculum. The Toolkit can be downloaded for free at the Voiceless website <http://www.voiceless.org.au/Law/Misc/The_Animal_Law_Toolkit.html>.
 - ³⁴ The BAWP comprises well in excess of 100 barristers (including some 25 silks) from all the State Bars of Australia. The primary role of the BAWP is to represent and advise litigants in matters of public interest affecting animal welfare on a pro bono or reduced fee basis.
 - ³⁵ BLEATS is an organisation of Queensland lawyers with the principal aim of focusing attention on the apparent unwillingness of Magistrates to wield their powers under the *Animal Care and Protection Act 2001* (Qld). BLEATS consists of a panel of over 150 barristers and solicitors who work pro bono for the RSPCA.
 - ³⁶ TLG Lawyers, based in Brisbane, is the first animal law practice in Australia. Tracy-Lynne Geysen, principal of the firm, is also the founder of BLEATS.
 - ³⁷ PALS is a national legal referral service which links animal protection organisations and concerned individuals with lawyers who are willing to provide free legal services in animal protection cases.
 - ³⁸ The AWCLC is based in Tasmania and aims to provide animal protection groups and other persons interested in animal cruelty issues with legal advice on a pro bono (free) basis.
 - ³⁹ The NSW Young Lawyers ALC comprises both legal practitioners and law students. It administers animal law essay competitions, information sessions, annual appeals and policy submissions.
 - ⁴⁰ The NRCLC Animal Law Project is a new animal law organisation that offers a pro bono (free) legal referral service to residents and organisations in the Northern Rivers region of New South Wales.
 - ⁴¹ Jan Cameron is the founder of the Kathmandu clothing company. She sold 51% of her share of the company in 2006 for \$247 million Australian dollars.
 - ⁴² See the Animal Justice Fund website for more information <<http://www.animaljusticefund.org>>.
 - ⁴³ Deborah Cao, *Animal Law in Australia and New Zealand* (2010), Foreword.