

Submission  
No 410

**INQUIRY INTO MANAGEMENT OF CAT POPULATIONS  
IN NEW SOUTH WALES**

**Name:** Name suppressed  
**Date Received:** 19 November 2024

---

Partially  
Confidential

**FREE OR HEAVILY DISCOUNTED DESEXING** programs must be implemented for owned, semi owned and unowned community cats to manage the population in a humane manner. With the current high cost of living people are not desexing their cats and then giving away kittens free to continue the cycle or to dump in parks.

These funded programs should be offered free for those on low incomes, overwhelmed hoarders, and carers and rescuers of semi owned and unowned cats (community cat rescuers), and areas of high intensity cat populations to make a rapid and effective reduction in numbers of cats HUMANELY, NO KILL.

The research and studies of highly successful free cat desexing programs were completed in a number of councils involving the APWF in Queensland, Banyule Council in Victoria, and the Keeping Cats Safe at Home (KCSAH) program managed by RSPCA for the NSW governments. Banyule free desexing program offered over several years is supported, it was cost effective by council funding offset by savings and achieved significant results in minimising the cat population. For owned and semi-owned cats this included “decreases in impoundments by 66%, euthanasia by 82%, and cat-related calls by 36% over 8 years, with savings to council of AU \$440,660 for an outlay of AU \$77,490”.

**ELIMINATE HEFTY COUNCIL REGISTRATION FEES** for kittens over 4 months which discourages people from desexing and chipping and encourages dumping.

**I OPPOSE MANDATORY CAT CONTAINMENT** as it will only increase cat cruelty by cat haters targeting neighbours or other cats.

As per the statement by the RSPCA which I agree with there is presently limited data on the impact or effectiveness of legislative change to require mandatory cat containment. RSPCA has advised the following risks from mandatory cat containment:

- Will increase the incidence of cats being surrendered or abandoned due to owner inability or unwillingness to transition their currently roaming cats to a contained lifestyle and provide an appropriate contained environment.
- The expense of erecting cat-proof barriers to contain cats on a property could be a barrier to cat ownership or retaining cats, which would have an inequitable impact on existing or potential cat owners on low incomes. The potential difficulties of mandatory containment for cat owners in rental properties would include getting permission from the property owner to have a cat and/or to erect cat-proof barriers, and additional associated expenses which could be incurred multiple times if the renter needs to move property.

- Cat owners might avoid permanently identifying their cats, to reduce the risk of a penalty being imposed if their cat is caught roaming away from home, which could reduce the probability of a roaming cat being reunited with their owner.
- High euthanasia rates or negative welfare outcomes for impounded cats
- Imposing a significant financial and resourcing burden on local government and animal management services.
- The potential for a significant impact on the operations and staff at animal shelters, pounds, and animal welfare organisations.
- Community members who do not like cats might be incited to trap or even harm cats outside their owner's property.
- A perception that cat containment will resolve all cat-related community issues, which could lead to a reduction in resourcing of other important cat management projects (e.g. programs for desexing and/or effective and humane management of unowned and semi-owned cats).
- Inadequate education on cats' physical and mental needs. Insufficient understanding of cats' physical and mental needs and appropriate containment methods could lead to people containing their cats in unacceptable and cruel ways such as by tethering or caging.

### **STOP THE GOVT AND MEDIA ENCOURAGING CAT HATE BY USING INCORRECT FIGURES**

and cherry picking studies to guesstimate random insanely incorrect and overflated figures about the amount of "wildlife cats kill" which is fiddling around the edges of the real causes. They are not public enemy No 1 as the media claims but habitat loss and degradation, urban expansion, land clearing, deforestation and humans contribute whilst govt eyes are fixed solely on cats as scapegoats.

There are many examples where cat haters use the excuse for protecting wildlife as a reason to label any roaming cat as a feral cat which should be killed.

It is of great concern and in the opinion of many cat rescues/carers/cat lovers that our own government has acted with Invasive Species to encourage community members to take matters into their own hands to eradicate stray cats as shown by comments on social media. Cat haters post of cruel methods they use kill cats by poisoning, drowning and blunt impact.

There already is a strong presence of cat haters on social media, and there is often seen comments on the Threatened Species Commissioner, ABC Rural facebook pages, and on local community facebook pages that roaming cats are considered "fair game" for being

killed. The community is aware of cat haters who will gleefully relocate cats to different suburbs and into parks or to the pound citing “killing wildlife”.

**MAKE TNR LEGAL** and the council and RSPCA assist community cat carers to achieve this which is far more humane than trap and kill as has been shown in the USA to be effective.