

**SELECT COMMITTEE INTO THE OPERATIONS OF THE  
ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION  
OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS WESTERN AUSTRALIA (INC)**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE  
TAKEN AT PERTH  
MONDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2015**

**SESSION ONE**

**Members**

**Hon Rick Mazza (Chair)  
Hon Paul Brown (Deputy Chair)  
Hon Nigel Hallett  
Hon Lynn MacLaren  
Hon Sally Talbot**

---

**Hearing commenced at 11.26 am****Dr INA CARRICK****Veterinarian, Greenough Equine Services, sworn and examined:****Dr MATTHEW CARRICK****Veterinarian, Bos Vet and Rural, sworn and examined:**

**The CHAIR:** On behalf of the committee, I would like to welcome you to the meeting. For the benefit of members and Hansard, could you please state your full name and the capacity in which you appear before the committee?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Matthew Carrick; my capacity is that we had an issue with RSPCA and direction notices that were given to us.

**Dr I. Carrick:** Dr Ina Carrick—and, yes, the same.

**The CHAIR:** I will introduce you to the members of the committee. We have Hon Lynn MacLaren, Hon Sally Talbot, Hon Nigel Hallett and Hon Paul Brown and myself, Rick Mazza, as Chair.

Before we begin I must ask you to either take the oath or affirmation.

[Witnesses took the oath or affirmation.]

**The CHAIR:** You will have signed a document titled “Information for Witnesses”. Have you read and understood that document?

**The Witnesses:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** These proceedings are being recorded by Hansard. A transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. To assist the committee and Hansard, please quote the full title of any document you refer to during the course of this hearing, for the record—and please be aware of the microphones and try to talk into them. Ensure that you do not cover them with papers or make noise near them. Please try to speak in turn. I remind you that your transcript will become a matter of public record. If for some reason you wish to make a confidential statement during today’s proceedings, you should request that evidence be taken in closed session. If the committee grants your request, any public and media in attendance will be excluded from the hearing. Please note that until such time as a transcript of your public evidence is finalised, it should not be made public. I advise you that publication or disclosure of the uncorrected transcript of evidence may constitute a contempt of Parliament and may mean the material published or disclosed is not subject to parliamentary privilege.

Would you like it to make an opening statement to the committee?

**The Witnesses:** Yes, please.

[11.30 am]

**Dr M. Carrick:** If I can get started. Thank you very much to the committee for giving us this opportunity to appear before you. We would like to open our statement by responding to some of the comments made by Amanda Swift in the hearing last Monday. We were not present at the hearing because we were out of the country, but it has since come to our attention that she claimed at that time a visit by Maureen Rogers to our practice in February 2014, a direction notice or document was torn up by myself and that I threatened the RSPCA inspector. I would like to clarify the following. Not at any stage of my conversation with Maureen Rogers did official documents exchange hands, nor did I ever tear up any documents. At the time of the visit, Maureen Rogers

tried to get me to sign a direction notice, which I refused. I said at the time that I was not comfortable signing any documents unless I received the official legal standpoint of the RSPCA in regard to shelter for livestock, as well as some specific clarification as to what exactly was being asked of me. During our conversation I did not at any stage threaten the inspector. I felt that I was very composed and calm and did not raise my voice at any stage during the conversation. All I did was repeatedly ask for the RSPCA's official standpoint and further explanation as to what exactly was being asked of me in regards to the horses in question.

I would like to openly criticise Maureen's Rogers' actions when speaking to me at the time. She said that if I told her that I was planning on building shelter in the paddock described, she would make this matter go away; all I had to do was tell her that I planned on doing it. In my eyes this was highly unprofessional, arrogant and totally inappropriate handling of the situation by what is supposed to be a trained and highly skilled inspector of the RSPCA—an inspector who has the power and responsibility of enforcing the Animal Welfare Act in the midwest.

Amanda Swift claims that we made it impossible for the RSPCA to communicate with us. When I asked Maureen Rogers for further explanation, I gave her my business card with all my contact details on it and asked for further communication to be given in writing via email. However, the next thing we received for any sort of communication was direction notices.

We have had several meetings with David van Ooran, and a single meeting where Mr van Ooran, Amanda Swift and Maureen Rogers were all present. The core topic of all of these meetings was the communication between the two parties—ourselves and them—especially at the time of the first visit. Not at any one of those meetings was it once mentioned that Mrs Rogers felt threatened or intimidated by me in any way. Neither did Amanda Swift mention that she was left with no option but to sign the direction notice herself because I had ripped up the initial document. If Maureen Rogers was so intimidated by me that Amanda Swift had to sign direction notices a couple of weeks later, why did Maureen Rogers then deliver these notices herself? If there was any form of intimidation, it was from the RSPCA, by having the chief inspector sign the direction notices and not the local inspector. Amanda Swift's claims last week in regard to my behaviour at Maureen's Rogers initial visit are totally and 100 per cent fabricated.

I have a witness who was sitting in my office at the time, less than three metres away, and heard the whole conversation and who can confirm everything that I have stated so far. We are speechless and absolutely flabbergasted that Amanda Swift would sit here under oath and make a totally false statement and lie to the politicians, the media and the general public. The defamation of us and our reputation is a desperate attempt of the chief inspector to justify her own actions, boiling down to her signing a direction notice without ever inspecting the horses in question or even setting foot on our property. RSPCA inspectors are only to sign notices when they themselves have inspected the animals in question. In our case, Amanda Swift decided to ignore this and sign our notice from her desk in Perth, willingly and knowingly ignoring this rule that she, as the chief inspector for the RSPCA, is surely well familiar with.

Two direction notices were then delivered to our practice on 17 March 2014. Neither myself nor my wife, Ina, were present at the time. One direction notice was given to each of us, and we do have them here with us. Not once did the local RSPCA inspector confirm who was actually in charge of the horses or whether our nurse was the appropriate person to be giving the direction notices to—another rule that has been overseen by so-called trained staff of the RSPCA. In addition to the direction notices, we were given an animal welfare toolkit—we have copies of them here; these are for the running of horse events and not for general husbandry—as well as a dictionary definition of the word “ensure” printed off the internet.

Lynne Bradshaw repeatedly describes this inquiry, as well as statements made by the likes of Eric Ball, as insulting. We would like to tell this committee, as well as Lynne Bradshaw, that we have a veterinary team of more than 20 years of combined experience, a veterinary team that is

---

highly accomplished, with intensive further training, continuing dedication, as well as decorated with prizes for presenting research to fellow colleagues. To serve our team with such documents as an animal welfare toolkit, which does not even address husbandry, is highly insulting, demeaning and provocative. Amanda Swift claims that she was unable to communicate with our practice initially due to my behaviour. It was actually my wife, Ina, who actually tried to open communication channels about the issue of shelter for horses in the midwest. At this time, I will pass over to Ina to continue.

**Dr I. Carrick:** Thank you. I had received several phone calls from our clients in about February 2014 about visits from Maureen Rogers demanding they build shelters for their horses or face prosecution. I had contacted Amanda Swift alerting her to the situation here with the inspector and voiced my concerns about her behaviour. Ms Swift told me that obviously she had to confirm these things with Maureen Rogers. Shortly after my phone call, we received our first visit from Maureen herself. There was a complainant that was reporting several other properties to the RSPCA animal shelter. This complainant was referred to Greenough Equine Veterinary Centre, which is my practice, by Maureen Rogers for further advice in regards to this matter. We are to this date still confused as to why the general public would be referred to this practice for further advice on heat stress in horses, yet shortly after we are given direction notices ourselves. Furthermore, I have acted as an expert witness for the RSPCA for a case in 2010. The RSPCA spent a significant amount of money flying me back from the Northern Territory, where I was at the time, to Perth in order to appear in court as their witness. I offered a far more cost-effective approach by offering to appear via video link in Geraldton court. However, the RSPCA decided to subpoena me to court as they felt that my actual presence would have a higher impact in that case. I would like to say that case in particular I am speaking about was against a mentally unstable older lady who was not in any way malicious and was represented in court by legal aid.

The RSPCA has also consulted with me on several other cases where horse cruelty was suspected. It is a mystery to me why the RSPCA would ask me to be their expert witness in a case in 2010, plus refer complainants to our practice for advice, yet days later decide to prosecute my practice for apparently breaching the Animal Welfare Act. The RSPCA, including statements by CEO, David van Ooran, to the media, have said that we have complied with the direction notice; therefore, the matter was resolved. This was said as part of their defence of using section 40(1)(b) of the Animal Welfare Act in our case. What he had failed to say was that the RSPCA has considered in mediation that, in fact, the measures that we had in place to ensure our horses' safety, health and welfare were adequate this whole time. This gives the impression that we were in the wrong and that we complied in order to rectify this. This also could not be further from the truth. In reality, we had to comply as we had no way to challenge the direction given under section 40(1)(b). Our only way was to take this matter to court. Unlike the RSPCA, we do not have pro bono lawyers or government funds, public donations or endorsements to draw upon. We were denied any form of natural justice. Estimates for our legal advice at the time put our likely cost at a minimum of \$300 000 to defend our position—an estimate that was well beyond our means.

The RSPCA has publicly, both in the media and to this committee, given the impression that they have acted completely appropriately in our case, even though in our mediation, instigated and mediated by Hon Paul Brown, MLA, they considered that there was a communication breakdown and that the contingency plans that we had in place all along were appropriate and completely adequate. We would also like to mention that in the mediation meeting it was agreed that we would provide the RSPCA with our contingency plans for horses on our properties in case of extreme weather by email, and that the RSPCA would then provide us in writing a retraction of the two direction notices given to us. We provided our plans to the organisation; however, we are yet to receive any documents that they agreed to give us.

[11.40 am]

---

The following points have become very clear to us. The RSPCA has no regard for authority and rules made by supervising bodies. The fact that Amanda Swift, in our case, has not only misused documents, but also presented false information in front of this committee confirms the arrogance and complete ignorance and manipulative nature with which the RSPCA decides to operate. Anyone that speaks up against this organisation or criticises the organisation in any way, shape or form is demonised. The RSPCA has the common practice of meeting critics by victimising itself. The RSPCA has a full legal team behind them that operates pro bono. They are represented with legal and other advice constantly. They can reach out to politicians, veterinarians and other representatives at any stage to seek advice. The RSPCA has contact and means, and we find it surprising that this organisation feels the need to victimise itself during this process. In our case, the RSPCA did not follow procedures that had been put in place by DAFWA, procedures that they are legally required to adhere to. We cannot emphasise enough that in our case horses were not inspected at any stage, neither by Maureen Rogers, Amanda Swift nor any other person. Notices were handed a few weeks after we made a complaint against a local RSPCA inspector.

To us, it is not the RSPCA inspectors that are the victims here, it is ourselves and the general public that are continuing to donate to this organisation, whose inspectors they trust are highly trained, skilled, compassionate and empathetic. Unfortunately, the total opposite has been our experience, which has left us emotionally drained and with a severe financial loss to our business for no animal welfare gain. We are animal lovers, we are veterinarians, and put a lot of thought, effort and money into providing the very best animal husbandry system that we can. People come to us so that they can copy our system for horse husbandry. It is our opinion that the current system for policing potential animal welfare issues is flawed when you have a private organisation with its own agenda having some of the strongest prosecutorial powers in Western Australian law and is not answerable to normal legal checks and balances, and intimidation and injustice can continue. Thank you very much.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** Thank you for coming.

**The Witnesses:** Thank you.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** I know you made your statement just then. Can you confirm that at no stage was there an inspection either by Maureen Rogers or by Amanda Swift or any person from the RSPCA of the horses in question?

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes.

**Dr M. Carrick:** Absolutely not.

**Dr I. Carrick:** Amanda Swift: I did not even know what she looked like until our mediation meeting at the end of January this year. She had never set foot on our property. I would believe that she would not even know where we were living at the time or where our property was at the time. Maureen Rogers I obviously had dealings with, as I mentioned, in the past in regards to cases that she consulted me about. On her initial visit she came straight to our office and on her second visit she came straight to our office again.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** You have provided evidence here today—the animal welfare direction notice that was given to you by Maureen Rogers, but it has Inspector Swift's signature on it. So when it says here that the direction notice was issued at 32917 Wakefield Road, Greenough, on 17 March 2014 by Amanda Swift, she was never at that time on the property at that location?

**Dr I. Carrick:** No.

**Dr M. Carrick:** Correct—had never been on our property at that time.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** What was your relationship with Inspector Rogers prior to this incident?

**Dr I. Carrick:** I believe it was good. I think she consulted me definitely about one case—from memory, maybe even a couple—since she had come into that role that she is currently in, and I just

gave my professional opinion. She contacted me about certain cases. I had to go and view those cases, give my professional opinion, in regards to whether I thought, you know, a horse was compromised or whatever, and she then took the cases from there. So, the dealings I had with her were pretty straightforward.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** I think in the hearing last week when Amanda Swift was making the statements about the intimidation and threats that were made by Matt, one of the responses made was that you also threatened that you would not provide veterinary assistance to her horse. Have you previously provided veterinary assistance to Maureen Rogers for any of her animals?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Nothing was ever said about providing assistance to her horse or anything. If there was anything, I may have said that it is not a way to foster help between the RSPCA and our veterinary practice.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** Had she ever been a client?

**Dr I. Carrick:** So, Maureen Rogers—there are two practices, essentially, in the midwest that deal with horses. One is obviously myself—we are the only 100 per cent equine practice—and there is Midwest Veterinary Centre, which is mixed practice. When I came into the area in 2009, I initially worked for Chapman Animal Hospital as their horse vet. Maureen Rogers was always a client of Midwest to my knowledge. I might have attended her horse, from memory, maybe once, sometimes for emergencies when I was rostered on and she could not get hold of Midwest. The last time that I remember dealing with her as a client was when a horse was agisted at her place and it had an eye injury, and she needed assistance with that. I cannot tell you for certain, but I would say 99 per cent of the time I attended her horses would be in an emergency situation when she could not get hold of anyone. She is definitely not a regular client of our practice by all means.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** At the mediation that was held at your own property between yourselves, the RSPCA inspectors, Mr van Ooran and myself, there was an agreement on that day, as you mentioned in your opening statement, that you would provide an animal management plan for horses to be taken back onto the property. Have you initiated that animal management plan?

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes.

**Dr M. Carrick:** Can I answer that. Our animal management plan was always in place; like, it was not something that we came up with to deal with the direction notice or anything. It was something that if they had talked to us from the very beginning, instead of being intimidatory, we could have explained to them.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** And what does that animal management plan entail?

**Dr M. Carrick:** I was specifically asked by Maureen originally about a paddock, not just the whole property, where the majority of horses on the property were being housed at the time, which were recipient mares for an embryo transfer program. They were in constant monitoring. If at any stage any horse showed any signs of feeling the effects of temperature, there were other paddocks with trees in them et cetera, but they cannot be in one paddock the whole time with trees—horses will destroy them. We also have several 100-metre long by 20-metre wide portable irrigation systems, which we would take out and place wherever the horses needed them at that time.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** And they were also, as you said —

**Dr M. Carrick:** And constant monitoring.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** Yes, okay. Are there horses back on the property now?

**Dr M. Carrick:** There are horses on the property.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** But you have not received any confirmation from the RSPCA as part of the agreement that was done that day that they have agreed to?

**Dr I. Carrick:** No.

---

**Dr M. Carrick:** No. On that particular paddock there is cattle, which is part of our cattle practice and embryo transfer program.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** At any stage did the RSPCA inform you of what type of shelter that they had proposed that you should erect?

**Dr I. Carrick:** No.

**Dr M. Carrick:** And that is the whole crux of it for me. I guess when Maureen first came, I was fairly flippant about the whole thing because I know Ina had instigated conversation with Amanda Swift, you know, trying to maybe educate Maureen about what the issues and the requirements of horses—what they actually were. So when Maureen came on her initial visit, I was a bit confused as to whether this was her own little agenda or whether she had actually sought further information from Amanda or the rest of the RSPCA. So, I did not know really—I was confused and said, “Are you sure this is the official stamp on it or is this your stamp on it?” I did not know which stage things had gotten after Ina’s initial talk with Amanda Swift, so that is part of the confusion. I could not understand why we would be given a direction notice if no-one was even looking at a horse. I did not think you could be prosecuted without any evidence or anything like that. I was a bit perplexed, I guess, at the time, so there was no reason for me to be argumentative or threatening, or anything, because I just thought the whole thing was a bit of folly, to be honest, at the time.

[11.50 am]

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** I know other members have got questions, but I will just ask you one more: the horses that you had on the property that were part of the embryo transfer, they were—Ina, you can confirm this—originally rescue horses?

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes. So, when you set up an embryo transfer program, obviously the choice of breed is the standardbred mare because of their temperament et cetera. In the racing industry horses are retired, so probably about 30 per cent of our herd we got from people that did not want the horses anymore so they essentially surrendered them to us, but the vast majority—I would say probably about 16 or 17 horses—I actually bought off a horse abattoir in Perth. We sent the truck down and I paid the guy and loaded the horses up. There was also two horses, actually, that were surrendered to us in a terrible condition to the point where the guy who was actually picking them up for us in Perth—who saw them in Perth—said, “Look, these horses are not in good condition, they’re pretty emaciated. I do not think they’d be any good.” We, at the time, had a lot of feed on our property and I just thought: just bring them here and we will see what happens. They ended up doing really well. For me as a veterinarian, and for any other veterinarian doing embryo transfer, it is a great opportunity to give horses another purpose. It is very fulfilling. It was a good thing.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** To be part of an embryo transfer program, those horses have to be in prime condition.

**Dr I. Carrick:** Absolutely. Embryo transfer, for clients, is very expensive. It is quite an advanced reproductive method and we charge appropriately for our skills and for the mares. The mares essentially receive the embryos, which come from some of the—in our practice—best stockhorse mares in this country. The embryo is worth a lot; once the embryo is in the mare, obviously the mare becomes worth a fair bit of money. To have these mares in absolute prime condition, mentally and physically, is the absolute necessity. You cannot have a successful embryo transfer program if the mares are no good. We put a lot of energy and a lot of money, and a lot of time and love into those horses for two reasons: because of the embryo transfer program, but also because we like doing that. That is what we do for a living—or I do for a living—and my staff do for a living and, as I say, it was a very, very good thing.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** Thank you. I have got some more questions, but I will let some others —

---

**The CHAIR:** I have a couple of questions. If I could just ask Dr Ina Carrick, how long have you been an equine vet?

**Dr I. Carrick:** I graduated in 2005 from Murdoch and I started in 2006 as an equine intern in equine medicine and surgery—so almost 10 years.

**The CHAIR:** How long have you been practising in the midwest?

**Dr I. Carrick:** Since 2009.

**The CHAIR:** Section 19(3)(e) of the Animal Welfare Act requires that shelter be provided to an animal. Why in this case in the midwest do you think there was not any requirement for shelter? There are certain defences within the act too, of course, to that.

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** So I am just asking why you feel there was no requirement for shelter?

**Dr I. Carrick:** The way the horses actually cool themselves is quite a unique physiological, I guess, pathway. In essence, to make it short, horses have quite a large surface area so they store heat in order to digest, but also they sweat but not to the point where you can see it; it is tiny little particles on their skin. The wind then blows over their body and that is how they cool; it is called evaporative cooling. The main reason why I have no doubt that horses do not need to have shelter in our area is because it is very windy. Horses stand wide open in the paddock; the wind blows over them. It is really quite lovely; it is even lovely for us. When the breeze comes in, everyone just kind of cools; not only just the horses. It is actually very, very important that they are in a wide space where they can utilise that wind appropriately.

**The CHAIR:** So the horses, in your veterinarian opinion, were not under any stress.

**Dr I. Carrick:** Absolutely not; no. Absolutely not.

**The CHAIR:** All right. What impact has there been on your business since this incident has taken place? Has there been any detrimental business impact specifically?

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes. The embryo transfer program had to be shut down. The clients that were doing it have gone to Perth to do embryo transfer; I will not get them back. We had to de-stock the whole property because it was our only way of, within four weeks, adhering to the direction given. Essentially, we have not only the recipients there; we had about 12 or 15 paddocks at the time that were housing horses that did not have shelter—horses that were there for artificial insemination; horses that were there for monitoring of other problems. So we had to essentially shut the whole clinic down.

**The CHAIR:** Okay, so you had to shut down the embryo transfer clinic.

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes, and anything to do with horses being out in their small yard.

**The CHAIR:** Is this because clients who learnt of this notice no longer wanted to deal with you or is it something that you just did not have the capacity —

**Dr I. Carrick:** We just could not risk having horses at the practice without shelter because our lawyer said at the time—I asked him specifically, “What if I put a horse out in the paddock without shelter?” They said, “The RSPCA can come and they will prosecute you straightaway.”

**The CHAIR:** Rather than shut down that side of your business, did you ever consider building some shelters?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Can I answer that part?

**The CHAIR:** Yes; absolutely.

**Dr M. Carrick:** There is a whole range of issues there. In the particular paddock where the recipients were, one, it is a flood zone; two, we were in the process of putting some state-of-the-art

---



cell-raising systems so that 30 hectares—35 hectares—is now split up into about 200, potentially, individual lots so that we can rotationally graze those animals through. In the smallest, we have normal grazing; looking after their gut; better enrichment; the whole thing with that. We had ability to provide shelter when required. That was never, I guess, wavered from to ensure their welfare and safety and health. We had issues—my wife—with a 30-year-old horse from Germany that had had colic surgery and we have some inside boxes, or stables, with all rubber matting; state-of-the-art stabling. And on those warmer days, we had to actually move them out of an insulated shed and out into the open paddock because they were sweating up indoors.

**Dr I. Carrick:** Because it is too static, the air. There is no airflow; they need airflow.

**Dr M. Carrick:** When Maureen came and the horses were in a particular paddock—before that, they were in some paddocks with trees in them that they just about ringbarked. We moved them out of there. Come 10 o'clock in the morning, they were all standing out in the middle of the paddock. We are in tune with animals in our care. We watch and monitor them. That is what I do. It does not matter whether it is horses or cattle or anything. There is no way I would ever compromise that.

**The CHAIR:** I know Hon Paul Brown has touched on this, but the first contact you had from Inspector Rogers, was what—that she approached either of you or was there a notice left somewhere, or —?

**Dr M. Carrick:** That was myself. I guess Ina had contacted Amanda Swift after some clients of Ina's had contacted her in distress about being threatened with prosecution.

**The CHAIR:** Sorry, just so I am clear on this: threatened with prosecution by whom?

**Dr M. Carrick:** By Maureen Rogers.

**The CHAIR:** By Inspector Rogers?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** Okay, so they then rang —

**Dr M. Carrick:** Ina —

**The CHAIR:** — Inspector Swift?

**Dr M. Carrick:** No.

**Dr I. Carrick:** They rang myself.

**The CHAIR:** They rang you first.

**Dr I. Carrick:** So that is how I got hold of the whole thing. People rang—they were our clients and they rang me and said, “We have just had the RSPCA visit here. They are threatening us with prosecution if we don't build shelter for horses.” I guess they sort of did not know what to do.

[12 noon]

**The CHAIR:** Sorry to interrupt you there. So you had contact from these clients prior to you then getting the notice?

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes, absolutely. So I had contact with those clients. I then rang Amanda Swift, because I was, like, “Well, is this an RSPCA thing or is this a Maureen Rogers thing? What's the go?” So I rang Amanda Swift and I said, “Look, this is what your inspector is doing here. In my opinion, this is not right. This is how she is behaving.” And then we had a brief discussion about shelter, and that it was a very vague thing in the Animal Welfare Act et cetera. She then said, “Well, look I'm obviously going to have to confirm with Maureen Rogers what you have said”, and then we hung up. Maureen Rogers, a couple of weeks later, then came to our practice, and we operate from the same building. I was not present at the time, I was out working. Matt was there, and that is when they had the conversation.

---

**The CHAIR:** So your first conversation was with Inspector Swift?

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes, I never had any contact—in fact, ever—with Maureen Rogers in regards to this whole thing.

**The CHAIR:** Okay, so how did you get the notice in the first instance?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Okay, so the first time Maureen Rogers visited the practice I was in attendance, and she spoke to myself about issues, and I asked for clarification, of which we still have never had, what would be appropriate shelter or information.

**The CHAIR:** All right, so you tried to discuss the situation with Inspector Rogers to explain the wind and cooling of the horses and all that.

**Dr M. Carrick:** Not necessarily. I thought that had already happened with Ina and Amanda Swift. I was a bit perplexed about whether this was Maureen on a vendetta in her own personal crusade to enforce what she thought was right, or the RSPCA's position. So all I wanted to know was, "Can you please go away and tell me that this is the official—can you get some legal advice from the RSPCA? Tell me what the actual position is and give me some clarification. If you want shelters, what does it entail? What is the amount of shade per—is it shade that you want; is it wind protection that you want; how many square metres of shade per head do I need? Does it have to be all times of the day? Is it only over certain temperatures?"

**The CHAIR:** All right, so after your conversation with Inspector Swift, did you think that was the end of the matter at that point?

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes, I guess I was just waiting to sort of hear back, you know, from Amanda Swift by a phone call saying, "Look I've spoken to Maureen. This is actually what we're doing. This is what is going on." And then I would have sort of—to be honest with you, Mr Mazza, I did not really spend too much time thinking about it. You know, to me it was just such a clear-cut thing. I mean, the welfare of any of my clients' horses or our horses or any of the horses that were involved in this whole matter was never compromised at all. Two of these clients are our best clients—you know, fully vaccinated, ring us about everything. They are not just sort of some, "Oh, we'll see them once a year" type clients; they were, "We are there on a regular basis looking after the horses." They were really, really good clients and very well looked after horses.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** I wanted to ask a few questions. Do we have any further information about the welfare of the horses at the time?

**Dr I. Carrick:** What do you mean by further information?

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Well, is this just about the theory of providing shelter, or was there some welfare concern about the horses? Like, what were the temperatures; were any of them ill? I mean, do we have any information about the welfare of the horses?

**Dr I. Carrick:** I will tell you exactly. I think it was in February, and there was maybe a couple of weekends where the temperatures were very, very high.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** When you —

**Dr I. Carrick:** So, 42—something like that. During those times, we stay home on weekends, when our nurses are not there to look at the horses—because it is our own horses as well that are out in paddocks—and we check them. And there was absolutely no animal welfare issue at all. We went out—I walked out in the paddock, I looked at every single horse, and they kind of looked at me going like, "Why? Why are you here?"

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** So, the other question was: is this a disagreement about whether the horses were in any kind of heat stress?

**Dr M. Carrick:** I do not think—the confusing part for me is that I do not really know. If no-one has ever looked at a horse, I know what they are saying—they are just under the assumption that if

shelter was not provided 24/7, then they could not be guaranteed that they knew that it was their health and welfare that was being ensured. My argument was we had other practices in place to make sure they were being monitored and had other strategies in place to make sure that we could always look after their health, safety and welfare.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** You are obviously aware of the statute that the Chair quoted, which is 39 —

**The CHAIR:** No.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** What is it?

**The CHAIR:** Section 19(3)(e), member?

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Section 19(3)(e) of the Animal Welfare Act, which says that inspectors have a —

**The CHAIR:** No, it is shelter needs to be provided.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** It is—I am just looking —

Without limiting subsection (1) a person in charge of an animal is cruel to an animal if the animal —

...

(e) is not provided with such shelter, shade or other protection from the elements as is reasonably necessary to ensure its welfare, safety and health;

That is the nub of the matter, so that is why, I guess, the RSPCA was there.

**Dr M. Carrick:** And, I guess, even in our subsequent meetings with the RSPCA, it has been considered that we had that all the way along. Amanda Swift, at the time of our mediation, also said that, “Well, they can’t go back to a complainant and say, ‘Well, they’ve just got strategies in place; leave us, you need to.’ And we can’t be here all the time to be checking that you’re doing what you said you’d be doing; therefore, you just have to put up a shelter.” Well, I think that is —

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Thank you. Did you write to the RSPCA in May of this year about the measures you have now got in place?

**Dr M. Carrick:** We do —

**Dr I. Carrick:** I do not know whether it was in May, but we did send an email.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Can I just check the information that we have, which is that you did write to the RSPCA in May?

**Dr M. Carrick:** I do not know if it was in —

**Dr I. Carrick:** It was an email that we sent. I do not know when exactly it was sent.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** You outlined that you have got measures now in place that include sprinklers and shady paddocks for days of extreme heat with no wind, stables and undercover shelter in cases of severe thunderstorms. Is that correct?

**Dr M. Carrick:** There were two emails. One was sent and retracted; it was one that was drafted and accidentally sent. That was an initial draft.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** So what measures do you have in place —

**The CHAIR:** Member, we do not have a copy of that.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** It is in your pack, member.

So what measures—I guess what I am trying to figure out is: are these measures new since this incident?

**Dr I. Carrick:** No, they are not new. They are measures that we had in place the whole time.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** They have always been in place.

**Dr M. Carrick:** From the moment we have ever had a horse or animal on the property.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Is it your understanding that the RSPCA was aware that you had these measures in place?

**Dr M. Carrick:** They never asked us.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** They never asked you, but did you provide that information freely without them asking?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Well, that was initially the thing. All I wanted was a continue of dialogue with Maureen Rogers when she first came. So, I sent her away with my details, “Please get back to me, and then I’ll explain what we’re doing. Don’t come here threatening this and that and saying you have to put a shelter in that paddock.” I said, “I can’t put a shelter in that paddock. There is a myriad of reasons why we can’t. One is the fact that it’s a flood zone, we’d never get—you know, there’s 30 horses there. If you want X amount, how much shade would you think would be appropriate?” And then we could go and have a discussion about what is actually here. Do not come in in a threatening sort of way.

**Dr I. Carrick:** And I guess what I would like to add is that Maureen Rogers was quite unclear what she actually—what was actually wanted. First she said, “Are you planning on providing shelter? If you just tell me now that you are, I will make this matter go away.” So, firstly, it was totally like, is this even real? What is this, even? Is this an official visit? Is this just a conversation? Like, what is actually going on? It was not—I mean, this comment is very, very unclear about what she actually is representing.

[12.10 pm]

And then secondly she was then, from memory, talking about, “Well, are you planning on putting trees into the ground as a wind break?” It was very, very unspecific. The way she spoke to us, or to Matt—I obviously was not there—the way she spoke to Matt was very unclear. Matt sort of reversed the conversation to me, and I said, “Well, I am confused. I do not even understand.” Does she just want a statement saying, “Yes, sure. In two years’ time maybe there will be shelter,” and then it is all good, or is there something further going on? I guess we wanted something in writing.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Yes, that was my question. So, when was the confusion, because this direction notice is dated the 17 of March, which is pretty specific? So when did this all lead up? It is sounding like you had conversations previous to this which were less clear.

**Dr M. Carrick:** So, it was basically, I think, a couple of weeks before that notice.

**Dr I. Carrick:** No, it was end of February.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** End of February.

**Dr M. Carrick:** I am not sure of the exact date. All I wanted was clarification, and I thought if anything happened from then on, I thought it was going to be a continual dialogue and that was it. The next thing we received was those direction notices on 17 March which was from Amanda Swift, and to me that felt like things went up a notch in the aggressive —

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Which is very clear though, that —

To provide all the horses at the Greenough vet services on the above property with shelter. This is to ensure the horses welfare, safety and health. You must provide this as soon as possible, but no later than the 14th of April 2014

---

This was last year. So I guess my query is: when the initial discussions occurred, why did you not just tell them about your measures in place for the welfare of the horses?

**Dr I. Carrick:** Because, I said that to you before, like, it was very unclear what was actually wanted. It was very unclear what Maureen Rogers actually—what the visit even was.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Okay.

**Dr M. Carrick:** Can I also add to that? When she came, there was continuing of dialogue; that is all I thought we were going to go away with, that we were having an issue with; I guess Ina had made contact with Amanda Swift. We were trying to clear up, not just for ourselves, but for our clients that were obviously in distress about being the potential of prosecution or whatever. So, I took it as an opportunity to have that dialogue with ourselves, with Maureen Rogers, and get to the bottom and get some official statements and stuff.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** I have one more question which was basically about the veterinary services that you offer. So, in addition to the equine services for the people in the region, and I guess lots of people in your region and your clients have received similar information from the RSPCA about the need to provide shelter, is that correct? Did anybody else get direction notices?

**Dr I. Carrick:** I am not entirely sure. There was one client that I spoke to and she said, “I was not given anything, she just came here and verbally instructed me to put shelter.” And she did. It was only one horse that was in question. Another client that I was in contact with, so the initial conversation was, “Tell me you are planning on building shelter and I will leave.” And she said, “Yes, I plan to build a shelter”, and Maureen left.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** Was that the Freemans?

**Dr I. Carrick:** That was the Freemans, yes. They were then sort of left alone until our mediation meeting, shortly after our mediation meeting I believe —

**Dr M. Carrick:** First one with David.

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes, which was in November I think last year. The Freemans received a second visit from Maureen, and she, I believe, neither Vanessa or Peter, who are the people in charge of the horses, were present at the time. Vanessa rang me and said, “A direction notice was just given to my daughter Charlie, who is 11.”

**Dr M. Carrick:** Thirteen.

**Dr I. Carrick:** Or it might have been Ruby, 11 or 13. Anyway, the daughter then rang her parents and said, “We have just had this visit.” She was quite distressed, and that is the only thing that I heard about direction notices given to other people.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** The two final questions are: did you make a submission to the Animal Welfare Act review about this incident; and how it can be improved, how the Animal Welfare Act can be improved?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Yes.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** So you have contacted the minister about it?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Yes.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** That is good. And finally: you provide veterinary services. Do you provide services now or have you in the past provided services to the live export industry?

**Dr M. Carrick:** I have, yes.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Could you explain, just describe those services or what you are doing?

**Dr M. Carrick:** The majority that I do is pregnancy testing of cattle prior to export, to ensure that they are empty prior to export.

---

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** And are you the only vet that does that in that region?

**Dr M. Carrick:** We go from Perth, all over; but north, in our area, there might be one other vet that does a little bit but I have been doing 99 per cent.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** What percentage of your business would that be, and do you currently have accreditation?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Yes, I currently have accreditation. The percentage of my business, I could not really tell; 20 per cent.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Twenty per cent; thank you.

**Hon NIGEL HALLETT:** Matt, you have obviously been practising there for many years now. It is not the first 42-degree day that Geraldton has had.

**Dr M. Carrick:** No.

**Hon NIGEL HALLETT:** What do you think triggered this action by the RSPCA? Was it, do you think, sort of they wanted to make an example of a veterinary practice? It seems odd to me, from what you have been telling us this morning that you have been singled out. Now, surely they could have been working with you. Why was this action taken to the length that it has been?

**Dr M. Carrick:** I guess, interestingly, several properties had to be driven past on the highway in plain view of horses without shelter to get to our property. We are 30 kilometres, 35 kilometres out of Geraldton. So we counted up somewhere between four and six properties without shelter that had to be driven past by the inspector to get to ours to charge; to, you know, give us direction or —

**Hon NIGEL HALLETT:** Why do you think you were singled out?

**Dr M. Carrick:** I think it might have something to do with Ina challenging the inspector.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** What, a previous incident or this incident?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Previously, when she made contact with Amanda Swift.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** Are you talking about the original conversation prior to the direction notice?

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes.

**Dr M. Carrick:** Prior to any contact with us at all.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** What, February 2014?

**Dr M. Carrick:** It would have been, yes, January or February, when you first spoke to Amanda.

**Dr I. Carrick:** It was, yes.

**Hon NIGEL HALLETT:** So were any other horse centres targeted as well, or were you the only one?

**Dr I. Carrick:** We are not sure. I think Amanda Swift, in our mediation meeting, mentioned that there was another veterinary practice down south, but I am not sure.

**Hon NIGEL HALLETT:** How about private individuals that have got three or four horses on a block of land?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Yes, look, I do not know.

**Dr I. Carrick:** To our knowledge, it was ourselves plus two other properties in the whole of the midwest—or three, sorry, three others.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Just two quick questions. We heard evidence last week, and I guess that you have read the transcripts or you were here?

**Dr M. Carrick:** We were actually out of the country, but some bit has been relayed to us.

---

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** We understand that the RSPCA has asked for clarification about which section of the act would be relevant to cite in the order. But there seems to be plenty of references on both sides of the argument about the fact that this was due to miscommunication, and I understand you have had a mediation session now and, you know, you have got a working relationship again now, have you, with the RSPCA?

**Dr I. Carrick:** Well, just to address your first part of the question, we, or Matt, in the first meeting with Maureen Rogers simply asked to be given something in writing about the official standpoint of the RSPCA as well as what was actually required of him. We then were given the direction notices plus a definition of the word “ensure” highlighted at dictionary.com, printed out from dictionary.com, and an “Australian Horse welfare and well-being toolkit” and a direction notice signed by Amanda Swift.

[12.20 pm]

To be frank with you, if this is the chief inspector’s way of opening communication channels between a veterinary practice that has previously worked with the RSPCA and themselves, I think that that is not the appropriate way to be going. You surely would have to admit that these documents, not so much the direction notices—that is a legal document—but the “Australian Horse welfare and well-being toolkit” and the dictionary.com printout with an ad for a \$20 million jackpot in Oz Lotto is totally inappropriate. It does not help. It is not even a useful document. I am not entirely sure what the point was of these two documents apart from being, I do not know, provocative, I guess. It is not what we asked for. It is not the information that we asked for.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** My question is: do you put this down now to miscommunication or are you suggesting that there is a systemic problem?

**Dr I. Carrick:** I think there is a systemic problem. We were very clear, or Matt was very clear in what he wanted of the RSPCA. If Amanda or the RSPCA was not willing to give us those things, they could have said via email or in a letter, “This is not how we operate; we don’t do this kind of back and forth type thing.” We were very clear in what we wanted so there was no communication breakdown at that point in time.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** My second question is about the circumstances that provoked the original complaints. Our understanding is that there were, in fact, three complaints.

**Dr I. Carrick:** That is what we were told.

**Dr M. Carrick:** Well, no. I have to answer that. The first time I heard of three complaints was actually after last Monday’s hearing. It never ever was brought up before there were three complaints. It was brought up that there was “a” complaint—the first I ever heard that there was more than one.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** One complaint, three complaints—the inspector came to tell you that there was a problem because she had received a complaint.

**Dr I. Carrick:** She came and she said, “Are you planning to provide shelter for these horses? If you are telling me now that you are planning to provide shelter, I will make this matter go away.” That was one of the first things, according to Matt.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** What you are saying is that you found that offensive or confronting.

**Dr M. Carrick:** From my point of view, I wanted to get to the bigger issue as well because we had made contact on behalf of other clients to get to the bottom of what they were actually trying to achieve with these matters, and not just with ours, with other people’s. I think it is totally inappropriate if you are trying to achieve an animal welfare outcome just to say, “We’ll just make this matter go away.” I am here about outcomes; I am not here to tick a box.

---

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Okay. My specific question goes to your reaction to the legal advice that you received. You are aware that there is some complaint about lack of shelter for the horses from the initial contact from the RSPCA.

**Dr I. Carrick:** Well, no, because she did not say that there was a complaint. She just came and said, “Are you planning on building a shelter for these horses?” She did not say, “I received a complaint on this date about your paddock.” She said, “Are you planning on building shelter for the horses on this property?”

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** So there is no mention of a complaint?

**Dr M. Carrick:** At the time.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** So when was the first moment that you knew that there was a complaint?

**Dr I. Carrick:** To me, from memory, it was the mediation meeting.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** What was the date of that?

**Dr I. Carrick:** It was at the end of January this year.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** In January this year? So you went for a whole year without knowing there was any complaint.

**Dr I. Carrick:** From memory, yes. To be honest, we did not have any communication with the RSPCA verbally. The last communication we had was this.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** When she spoke to the chief inspector, she did not mention that there had been any complaints?

**Dr I. Carrick:** The first time I even spoke to the chief inspector was at a mediation meeting at the end of January. We had a previous meeting planned where we drove down here at Parliament House. Amanda Swift, unfortunately, was unable to attend that meeting.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** So you did not speak to Amanda Swift before 2015, not at all in 2015?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Only Ina spoke to her initially before any of this happened by telephone.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** After the direction notice was issued?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Never.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** There is a misunderstanding there about time lines. Can I ask you a specific question? What is confusing me is the legal advice we received from your lawyer—“Don’t put the horses back in the paddock without shelter.” So you did not.

**Dr M. Carrick:** We just stocked the property.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** But at the same time you are saying that you did have shelter for the horses.

**Dr M. Carrick:** They needed to be in particular paddocks. There were some paddocks they could be. They could not be in there all the time. Stock do not just stay in one paddock. I do not care whether it is horses or cattle or sheep.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Is the real issue that you did not have sufficient paddocks with shade?

**Dr M. Carrick:** No. The direction notice here said that we had to erect the shelters in all the paddocks where they were. That is not feasible; it is still not a possible thing to do. We had no ability to —

**Dr I. Carrick:** Are you finished? Two things, essentially. This direction notice does not give me or us any detail as to what actually was required in terms of shelter. We felt very exposed and unsure because we said, “If we put the horses in a paddock with trees, what does stop them from coming back and saying, ‘This is not adequate—bang?’” The risk to us is, like it says here, “The maximum

---



penalty for failing to comply with the direction notice is a fine of \$20 000 and imprisonment". This direction notice is not clear on what is actually required at all. It does not say they need to have trees. It does not even say they need to have trees or they need to have shade or they need to have anything. We felt exposed in that way. But, secondly, the paddock that had sufficient shelter for the horses in terms of trees for the recipient mares, they could not live there the whole time because it would have not been the best outcome for the horses.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Do you think there is a problem with the direction notice or with the act?

**Dr I. Carrick:** I think both, because the act does not specify what shelter is required. The act is very open to interpretation.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** You have made a submission to the current inquiry. Would you be prepared to give the committee a copy of that submission?

**Dr M. Carrick:** To the animal welfare inquiry?

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** Yes.

**Dr M. Carrick:** Yes. It was emailed. I am sure if you have ways of obtaining that, I would certainly give permission. Sorry; it was an online document that was filled out for the application to animal welfare.

**The CHAIR:** So you do not have a copy of that?

**Dr M. Carrick:** I do not have a hard copy, no. I do not remember.

**Hon SALLY TALBOT:** I ask you to liaise with the staff about that.

**Dr M. Carrick:** If you can get it from DAFWA, I certainly give my permission.

**The CHAIR:** On behalf of the committee, I wish to thank you for your attendance today. The committee will forward any additional questions it has to you in writing in the next few days together with transcripts of evidence —

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** I was hoping to ask more questions.

**The CHAIR:** The time is up, sorry. Member, did you want to ask more questions?

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** Given that you have started that, I will hold my question. I would have liked —

**The CHAIR:** I am happy to interrupt that and let you continue with a couple of very quick questions.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** Sorry, doctors. I just wanted to follow on from some comments you made before. As you stated previously, you have been engaged as an expert witness in an animal prosecution case by the RSPCA. Can you give the committee some opinion of your views of their training and their experience in regard to animal welfare, the knowledge of inspectors?

[12.30 pm]

**Dr I. Carrick:** The current inspector or the inspector that I was dealing with for this particular case?

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** I will leave that open to you.

**Dr I. Carrick:** So, the inspector that I was dealing with for this case in 2009, which then led into 2010, I had a very, very good relationship with. I was working for Chapman Animal Hospital at the time. I was their equine vet. The RSPCA contacted Chapman Animal Hospital. I then went out to visit these horses with the inspector. The horses were severely emaciated. It was a case of underfeeding the horses, as well as not providing appropriate wound care to one particular horse. She was very much following my guidance in terms of how to feed the horses, what to buy et cetera, et cetera. She said, "I have no experience with this whatsoever. Can you please help me in

getting an outcome for these horses? How should we handle this?” And we worked as a team. She essentially handled all the, I guess, legalities and the notices and things like that with the owner of the horses at the time, and I handled the horses. So that is that working relationship. In terms of Maureen Rogers, I mean, I do not know about her training. I definitely do not think that she has that similar attitude. I think that she—and this is a totally subjective thing from communications that I have had with her—is very much like, “I will tell you what you need to do and you do it.” So, she sort of treated myself, as a veterinarian, to just sort of do what she, like, says.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** Maureen is not a vet though, is she?

**Dr I. Carrick:** No, she is not a vet, no. I do not know what training she has got whatsoever. You know, she definitely does not have any tertiary education or anything like that, I do not think. But, yes, so I guess all the knowledge that she has about horses is as a horse owner herself.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** Just one final question, Chair.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Mr Chair, I do have a question but it can be answered in future. If I could ask it so they could table the information later; that would be great.

**The CHAIR:** We will just finish with Hon Paul Brown. I must apologise; he did actually indicate he had follow-up questions.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** The prosecution case where you were engaged as an expert witness, in your view, being the veterinarian that was brought back from Darwin—I believe it was your first anniversary that you were subpoenaed to return back from.

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** You offered to give evidence by teleconference and that was not accepted. Do you believe that given the lady, I think you said that she was mentally —

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes, well —

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** I will finish the question and then —

**Dr I. Carrick:** Yes, sure.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** Do you believe that was in the public best interest?

**Dr I. Carrick:** No, not at all. The lady was—I mean, I am not a psychiatrist or a counsellor, I do not know, but it was very clear that she did not in the communication I had with her—she was obviously very upset when we visited the property. The first time we visited the property, she was not present. The second time she sort of came out after about 20 minutes of us dealing with the horses. She was elderly. She did not understand at all why we were taking these horses, what the problem was. I asked her, “What is your feeding program for these horses? What do you do with these horses?” And she said, “Well, I just feed them this”, and put like a handful of hay. It is my opinion that at the time she thought that was totally fine; she did not understand any of it. And when it came to the court, she actually, you know, caused a bit of an upset. She did not really understand how to behave in court, what she was charged with. She was confused. She was confused. She was old. She was not well in her mind. It was very, very obvious.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** And there were better ways to achieve an outcome in that case?

**Dr I. Carrick:** It was a clear-cut case. The horses were emaciated; they were skin and bone. In fact, it came to the point where the RSPCA was presenting so much evidence, pictures and pictures and pictures, and the judge in the end said, “Look, guys, I think it is fine; it is enough.” It was black and white.

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** Thank you.

**The CHAIR:** You have a question, Hon Lynn MacLaren?

---

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Yes, just for Dr Carrick. Could you provide us with a list of the live export clients you have currently and in the past, thank you?

**Dr M. Carrick:** What —

**Dr I. Carrick:** How is that —

**The CHAIR:** I am sorry, what relevance has that got to this situation?

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** It is relevant.

**Dr M. Carrick:** No, it is not.

**Dr I. Carrick:** No. I do not think you should agree.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** What is the problem with it?

**Dr M. Carrick:** What has it got to do?

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Members, what is the problem with it?

**Hon PAUL BROWN:** My belief is that you are setting up an agenda here, as opposed to being unbiased with the question.

**The CHAIR:** Members, look, we might deliberate on that later. The question has been asked —

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** But it is just one question.

**Dr I. Carrick:** But can I also say it is actually confidential, our client list?

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Your client list is confidential? Is that your answer to the parliamentary committee? That is noted.

**Dr M. Carrick:** Can I please also add one thing? We also have a statement here from my client who was present at the time Maureen Rogers initial —

**The CHAIR:** Is it a brief statement?

**Dr M. Carrick:** No, no; I would just like to table it. I do not want to —

**The CHAIR:** You would like to table it; okay; so tabled. Okay, if everybody is finished.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Thank you.

**The CHAIR:** Are you happy for that to be made public, Dr Carrick?

**Dr M. Carrick:** Absolutely.

**The CHAIR:** On behalf of the committee, I wish to thank you for your attendance today. The committee will forward any additional questions it has to you in writing in the next few days together with the transcript of evidence, which includes any questions you may have taken on notice. Responses to these questions will be requested by a due date, and should you be unable to meet this deadline, please contact committee staff as soon as possible. Once again, thank you for your attendance today.

**The Witnesses:** Thank you.

**Hearing concluded at 12.35 pm**

---