

Submission to the:

# **PROPOSED DRAFT AUSTRALIAN ANIMAL WELFARE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR POULTRY**

Version: Public Consultation Nov 2017

**From:**  
Peter Fraser

Dear Sir / Madam,

I have attached answers to a number of the RIS questions as an addenda to this submission.

## **Background.**

I come from a family of early pioneers in poultry production for both eggs and meat in Australia. My uncle (John Fraser) pioneered the practice of caging in the early 1950's at a time when he worked for a number of agricultural organisations, including Meat and Livestock as its Secretary. A second uncle (Harold Fraser) pioneered turkey barn production in the Wagga Wagga district in the late 1950's, the first of its kind in Australia, and lectured at Wagga Wagga CAE in animal husbandry prior to it becoming a university.

My cousin, Robert Fraser, was an early geneticist who pioneered brown egg genetics and was awarded a PhD from Davis UC in the early 1960's for his work. He later lectured at Hawkesbury Agricultural College.

## **Submission**

I submit that this proposed draft is substantially deficient because it omits any mention of abolishing caging of animals for the purpose of either egg or meat production. I consider the practice of caging poultry an ethical abomination. The draft does not even address this issue but merely assumes the practice will continue. This is unacceptable.

Production of poultry eggs and meat using caging is cruel and unnecessary and only serves to support a limited number of producers who dominate the industry. As a consumer I never purchase caged eggs and do not eat poultry, essentially because of the cruelty that is visited on sentient animals by people for profit.

It is an unnecessary form of meat and egg production and any form of caging is inherently cruel.

I take exception to the argument in 2.3.1 of the RIS that states:

“There are no quantitative measures of the impacts of procedures on individual animals, other than stress measurements such as the levels of cortisol in blood. No such studies have been done on any significant scale in poultry. Impacts on individual animals is therefore a matter for qualitative judgement. “

What possible quantitative measurements could be employed apart from asking the animals how they feel? It is a preposterous argument that because we cannot know how an animal is feeling apart from measuring some kind of chemical or neurological response, that the animal is not in stress. All knowledge of *any* animal's subjective experience, including that of humans, has to be inferred by the observer and is “a matter of qualitative judgement”.

It can easily be inferred that animals that exhibit outward signs of stress or pain are probably experiencing stress and pain. This even more so if they are confined to a lifelong experience of something completely outside their natural way of living. If it looks like stress and pain it probably is, even if none of us can “quantitatively measure” with certainty the experience of anyone else but ourselves.

When it is totally unnecessary to subject these animals to this kind of existence (ie caging) in order to produce eggs or even meat, it is clearly ethically immoral for this practice to continue. Other means of egg production can be used and can substantially reduce the *inferred* pain and stress that comes from being held in any form of confinement for the production of food for human consumption.

I therefore submit that the following sub-clauses be deleted from the draft standard:

**Proposed change to Standards:**

Delete all of SB1 and GB1.1

Delete all of SB3.1 – SB3.4, SB3.8 – SB3.10

Regards,  
Peter D Fraser  
January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2018