

SUBMISSION TO SENATE INQUIRY REGARDING ANIMAL WELFARE
STANDARD'S TO AUSTRALIA'S LIVE EXPORT MARKETS:

*TO INVESTIGATE CONCERNS REGARDING THE TIMING OF THE RELEASE OF
THE FOOTAGE HELD BY RSPCA AND ANIMALS AUSTRALIA, AND THE 4
CORNERS PROGRAMME.*

As a cattle producer I am grateful that images shown in 4 Corners as distressing as they were brought to light, in order for any animal welfare issues to be identified and addressed. However I hold serious concerns for the manner in which RSPCA and Animals Australia chose to withhold footage of animals being abused, and the resulting disregard shown for animal welfare in Australia, and Indonesia.

Any examination of one aspect of Live Export, and in isolation of the full benefits to Australian cattle would be reckless in the extreme. Animal Welfare is a whole of life issue, it is not exclusive to the last half an hour of an animal's life, and any viewing of images needs also to be contrasted with those of drought and disease.

I feel that had this footage been released thru any section of the media during the wet season that the immediate reaction of Pastoralists would have been to demand MLA take action. Which would have been the appropriate response, and negotiations regarding animal welfare could have been undertaken in the manner that would normally result in positive change.

This was not to be the case and instead of seeing an immediate release and seeing pastoralists fighting for animal welfare in Indonesia, by a in-season release pastoralists were forced to fight for their very survival, and publicly fight for animal welfare in Australia, which stangely enough was interpreted as pastoralists only concerned with making money. (Please see also Complaint to ABC 4 Corners)

To give an example of this media at the time, the following is an excerpt from The Australian, it was in the Business Section

"Four Corners' report on animal cruelty is what journalism is all about"

- *ERROL SIMPER*
- *From: [The Australian](#)*
- *June 13, 2011 12:00AM*

"IT'S instructive that the loudest voices in the wake of the horrendous Four Corners (ABC1, 8.30pm, Mondays) disclosures about animal cruelty have been from those demanding taxpayers' compensation because of the suspension of live cattle exports to Indonesia. Just so long as the cattle industry gets its priorities right!"

"It's a win for traditional, mainstream, free-to-air media and for community sensibilities. Yet everyone involved will undoubtedly refrain from anything faintly resembling vulgar triumphalism. The dollar, as always in Australia, will win and this ugly trade will resume soon enough. Other shocking stories will materialise, and Australian holidaymakers in Bali or Jakarta will happily consume them, along with

their rare steaks. Some commentators will continue their shallow babble about how the ABC is middle-class welfare, isolated from mainstream social concerns."

Well I happen to disagree with Errol who is entitled to a personal opinion, but I do wonder why as a Business journalist he was not exploring the consequences for Australian business and particularly export.

In the history of Australia, it would be very hard to identify a similar occurrence where entire Industries were effectively closed within a week. These Industries were the Australian Pastoral Industry and the Export Industry for Live Trade.

On the space of a 45-minute Television programme and Australia's first and most successful Cyberspace campaign, a minority government felt compelled to make a decision to Suspend trade. The decision to Suspend occurred in a week. To give an idea of the extent of the public pressure placed on the government.

Here is an excerpt from Animals Australia's website of what happened in the first 24 hours:

"Australia's most respected current affairs program [Four Corners](#) airs explosive footage of Animals Australia's investigation into the [live export trade to Indonesia](#), exposing unspeakable suffering and torture endured by Australian cattle nightly in that country. Websites of Animals Australia and campaign partners, RSPCA Australia and GetUp! crash as outraged Australians attempt to make their voices heard. In the first 24 hours after the screening [a bill is announced](#) to parliament to end live exports as the government immediately suspends exports to the abattoirs identified; the Agriculture Ministers phone system is brought down; tens of thousands of emails are sent to the Prime Minister Julia Gillard local MPs; the number one nationwide Twitter trend becomes #BanLiveExport and a petition to ban live exports is the fastest growing petition in GetUp!'s history. Australians have sent a clear message to their leaders that they will accept nothing less than a total ban on live animal export."

Only problem was, it wasn't all Australians sending a clear message only those in areas with consistent access to internet, phones and mobile coverage. Many of the people most affected did not necessarily have access to the same consistency of services or literacy skills, as in some remote communities english is a second or third language (see Submission Regarding Equity of Access).

Due to the critical time within the boat season of the programme's release, within a week two Australian industries are at risk of collapse, and Australia's ability to be an International Exporter of any products is in question.

There has been considerable ongoing damage caused by the Suspension even after it's lifting, to both the Pastoral Industry and Australia's Export Industry these include:

- Animal Welfare in Australia was seriously compromised. Instead of producers previously being able to meet their obligations under the Australian Animal Welfare

Strategy, they are in danger of being in violation of the Model Codes of Practice for the Welfare of Animals, and risk of prosecution.

- Australia whose Bio-security was hard won after 17 years of eradication of Tuberculosis and Brucellosis, was suddenly at risk by not appreciating the buffer and surveillance provided over many years by its closest neighbour Indonesia for Foot and Mouth Disease.
- Income for the entire year was placed at risk, as it takes two countries to re-open trade. Even with the Suspension lifted, it is uncertain how many cattle will be able to travel thru new guidelines regardless of Indonesia's commitment to 180,000.
- All future income placed in jeopardy as Australia is seen as unstable trading partner
- Pastoral Leases and freehold have been devalued as banks are unlikely to be able to give finance to an industry at the mercy of government.
- A whole generation of remote children's education has been placed at risk as pastoralists traditionally meet the majority of boarding school costs essential for accessing high school from remote areas.
- An industry that has the highest level of Aboriginal participation in business and employment, was perceived as being able to turn a tap off and the real jobs will still be there at the Government's leisure.

I appreciate the unusual nature of the request to investigate the timing, but I would ask the Senate Inquiry to investigate this matter in "other related matters", as any related legal action may take years for these questions to be asked. By that time many people will have lost their homes, their children's future and those jobs lost, cannot be re-created in another industry as the cost of this tsunami continues.

I had hoped that at some point the investigative journalists of Australia would start to understand the extent to which there was

We are therefore reliant on the processes of the Senate of Australia to closely examine some of the factors leading to this decision of Government, which has been to the detriment of a large proportion of the remote population of Northern Australia and regional Australia.

If you could bear with me I will tell you a story I wrote it is called "Duck Hunting", which arose out of looking closely of the events while the Suspension was in place. It is merely my own observations of cause and effect, and it is not intended to discredit any party mentioned. Please read it fully before you make any judgement on whether or not the questions raised need your attention.

"Duck Hunting"

A Northern cattle producers perspective.....

When we watched the show we had just been through one of the worst Droughts in living memory where native shrubs, trees, kangaroos, frogs and snakes died in the immense heat and cattle caught in the Rangelands, were those that had not been able to get to Indonesia.

Like everyone else watching 4 Corners we were disgusted and surprised at the method of slaughter. My husband observed that they seemed to be making it much harder than needed, in short it was horrific, but fixable. As the Drought is still close in our minds we could not fail to observe how well fed and healthy the cattle looked.

We were surprised that Dr Bidda Jones, Chief Scientist, with a respected Animal Welfare organization, who the public rely upon to be objective about the same, didn't comment on it. These cattle were feeder cattle they had been in Indonesian care for between 90 – 120 Days, not only had the basic First Freedom of RSPCA been met, the standard appeared to have been much better met than if they had stayed in Australia.

A quick examination of RSPCA Policies reveals many things. One is by sending cattle to Indonesia for slaughter we were meeting all of their policies as a producer, and the second if we stop sending them, as producers we will be in breach of most of their policies. For example:

“It is unacceptable for animals to be allowed to starve to death and die of thirst under any circumstance.”

RSPCA policy is we must prevent starvation in any circumstances, avoid long distances on trucks and use the closest slaughter point. We were sending the animals to Indonesia to be fed, thereby avoiding long distances in trucks and also using our closest slaughter point. And even though we can send the cattle now to Australian feedlots in Indonesia who have a closed system, RSPCA is still Ban Live Export.

Given their policy, why on earth would RSPCA be looking at Banning something, that would immediately require the retention of a million plus grazing animals be retained in an arid climate and in danger of perishing in the next drought, without any Audit of feed levels, processing facilities or distance to travel to slaughter. I have read Dr Jones report and although I agree there needs to be change on all the issues she raised, I still don't see how creating a problem in Australia, fixes one in Indonesia.

RSPCA Position paper B5 is entitled “Managing farm animals during drought”.
“Where there is any doubt as to the ability to provide animals with adequate feed and water, the decision to agist or sell must be made sooner rather than later and well before the animal is too weak to be moved.”

The 300,000 cattle annually turned off WA's Pastoral Rangelands that are slaughtered overseas, are in grave danger of perishing in the next drought if not mustered now and immediately sold thru Northern exit points. As the refugee Live Export cattle from NT and Qld also enter the Eastern cattle market and need to be fed, prices drop, it is unlikely Eastern buyers will find it viable to transport them.

In last year's drought, 127,000 cattle were transported across the SA Border in trucks inspected by the RSPCA of WA travelling distances of 2000 – 4000km as there was insufficient feed and slaughter facilities. The RSPCA knows that what it is advocating for with Indonesia will place Australian cattle in more danger by Long Distance Transport of animals, than ever were with Live Export.

“RSPCA teams up with WSPA to fight for a ban on live animal exports.
“The World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) is leading a coalition of animal welfare organisations to end the long distance transport of animals for slaughter.” RSPCA WA website.

RSPCA is being a bit quiet and not advising WSPA of the role a ban on Live Exports for Australia will play in increasing long distance transport of animals for slaughter. Currently on the RSPCA Website underneath BAN LIVE EXPORT

COMMUNIQUE FROM RSPCA AUSTRALIA BOARD | 20 JUNE 2011

“At the RSPCA Australia Board meeting this weekend in Canberra, the Board unanimously supported the continuation of the current campaign to bring an end to the live export of animals for slaughter.

The RSPCA has long held the position that animals should be slaughtered as close to the point of production as possible. The RSPCA does not believe that the live export of animals for slaughter is justifiable due to the considerable risks to the welfare of animals involved.”

The cattle are currently being slaughtered as close to the point of production as possible, it is Indonesia. The cattle are not in Gippsland, they are in the far North of Australia, most are Brahman and may have to wait years to be slaughtered here.

We all know Animals Australia will not stop until the last guide dog is out of it’s harness, and I hope you didn’t have milk in your coffee as Dairying is next on their hit list, although the Dairy Farmers probably think Coles is doing a good enough job of making them extinct. It is no surprise to us that AA has shifted to the next cause without looking at the outcomes for cattle that they saved.

I do stand corrected Animals Australia through it’s Administration of Jan Cameron’s Animal Justice Fund will offer up to \$30,000 for any employee who dubs in their boss for animal welfare issues, including those created by this Suspension. Well that should be a lot better than the amount currently being offered by Centrelink on Julia’s Tab for those made redundant.

However, RSPCA is a very different matter. RSPCA was the Animal Welfare group we all remember and respect. That stands up for, provides shelter to, and humanely puts down large numbers of our pets when needed. We all go on the Million Paws walks and who could resist Happy Tails Day. RSPCA stands for all things good and cute with animal welfare.

Even your average farmer would have contemplated ringing RSPCA if they thought mistreatment of animals was occurring in their area, although they were probably more likely to creatively stop the problem themselves. The Northern cattle industry might even get a Paw for being largely organic, free-range, with the “*freedom to*

express normal pattern of behaviour” and into low-stress stock-handling. In short up until 4 weeks ago the welfare of cattle within Australia was not the issue.

To get an idea of how far this goes against the RSPCA we used to know and admire. It would be as if RSPCA decided that because of some irresponsible pet ownership, it then forced the rest of us to suddenly have more dogs than you can possibly feed and provide care to, not desex them and put them at high risk of Parvovirus when they are not vaccinated, and send them standing up the entire way across Australia, and not consider their needs for a similar climate. Not likely is it.

They would say “reduction in numbers of animals” as per draft “Universal Declaration on Animal Welfare”.

http://www.wspa.org.au/Images/Proposed_UDAW_Text%20-%20ENGLISH_tcm30-2544.pdf#false

It is standard animal welfare practice to reduce numbers for the benefit of all animals. Indonesia currently takes approximately 30% Speyed females, they are the only major market to do so. The cruelty issue can be fixed, however the numbers issue can only currently be fixed by Live Export.

Many of the cattle are in areas only accessible by helicopter, and no organization public or private, Commonwealth or State, will have the capacity to process or euthanize the numbers required to ensure they don't starve or die of disease. A much longer and crueler death but the media usually finds it not dramatic enough to film. In the case of the Northern Cattle Industry, Fixing Live Export is the only humane option.

RSPCA withheld the footage of animals being abused, it is unclear why, for how long and who else knew. Did it want to completely eradicate Live Export from the universe, at all costs?

Australia is now being seen as an unstable trading partner for Export, cattle are now going to be shipped much longer distances and will be at much greater risk when they get there. I am confused as to how this Bans Live Export, when it not only Increases Live Export and multiplies the welfare risks.

We are constantly told that the OIE Guidelines are not enough and leave animals vulnerable, well Heather and Lyn, at last look we were the only ones asking for anything more. Your policy doesn't say Australian animals only, and to hell with all others? Not exactly working for that noble goal of ending long distance transport for slaughter is it.

<http://qcl.farmonline.com.au/news/nationalrural/livestock/cattle/footage-timing-questioned/2202050.aspx>

<http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/national/games-over-indonesian-animal-cruelty-cost-animals-lives/story-e6freuzr-1226076699311>

RSPCA spokeswoman Lisa Chalk said the government was prevented from seeing the footage because it had failed to act when shown similar evidence of past cruelty cases. "Our fear was, if we showed it to them he wouldn't have done anything. It did

weigh heavily on our minds every day but we wanted to get our ducks in a row. It was a huge ethical dilemma for us," she said.

But apparently not enough of a dilemma to speak up straight away about cruelty, Senator Back has the same concerns and has asked for the Senate Inquiry to look at 4 Corners footage.

Senator Back said he had major concerns over the delay which suited animal rights campaigners' agenda but creating the perception, right or otherwise, the ABC was working according to a time-line that suited that agenda.

"All I can say to you as a veterinarian is that if I was aware of animal welfare abuse, I would act on it," he said.

"Let me put it to you in human context, if you were aware that a child was being severely molested, would you wait eight or 10 weeks to get a media effect, when you could have in fact taken some action at the time to protect that child?"

<http://qcl.farmonline.com.au/news/nationalrural/livestock/cattle/senate-inquiry-to-scrutinise-4-corners/2212399.aspx?storypage=0>

Aside from interesting shooting terminology, what were the "Ducks", if they believed as Sarah told us that most were not slaughtered humanely, why did they not just release this to the media straight away if Joe did nothing.

By releasing the footage prior to the start of the Northern Cattle season, the outcry would have been just as loud but the outcome would have been very, very different for industry, and for animal welfare.

I asked Heather about the "Ducks" in her recent appearance on Australia Talks <http://www.abc.net.au/rn/australiatalks/stories/2011/3250659.htm>

I couldn't obtain an authorised transcript, but to summarise my questions are about the third in (Seek 11:57):

Christine: *"Given that all of these problems we are talking about with slaughter, arrangements with closed feedlots and abattoirs, traceability, could have been resolved on release of the footage. What were the ducks that she was referring to, what did it actually relate to, that the footage wasn't released until the ducks were in place?"*

Because as it stands now it has caused the maximum amount of damage to the Industry, it's almost collapsed it. It's put Australia at risk of foot and mouth disease, it's actually going to possibly perish large numbers of animals in the next drought. What were the ethical considerations, and why were they waiting to release it?"

Paul: *"Was there some, I think the suggestion from Christine there, that there was some, perhaps strategy, involved in the release of this, that might not have been necessarily been in the interests of the animals themselves?"*

Heather: *"I think I need to reflect on a couple of things Mr Crombie said as well. I mean MLA, and anybody who has been to Indonesia and seen the slaughter of cattle there, has seen in a typical slaughterhouse, which is where 90% of Australian cattle actually go.*

At the very least they have all seen animals tripped onto their side, either because they are being slaughtered traditionally, or thru a Mark 1 Box. MLA's own reports since 2003 have documented problems with slaughter processes in Indonesia. And that really led to a whole series of refinements of the Mark 1 Box. But even still, despite the fact everybody recognized that there were problems. Last year that MLA installed 10 new boxes into Indonesia.

So everyone's known about problems with slaughter in Indonesia really for a decade, and it is a really sad fact that unfortunately with the Live Export trade that not one thing significant has happened to change the lives of animals exported for slaughter unless there has been a public exposure. "

Paul: *"I don't think that quite answers the question though about the role of the RSPCA in this and the release of the footage."*

Heather: *"We had no choice, we didn't think, but to actually find a reputable organisation that was going to do their own investigation to prove to the Australian community and to MLA, Livecorp, the Australian Government that the cruelty occurring in Indonesia was abysmal and needed to change and something needed to happen."*

Well there's one Duck, one that is identified as taking 8 weeks for 4 Corners to produce the programme. It is a very "Noble" Duck, if there had not been a reputable organization, no-one would have been convinced. Or would they? The footage that Lyn White held was horrific, that any release of it either to the government or to the media, or viral U-tube, would have prompted public outcry and need for change.

<http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/national/games-over-indonesian-animal-cruelty-cost-animals-lives/story-e6freuzr-1226076699311>

"The letter to the RSPCA chief executive Heather Neil from Agriculture Minister Joe Ludwig expressed concern that the organisation had refused to show the footage and implied it would have acted had it seen the evidence.

At no point has either Animals Australia or the RSPCA provided to myself, my office or my department copies or examples of this footage," the senator wrote on May 25.

This footage was not provided at the meeting on 6 April, nor in response to the phone call on 12 April.

This is despite the fact that your letter makes it clear that Animals Australia has been in possession of this footage since late February or early March."

There were more Ducks that had to be in line though. A quick glance at the websites of RSPCA, Animals Australia reveals a highly developed network of interlinking

Parent-child websites that could not be released until 4 Corners screened. They could not be launched until the footage was in the public domain:

<http://www.rspca.org.au/> Parent- child website <http://www.banliveexport.com/> which links to <http://www.animalsaustralia.org/> which links to <http://www.banliveexport.com/virtual-protest/> which both link back to RSPCA and Animals Australia websites. And this excludes another powerful lobby GetUp.

All websites allow the viewer to Donate and Vote and Donate again, in what was undoubtedly the first, and may be most successful Virtual Fundraising/Publicity Campaign for any charity ever in Australia. These websites are fantastic, if you get some time go and have a look at them but be careful, because just by having a look you can accidentally vote, pass judgement and there is a myriad of different ways to empty your wallet. Especially the workplace donators as they will still be donating long after anyone remembers what it was all about.

Well I am a bit like Lyn, I like to name my animals, so I will call this Duck “Webby”

All sites encourage viewers to...

“Watch, React, Click, DONATE”

“Watch, React, Click, DONATE”

Watch, VOTE, hey that took my vote, and I was just looking.

Next in line were “Donation” and “Outcry”, these are very fat ducks. And they are the parents of a ugly duckling called “Publicity”. This Family is very important because it allowed those who have reliable access to Internet, TV, mobile and phones to mobilise, and have their outcry very loudly heard, before anyone had even made it in from looking after cattle.

Attempts to clone the Donation, Outcry and Publicity family have met with not much success by the pastoral industry, after weeks of fundraising allowed them to put their first ad on Imparja TV. It is a fantastic effort, however the comparison of the Media blitz before them is 100 to 1.

I know nothing about the internet, and I thought RSPCA websites were amazing, so I followed up with the website designer who are listed as developing RSPCA’s new website. Something similar would take over 3 months.

Although we didn’t manage to find Animals Australia’s website designer it is even more impressive again, it is very clear “Webby” took far more than three months to grow to his present size. And “Webby” had to be ready to be out in public the moment “Noble” paraded past.

I am not going to go on about “Goose” and “Gander”, “Member” and “Caucus”, ‘Independent’ and “Green” but they are very important ducks in this shoot.

However there was an entirely different set of Ducks that RSPCA needed to be waddling and on the move. The Northern Cattle Industry needed to start it's annual migration. Yes Sarah, it is Seasonal.

<http://qcl.farmonline.com.au/news/state/livestock/cattle/abc-washes-hands-of-live-export-blame-part-two/2205941.aspx?storypage=4>

If the footage had been released during the wet, there possibly would have been no ducks at all, apart from a few feathers pulled out of MLA, and a puddle where the Goose had been. The Goose could have gone and investigated while the doors to abattoirs were still open, to see if they could be sent into closed systems, safeguards could be in place, or if a Suspension was absolutely necessary the Gander could have gone up to send a clear message that \$11.5 Billion of shared poultry was still worthy of a respectful relationship.

However if you wait patiently until the cattle were in the supply chain you can get every single Duck. Gander is forced to make a chopping block decision, to save her own neck. Exporters, Importers, Producers big and small, International Relations all were offered in sacrifice instead.

Pastoralists can't muster without forward supply to Boats, as the costs of helicopters, feed and fuel are too great, hence the jumping up and down. Most who were in drought last year, and remember it, may go under, if not this year, then next.

And if you want to really upset the neighbours just pull the stunt just before Ramadan. Why would anyone want to invest money in animal welfare in another country or this one, when supply can be instantaneously withdrawn by Twitter. By waiting the Producers, Exporters, Importers and Markets may have taken a fatal hit.

China Market will now source it's dairy cows from NZ. Yes, that's right the country across the Tasman you keep telling us doesn't Live Export, only 70,000 dairy heifers. And Australian dairy farmers probably just lost their last bit of viability to be able to provide the Australian public with Milk, which kids need to grow.

Complete eradication of a species, or is it? We still have Donation, Outcry and Publicity and for the time being Goose and Gander and their flock.

And as for Lyn she has decided to use the considerable funds raised to ensure that people eat more beef, so that "Brian, Tommy, Bill, Arthur and Dudley" are not slaughtered overseas, only kidding. Check out the Animals Australia website, Australian Meat Industry Council has got to be happy it held hands with the Tofu-set. <http://www.animalsaustralia.org/features/global-warming-film/> "Meat the Truth"

Animals Australia is fully aware by Australia withdrawing cattle, that the OIE (World Organization for Animal Health) Guidelines are insufficient and any live cattle that are now exported to Indonesia from other countries are at considerable risk. Probably need to change the Website, "a voice for animals who speak the same language as Lyn".

But what about the Cattle that were saved, we are told that “90% of Australia” stretched it’s forefinger to click. From all I’ve seen in the media all attempts to explain their welfare needs and have been portrayed as self-interest.

RSPCA considers them in it’s Communiqué continues:
“Mechanisms for the domestic processing of cattle that were destined to be exported live for slaughter, but held back in Australia, must be rapidly put in place and the Government and industry must address support for producers and the industry needed to make this happen. The Board noted that the welfare of cattle in Australia is protected by Australian animal welfare legislation.”

No matter what the Greens think there is no such thing as an Instant Abattoir. There is also no amount of legislation/support that can now protect Cattle in Australia from the scale of the animal welfare and environmental problem that has just been created by RSPCA’s planned and deliberate Duck Shoot. In the meantime, cattle are now being processed in Indonesia, in 4 short weeks, no foreigner can have access to abattoirs.

The RSPCA, we and many of their members remember has gone, it’s new emergence alongside the Animal Right, (and who thought politics were just for Parliament) leaves a vacuum. There is no longer an independent voice for animal welfare, with a few steps to the right it moved itself, so far out of the picture that it will be difficult for it to be present in Indonesia where the problem was.

And for the RSPCA to expand, or collect donations on the back of an animal welfare issue it has just created, their ability to work in Australia will have been greatly compromised.

You see to wait about animal cruelty until Webby was established to ensure Donation, Outcry, and Publicity were created is not really Noble is it. Especially if the RSPCA were also ensuring all the Northern Ducks were in full flight for their complete obliteration, and in doing so disregarded the consequences of creating the most adverse outcomes for animal welfare in recent Australian history.

If RSPCA is against Duck Hunting, they are certainly good shots.

1st July 2011:

If there is to be any substantive gain in animal welfare on the international arena, there needs to be the supporting legislation/standards. The draft “Universal Declaration of Animal Welfare” from WSPA appears to remain just that since 2007. If there is to be any substantive gain in animal welfare on the international arena, there needs to be the supporting legislation/standards.

A quick scan of RSPCA, Animals Australia and WSPA Websites finds no mention of any publicity campaign towards improving OIE World Organization for Animal Health Guidelines for slaughter of animals for human consumption. Yet this would be essential to improve the lives of all animals slaughtered overseas, irrespective of country of origin.

Personally I do not believe that this has been about Banning Live Export, or about the collection of Donations, it is merely a wave on which to ride in on. For Animal Welfare in Australia to be put so greatly at risk by the withholding of footage, is not like the RSPCA and many questions have to be raised as to what they saw could be the possible gain.

However if the “Voice for the Animals” had a voice in Parliament that may be worth it. You may not have had your party invitation yet. But the Campaign base that has been built is extremely impressive, you can even get an SMS reminder to attend the next rally.

<http://www.animalsaustralia.org/>

<http://banliveexport.com/rally/>

<http://banliveexport.com/where-does-your-MP-stand/>

<http://www.banliveexport.com/where-does-your-MP-stand/live-export-lobbying-toolkit.pdf>

http://www.animalsaustralia.org/take_action/live-export-conscience-vote

<http://banliveexport.com/1/#tv-ad>

<http://banliveexport.com/1/#support>

<http://banliveexport.com/virtual-protest/>

<http://www.animalsaustralia.org/action/welcome.php>

https://animalsaustralia.qnetau.com/support/monthly_giving.php

<http://www.animalsaustralia.org/action/feedback.php>

<https://animalsaustralia.qnetau.com/support/donate.php>



Lyn White
Investigator & Campaign Director

Most political parties would not stand a chance up against this level of organization, let alone your average remote pastoral group, and the current minority government maybe the first casualty. Please ask on our behalf these questions that need answering:

Q. 1 What date was RSPCA first made aware of the footage? When did it view the footage?

Q. 2 Where was this footage taken to prior to 4 Corners?

Was the footage taken to Members of Parliament and Senators prior to it's release by 4 Corners?

a. When did this occur?

b. Who was the footage taken to?

Q. 3 What were the reasons that RSPCA withheld footage, what were the "Ducks" (plural) that they were referring to in media comment that all needed to be in a row? <http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/national/games-over-indonesian-animal-cruelty-cost-animals-lives/story-e6freuzr-1226076699311>

RSPCA spokeswoman Lisa Chalk said the government was prevented from seeing the footage because it had failed to act when shown similar evidence of past cruelty cases. "Our fear was, if we showed it to them he wouldn't have done anything. It did weigh heavily on our minds every day but we wanted to get our ducks in a row. It was a huge ethical dilemma for us," she said.

Q. 4 To what extent were 4 Corners researchers and journalists aware of the Campaign base and inter-linking websites that were being constructed to be launched simultaneously with the screening by the co-contributors/co-beneficiaries of their programme? Similarly any political lobbying.

Q. 5 Did 4 Corners consult anyone skilled in halal slaughter abattoir practices, preferably a Vet, to ensure that in all the 11 hours of footage (particularly that directly obtained by 4 Corners) obtained that:

- a. They were adequately able to identify footage that was reflective of the correct method of slaughtering in Indonesia
- b. They could identify practices which were not reflective of standard practice.
- c. That when showing edited footage they could specify that which had been professionally identified as correct.
- d. Similarly they were able to identify that which was not standard practice.
- e. And the correct ratio of the same, could be relayed to the public.

Q. 6 Did Dr Grandin make reference to the techniques used by AA to obtain the footage as described in the RSPCA Report:

2 extra people and a video camera, with flash photos also being taken

Would be highly likely to affect the flow of cattle and subsequently create more instances of cattle being mishandled?

Q. 7 If 4 Corners felt this was unacceptable that this go on another night, which the cattle industry agrees it wasn't. What were the reasons 4 Corners screening postponed by a week?

Q. 8 RSPCA and Animals Australia both established significant Donation Campaign websites in synchronised to be launched with the screening of 4 Corners.

The cattle industry is obliged to declare income directly attributable to Live Export. As a matter of public interest RSPCA and Animals Australia now declare the funds raised to date, since the launch of their website for their respective campaigns to "Ban Live Export".

As registered charities could they also declare how this compares with donations received prior to the screening of 4 Corners.

Regards

Christine Glenn
Pilbara WA

From: Broadcasting [Broadcasting@acma.gov.au]
Sent: Wed 20/07/2011 12:47 PM

ACMA2011/7-20 C 21360

Dear Ms Glenn

Thank you for your further message below.

I would like to make the following points:

- You can bring your complaint to the ACMA in less than 60 days if the ABC responds to you earlier and you consider the response inadequate.
- However, any ACMA investigation would take several months, including the preparation of a report and a procedural-fairness opportunity for the ABC to respond to any adverse preliminary findings.
- The ACMA has only limited powers in relation to the ABC, which has its own Act of Parliament and Charter. Under section 13(4) of the *Broadcasting Services Act 1992* (the BSA), the regulatory regime established under the BSA does not apply to the ABC except as expressly provided by the BSA.
- The ACMA does not have jurisdiction in relation to the ABC's Editorial Policies. It does have jurisdiction in relation to the *ABC Code of Practice 2011*, a copy of which is available at the Codes Index on the ACMA's website:
http://www.acma.gov.au/WEB/STANDARD/pc=IND_REG_CODES_BCAST.
Specifically, the ACMA can investigate complaints that the ABC has acted contrary to its code of practice, where the person has first complained to the ABC, and has either not received a response within 60 days, or is dissatisfied with the ABC's response (Sections 151-153 of the BSA).
- Further, a person is entitled to make a complaint to the ACMA in such circumstances (section 150 of the BSA). A person is not entitled to make a complaint to the ACMA about the ABC's broadcasting services in any other circumstances.

Accordingly, if you seek a swifter and/or a broader redress than that which may be available under the BSA, you are advised to seek legal advice as to other options.

Yours sincerely

Eileen Haley
Assistant Manager
Broadcasting Investigations Section

Australian Communications and Media Authority
Eileen.Haley@acma.gov.au
www.acma.gov.au



communicating | facilitating | regulating

From: Andrew and Christine Glenn [\[mailto:andrew.glenn8@bigpond.com\]](mailto:andrew.glenn8@bigpond.com)
Sent: Tuesday, 19 July 2011 1:02 PM
To: Broadcasting
Subject: Re: TRIM: Complaint regarding 4 Corners "A Bloody Business"
[SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear ACMA

Thank-you very much for your reply. I take note of your response that the complaint would not be looked at by ACMA under 60 days and have referred to the information linked about ACMA's role. The Pastoral Industry and Live Export however may be completely dead in the water if we have to wait 60 days, and from your link there is no other form of redress. There are currently 2 Bills sitting in Parliament designed to Ban Live Export and very influential backing in the form of a publicity/lobbying campaign, and those most affected being from remote areas we are experience difficulty in getting our voices heard in the same numbers. We have been advised by the Minister that decisions will be made related to numbers protesting, irrelevant of serious animal welfare concerns if the animals stay in Australia.

The 4 Corners program was screened with a highly orchestrated Parliament, Internet and Donation campaign launching simultaneously. To date it would be fair to say it was Australia's first and most successful Cyberspace to date.

"Australia's most respected current affairs program [Four Corners](#) airs explosive footage of Animals Australia's investigation into the [live export trade to Indonesia](#), exposing unspeakable suffering and torture endured by Australian cattle nightly in that country. Websites of Animals Australia and campaign partners, RSPCA Australia and GetUp! crash as outraged Australians attempt to make their voices heard. In the first 24 hours after the screening [a bill is announced](#) to parliament to end live exports as the government immediately suspends exports to the abattoirs identified; the Agriculture Ministers phone system is brought down; tens of thousands of emails are sent to the Prime Minister Julia Gillard local MPs; the number one nationwide Twitter trend becomes #BanLiveExport and a petition to ban live exports is the fastest growing petition in GetUp!'s history. Australians have sent a clear message to their leaders that they will accept nothing less than a total ban on live animal export."

Only problem being only those Australians with consistent access to internet, phone and mobile coverage had sent a clear message. Most of those affected were looking after cattle and still are, there is also a massive issue that most aboriginal people who are heavily involved and work within the pastoral industry do not necessarily have equitable access to literacy or computer skills.

These are Exceptional Circumstances and we would ask that ACMA conducts it's own investigation within the usual 60 days. Never before has an entire Industry been stopped within a week on the basis of a TV program, and both Senator Ludwig and the Prime Minister publicly declared that the decision to Suspend was taken on the basis of the TV program. To date there has been no permits to ship cattle back to

Indonesia, have been issued even though it is widely accepted there are many feedlots/closed abattoir systems cattle can travel humanely through.

Usually we would be reliant on the Australia's Public Broadcaster to ensure that any misinformation and in-balance was corrected, however there are several conflicts of interest that exist. Complaints to Media Watch although acknowledged have not been pursued, even though there was evidence of media manipulation by withholding of the footage. Letters to Mark Scott have thus far been unanswered.

It is not the first time concerns have been raised regarding 4 Corners techniques or impartiality.

<http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=5426&page=2>

However in this incident the damage done is occurring on a massive scale every day due to the precise timing of the release of the footage.

The existing conflicts of interest within ABC, which have already raised by people within the media may prevent the timely release of facts (see complaint attached). Although the integrity of award winning investigative journalists is not being questioned, how likely is it they will pursue and bring something to public attention which may damage their spouse. For example, Chris Uhlmann is quite deservedly a very well respected journalist, however:

http://www.abc.net.au/tv/independent/doc/Conflict_of_Interest.pdf

<http://www.crikey.com.au/2010/05/06/chris-uhlmann-a-pro-says-abbott-but-is-there-an-abc-double-standard/>

<http://abcnewswatch.blogspot.com/2010/07/managing-bias-at-abc-24-news.html>

Any court action that may be undertaken will be far too late the people who will lose their homes, businesses and employment.

Regards

Christine Glenn

From: [Broadcasting](#)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2011 11:35 AM
To: ['Andrew and Christine Glenn'](#)
Subject: RE: TRIM: Complaint regarding 4 Corners "A Bloody Business"
[SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

ACMA file reference: ACMA2011/7-20 C 21360

Dear Ms Glenn

Thank you for sending the Australian Communications and Media Authority (the ACMA) a copy of your complaint to the ABC dated 11/7/11.

If you do not receive a response within 60 days after 11/7/11, or if you receive a response but are dissatisfied, you may then bring your complaint about the matter to the ACMA for consideration.

If you wish the ACMA to investigate your complaint under these circumstances, could you please ensure that you provide copies of all correspondence with the station.

For information about the broadcasting complaints process and the ACMA's role in it please follow the link below:

http://www.acma.gov.au/WEB/STANDARD/pc=PC_90137

I hope this information is of assistance.

Yours sincerely

Broadcasting Investigations Section

Australian Communications and Media Authority

www.acma.gov.au



communicating | facilitating | regulating

From: Andrew and Christine Glenn [<mailto:andrew.glenn8@bigpond.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, 13 July 2011 8:11 PM

To: scott.mark@abc.net.au

Cc: Broadcasting; complaints@presscouncil.org.au; ombudsman@ombudsman.gov.au; rat.sen@aph.gov.au

Subject: TRIM: Complaint regarding 4 Corners "A Bloody Business"

Dear Mark

Please find attached Complaint regarding ABC 4 Corners "A Bloody Business" and associated coverage.

Regards

Christine Glenn