

Please consider when reading my submission that every time we export animals to a country that has lower standards or should I say no standards at all, it is a failure - a failure of our duty of care to those animals and it is a failure to Farmers who need and deserve certainty their livestock are treated in a humane way. This is where the MLA has totally let them down and should be held accountable.

I cannot understand how Australia can condone such cruelty and pander to the needs of other countries and kosher and halal. This way of slaughtering animals is supposedly due to a "belief". We MUST know that a "belief" is just that, a belief. The thought of there being some God and therefore he/she dictates how animals should be killed is ridiculous. Essentially a belief is based on a fallacy. Nothing concrete. To be pedantic, their strict "beliefs" do not condone cruelty or suffering in any way. So the fact they say in the Middle East and Indonesia they need live animals is a complete lie.

Please note the following:

- 1, Live cattle exports are cannibalising Queensland's beef-processing industry and threaten to destroy \$3.5 billion worth of assets, \$5 billion in turnover and 36,000 jobs.
- 2, Far from being complementary, live exports compete with and undermine Australia's beef exports.
- 3, Live cattle exports equals Australian job losses and a threat to Australia's capacity to supply the growing world demand for beef.
- 4, Queensland cattle are increasingly being exported live to Indonesia taking with them lost processing opportunities in Queensland.
- 5, Indonesia actively protects its own beef industry and live cattle imports by banning key beef cuts and imposing high tariffs on imported beef product there is not a level playing field.
- 6, Live cattle exports means premium disease-free cattle are being processed in importing countries and sold in competition with genuine imported Australian beef. Australia's major meat processors have confirmed that Australia has the capacity to process all cattle and sheep currently going to live export.

Contrary to industry claims, live export does not underpin 10,000 jobs in the rural sector. The majority of those jobs would remain if animals were processed in Australia. In fact thousands of jobs would be created by increased domestic processing.

Phasing out live sheep exports would have a minimal impact on farmers and would in fact reap long-term benefits for farmers and the economy through increased processing in Australia.

Please examine the following points:

- a) the facilities, treatment, handling and slaughter of livestock, exported from Australia, in the importing country for consistency with the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) recommendations and standards set out in Terrestrial Animal Health Code (2010) published by the World Organisation for Animal

Health and other relevant standards

Using World Organisation of Animal Health (OIE) standards as a benchmark is not acceptable they are well below Australian standards and do not require upright pre slaughter stunning (rendering the animal unconscious to pain) and they do not exclude the roping restraint, tripping and casting of animals that occurs in Indonesia and other importing countries and that causes unacceptable suffering.

Standards must be mandatory and include the requirement that animals are upright and stunned (rendering them unconscious to pain) prior to slaughter.

b) the adequacy of the Australian Standards for the Export of Livestock (ASEL) as they apply to the preparation and export of all livestock with consideration of responsibilities for compliance and enforcement of the ASEL

While the Standards take a “whole of chain approach” covering all aspects of the livestock export trade from planning through to on-board management, many sections of the Standards lie outside the jurisdictional powers of the Australian Government, and could only be enforced under State and Territory legislation. No Australian State or Territory government has yet legislated to recognise the ASEL, and, as a result, large sections of the ASEL are effectively unenforceable.

c) the adequacy and effectiveness of current Australian regulatory arrangements for the live export trade

Current regulatory arrangements are totally inadequate. As soon as Australian animals leave Australia they have no protection against cruel treatment. Importing countries do not have basic animal welfare legislation/anti-cruelty legislation (or, enforce such legislation) and as such these animals have absolutely no protection once they leave Australia. Any assurance that Australian animals will be protected from cruelty and mistreatment is not guaranteed in legislation and therefore cannot be relied upon.

d) the types of livestock suitable (weight, age, body condition, breeds) for export as feeder or slaughter animals

No live animals should be exported from Australia as feeder or slaughter animals. Available scientific evidence shows that exporting animals live directly compromises their welfare. The best animal welfare outcome is achieved when the animal is slaughtered humanely as close to their point of production within Australia and under Australian law.

Goats, deer, wild camels and pregnant animals are at increased risk when subjected to the stressors of live export.

Transporting animals from a cold (Australian Winter) to hot climate (Northern Summer) exacerbates heat stress (which can lead to suffering and a prolonged death)

e) the extent of monitoring required for each export consignment of feeder or slaughter livestock, in a manner that ensures accurate and transparent reporting to the Australian Government of the condition of the livestock from departure from Australia up to and including the point of slaughter in the country of destination

A high level of monitoring is required to ensure standards are met, particularly

at the point of slaughter. For e.g. where MLA-trained operators may revert to old practices as soon as no one is looking.

Third monitoring is needed

Permanent identification of animals from farm to post slaughter

Upright pre slaughter stunning (rendering the animal unconscious to pain)

f) the risk management strategies necessary to address the welfare of animals from departure from Australia, up to and including the point of slaughter in the country of destination

Available scientific evidence shows that exporting animals live directly compromises their welfare. The best animal welfare outcome is achieved when the animal is slaughtered humanely as close to the point of production within Australia and under Australian law.

There are risks to animal welfare at each stage of the journey from loading, to transport, at the feedlot, and at slaughter. Stress is cumulative.

In the case of cattle and pastoral sheep, these animals are unused to frequent handling and are fearful of humans. This increases the risk to their welfare throughout the live export process.

g) other matters relevant to these terms of reference that the reviewer considers appropriate.

- Indonesia's growing self-sufficiency in the near future
- Live exports is a high risk industry with permits provided on a 3 monthly basis = no certainty or stability of market
- Jobs in Northern Australia
- Development of processing in Northern Australia
- Domestic processing - Creates jobs and opportunities
- Meat-only trade and value-adding to products exported
- Lack of animal welfare /anti-cruelty legislation in importing countries
- Live export is a high-risk industry, lack of any control (in the legal sense) over what happens overseas.
- ACIL Tasman reviews
- Third party independent auditing
- Staying in the market is not going to improve animal welfare
- Welfare issues for each species
- Animals unfit to load = Inspection doesn't always identify these
- Veterinarians on export ships

Please do the right thing. We must end this cruel ,barbaric and archaic trade.

No jobs will be lost, but the lives of living, breathing, feeling and intelligent beings will not end in suffering