



Australian Government

Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Senator the Hon. Glenn Sterle
Chairman
Senate Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
Department of the Senate
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Senator Sterle

I would like to make an additional correction to the transcript of the Budget Estimates hearing conducted by the Senate Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee on 23 and 24 May 2011.

The first correction relates to an answer provided by Ms Evans to a question from Senator Coonan, which can be found on page 77 of the proof Hansard of 24 May 2011.

Senator COONAN: If I could have a breakdown I would appreciate that. Has any officer from the department actually observed the operation of restraint boxes in Indonesia or has it always been consultants and industry representatives?

Ms Evans: In a formal sense it has never been the consultants, but certainly we have an officer on the ground in Indonesia. I would have to double-check with him as to whether he has actually physically gone and had a look at one, but I would suggest he probably has.

The correct response should read:

Ms Evans: In a formal sense it has only ever been the consultants, but certainly we have an officer on the ground in Indonesia. I would have to double-check with him as to whether he has actually physically gone and had a look at one, but I would suggest he probably has.

The second correction relates to an answer provided by Mr Glyde to a question from Senator Siewert, which can be found on page 79 of the proof Hansard of 24 May 2011.

Senator SIEWERT: Thank you. We will be back for MLA. You said that one of the problems with Mark 1 was the way they were being used. What is the appropriate way that you would use Mark 1 boxes?

Mr Glyde: Mark 1 is an improvement over a previous stunning practice. Mark 4 is an improvement over Mark 1. Mark 1 is used in a circumstance where there is no power. As I understand it, Mark 4 boxes require power to operate the hydraulics and the like. It is the question of continuous improvement, trying to find mechanisms that will lead in different circumstances and in different countries to improved animal welfare outcomes.

The correct response should read:

Mr Glyde: Mark 1 is an improvement over a previous slaughter practice. Mark 4 is an improvement over Mark 1. Mark 1 is used in a circumstance where there is no power. As I understand it, Mark 4 boxes require power to operate the hydraulics and the like. It is the question of continuous improvement, trying to find mechanisms that will lead in different circumstances and in different countries to improved animal welfare outcomes.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide clarification on the above points.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Elizabeth Bie".

Elizabeth Bie

General Manager
Ministerial and Parliamentary Branch

7 July 2011