

		I support the docking of tails in dogs for therapeutic reasons only. The procedure must be performed by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Pain relief must be used at the time of this procedure.
63	Cattle	Teats
		<p>I support the proposal for supernumerary teat removal of animals >6 weeks of age to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the removal of supernumerary teats in animals <6 weeks of age without pain relief, however the procedure could be undertaken by a skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie a vet tech). I propose that:</p> <p>the maximum of age of animals on whom supernumerary teat removal can be performed by a lay person is reduced to 4 weeks of age</p> <p>i) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>pain relief is required for any supernumerary teat removal procedure regardless of age</p> <p>ii) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>procedure is performed using sterilised equipment</p> <p>iii) infringement penalty of \$500</p> <p>any person performing the procedure who is not a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student is signed off by a veterinarian</p> <p>iv) infringement penalty of prosecution</p>
64	Cattle	Claw removal
		I support the proposal that claw removal is restricted to being performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief is required at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) pain relief is also administered. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
65	Cattle	Teat occlusion
		I support the proposal that teat sealing can only be performed with a product registered for that specific purpose. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution.
66	Cattle	Tail docking
		I support the restriction of tail docking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons only, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should

		be \$300.
67	Cattle and sheep	Castration and shortening of the scrotum (cryptorchid)
		<p>I support the proposal for surgical castration at any age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I support the proposal that non-surgical castration in cattle and sheep over 6 months of age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the age of 6 months as an appropriate age at which lay people can no longer perform non-surgical castration and propose that this age limit is lowered to 2 months, I support limiting the manner of non-surgical castration to only the use of conventional rubber rings. I does not support performing non-surgical castration without pain relief at any age and propose that pain relief is required for any castration procedure at any age. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also required. I propose that the penalty for all infringements other than lack of NSAID use is prosecution and that the penalty for not using an NSAID is an infringement of \$300.</p>
68	Cattle, sheep and goats	Disbudding
		<p>I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian, veterinary student under direct supervision, or skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie vet tech/appropriately trained farm worker). I propose that appropriate maximum ages are determined for disbudding to be performed by a lay person. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p>
69	Cattle, sheep and goats	Dehorning
		<p>I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision. Given the much greater risk of pain, bleeding, and infection from dehorning rather than disbudding I propose that farmers are given 12 months warning after which dehorning can only be performed by veterinarians. This will give a strong message that disbudding is much preferred and much more economically viable. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p>
70	Sheep	Tail docking

		<p>I support the limiting of tail docking in sheep who are greater than 6 months of age to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered.</p> <p>I support restricting the techniques for tail docking in younger animals to rubber ring and hot iron only. I propose that pain relief at the time of procedure and NSAID should also be required, regardless of age at the time of tail docking. Furthermore I propose that the maximum age at which a lay person is able to perform a tail docking procedure is reduced to 2 months.</p> <p>I support the proposal that tails are not to be cut flush and are to be able to cover the vulva in a female and of a similar length in a male.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for infringements in sheep > 2 months of age and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalties of \$500 for use of non-listed methods and not cutting tails flush in sheep < 2 months of age. I propose a penalty of prosecution for not using pain relief in sheep < 2 months of age and a penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p>
71	Sheep	Mulesing
		I support the proposal to prohibit mulesing. I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
72	Deer	Develveting
		I support the proposal for develveting to be only performed by veterinarians, directly supervised veterinary students or a person with veterinary approval. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
73	Horses	Blistering, firing, or nicking
		I support the proposal to prohibit blistering, firing or nicking, and support the proposed infringement penalty.
74	Horses	Tail docking
		I support the proposal for tail docking to only be performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students, only for therapeutic reasons, only with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
75	Horses	Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal pregnancy diagnosis in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
76	Horses	Rectal examination of horses

		I support the proposal for rectal examination in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
77	Horses	Caslick's procedure
		<p>I support the proposal for creation, opening and repair of caslick's procedure to only be performed by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and the use of pain relief for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p> <p>I propose that a caslick's procedure may only be performed for therapeutic purposes and not for a perceived performance benefit and that the proposed infringement penalty for this breach is the same as that proposed above.</p>
78	Horses	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
79	Llama and alpaca	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in llama and alpaca to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure, and the minimum age for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalties for these infringements.
80	Pigs	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration to only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision and the required use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution. I propose that a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) is also required and that the penalty for not administering an NSAID is \$300.
81	Pigs	Tail docking
		I propose that pain relief should be used for this procedure regardless of the animal's age. I support limiting the procedure to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students in animals > 7 days of age. I propose that a NSAID should also be administered at the time of the procedure. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and for a lay person performing the procedure in an animal > 7 days of age. I propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID administration.
82	Birds	Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird
		I support the restriction of pinioning/deflighting a bird to being performed only by

		a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only being performed in the best interests of the animal, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
83	Poultry	Dubbing
		I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence to perform dubbing on breeds not usually dubbed and to not use pain relief at the time of the procedure. I oppose the surgical modification of an animal if the modification is not in the interests of the animal, therefore I propose that dubbing is prohibited with the penalty of a prosecutable offence.
84	Ostriches and emus	Declawing
		I support the prohibition of radical declawing of emu chicks. However the use of the term radical implies that some declawing is allowed and opens the regulation to subjective interpretation. I propose that the regulation prohibit all declawing of emu or ostrich unless performed by a vet for therapeutic reasons. I support the penalty of prosecutable offence.
85	Roosters	Caponising (rooster castration)
		I support the restriction of caponising to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Submitted by:
Deirdre Sims

s 9(2)(a)

MPI Animal Welfare Codes Submission

Nathan Guy
Minister for Primary Industries

In response to MPI's request for feedback on proposed animal welfare regulations I submit the following for your careful consideration.

The given consultation period (14th April to 10 May 2016) for public involvement is woefully inadequate. Five weeks is unrealistic and makes a mockery of the consultation process. The volume of proposals we are being asked to consider in this time frame isn't feasible and I ask that a more realistic time frame be given for the public to have our say.

I suggest a period of five weeks be given to each section of the proposed welfare regulations.

While the proposed regulations relating to live animal exports, the care and conduct towards animals, and surgical and painful procedures is a start, I ask that there be a full review into intensive farming practices across the agricultural industry.

The last two decades have seen the intensification of animal agriculture to levels that are unprecedented in recent history'. The current welfare codes and proposed welfare regulations don't go nearly far enough in protecting animal welfare under increasingly intensive farming practices.

Society's moral values are constantly shifting yet these regulations have remained largely static and are vastly out of step with changing attitudes to animal welfare'. I want to see a total ban on all cages for layer hens, farrowing crates for sows and a reduction in intensive dairy resulting in the slaughter of over 2m calves annually.

These farming practices can no longer be deemed humane by today's standards and cannot be incorporated as such in any welfare code. The new rules are not keeping pace with changing scientific knowledge and cannot be accepted as good practice.

- 1) From 5.3m dairy cows in 2007 to 6.4m in 2012 (23% increase in just 5 years) Statistics NZ
- 2) Switzerland banned cages for hens in 1992

Care and conduct regulatory proposals		
1	All animals	Electric prodders
		I propose that the use of electric prodders be banned under all circumstances except when they are "necessary for protection,

		<p>preservation or maintenance of human life"</p> <p>I do not support exemptions on the use of prodders based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the species and size of an animal b. the manner of use of an animal (circus) c. the location of the animal (slaughter premises) <p>I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p>
2	All animals	Use of goads
		I support the proposal to ban the use of goads on sensitive areas of an animal's body under any circumstances. Given the deliberate cruelty involved in using goads on sensitive areas I propose an increased infringement penalty of \$500.
3	All animals	Twisting an animal's tail
		I support the proposal to prohibit painful twisting of an animal's tail. Given the potential for significant pain and damage from this behaviour, and the deliberate nature of the act I propose the infringement penalty is set at the higher level of \$500.
Proposed	All animals	Any animal requiring manual lifting must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick animals).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed 2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/
4	Dogs	Pinch and Prong collars
		I support the prohibition of pinch and prong collars under any circumstances; no exemption for dogs used for special purposes (guarding, military) is supported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300. I also support the banning of the sale of these collars and associated penalties under the law.
5	Dogs	Injuries from collars or tethers
		I support the proposal to only use collars or tethers in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. Given the potential for severe injury from collars I propose the penalty is increased to a prosecutable offence.

6	Dogs	Muzzling a dog
		I support the proposal for regulating the use of muzzles so they do not cause injury or distress. I support the inclusion in the proposal that muzzles should allow for a dog to be able to drink. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
7	Dogs	Dry and shaded shelter
		I support the proposal for dogs to have access to dry and shaded shelter at all times. I propose the inclusion in the proposal that dogs also have access to fresh, palatable drinking water at all times. Given that shelter and water are basic needs of life neglecting these items has the potential to cause significant harm and even death therefore I propose the infringement penalty to be increased to a prosecutable offence. I also propose that there be a maximum time imposed that a dog is allowed to be chained for at any one time and that an infringement fee be set for exceeding that time.
8	Dogs	Dogs left in vehicles
		I support the proposal for people leaving dogs in vehicles to ensure their safety. I propose increasing the penalty to a prosecutable offence both to reflect the potential fatal nature of the injury and also to act as a suitable penalty to prevent this behaviour. Additionally increasing the penalty allows for effective prosecution of corporations who use dogs who have a responsibility to ensure dogs in their care are cared for appropriately.
9	Dogs	Secured on moving vehicles
		I support the proposal to secure dogs on moving vehicles. I propose including dogs on vehicles on private property in the regulation, and propose a speed limit of 40kph for vehicles carrying unsecured working dogs. I propose increasing the penalty for infringement to \$1000 due to the potential for severe injury, suffering, and death resulting from falling from a moving vehicle.
Proposed	Dogs	Ban export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Macau or China
		The Macau and China greyhound racing industries do not have the same standards of animal welfare as NZ. The export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Hong Kong (for further transport to Macau/China) is minimal at present. However if the export of greyhounds from other countries (Australia, Ireland) is banned or more heavily regulated then NZ could become a transport hub for dogs in this industry. This has the potential for poor welfare outcomes for dogs and very poor public perception in New Zealand. It is far better to ban an activity like this before it has the potential to become established. MPI have demonstrated their willingness to put in place infringements for uncommon industry activities which have the potential to become welfare issues in the future with proposal 50 in this document banning transport of young calves across cook strait. I propose the above regulation and propose the infringement penalty is set at a

		prosecutable offence.
10	Dogs and Cats	Drowning dogs and cats
		I support the prohibition of the killing of a dog or cat of any age by drowning. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
11	Eels	Insensible for desliming
		I support the proposal that eels must be insensible for desliming or killed before they are deslimed. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
12	Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish	Insensible before being killed
		<p>I support the proposal that crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish must be insensible before they are killed. I dispute the NAWAC statement that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible and propose that either:</p> <p>a. the only legally acceptable method of rendering crabs and crayfish insensible is by electrical stunning (for which specific equipment is available for use in small restaurant premises). OR</p> <p>b. NAWAC conduct a review of the recent (since 2000) scientific literature on humane slaughter of crustaceans and present good quality, recent evidence to support the claim that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for failing to render a crustacean insensible prior to slaughter.</p>
13	Goats	Tethering requirements
		<p>I do not support the tethering of goats, on the basis that it stops goats expressing normal social behaviours, and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$500. Furthermore I share concerns with previous submissions around tethering of goats that tourists witnessing tethered goats on the road side could easily get a negative impression of animal welfare in NZ.</p> <p>I propose that all goats, regardless of housing system, have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$500.</p> <p>I also propose that as goats are social animals, all goats should be provided with a companion such as another goat, camelid, horse, donkey or sheep. I propose that failure to house a goat with a companion should attract an infringement penalty of \$300.</p> <p>1. Miranda-de la Lama, G.C. and Mattiello, S. (2010). The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming. Small Ruminant Research 90, (1-3), 1-10</p>
14	Horses	Use of a whip, lead, or any other object

		I support the prohibition of using a whip, lead or other object to strike around the head. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
15	Horses	Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
16	Horses and Donkeys	Tethering requirements
		I do not support the tethering of horses and donkeys and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$300. I propose that all horses and donkeys have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times regardless of housing system and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$300.
17	Layer Hens	Opportunity to express normal behaviours in housing systems
		I believe that colony cages do not adequately consider the welfare of layer hens because they prohibit the ability of the hen to express a range of normal behaviours. In addition, colony cages are not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 as they do not allow owners or persons in charge of animals to take all reasonable steps to ensure that their physical, health and behavioural needs are met. 1) Sections 9, 68 Animal Welfare Act 1999
18	Layer Hens	Stocking densities
		Colony cages do not allow hens to engage in a range of normal behaviours and therefore they are in clear breach of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. With a stocking density of 13 hens per square metre or 750 square centimetres, clearly the stocking density is too high.
19	Layer Hens	Housing and equipment design
		<p>Colony cages are only slightly bigger than traditional battery cages. While they provide token welfare gestures like nest boxes, scratch pads and perches, these gestures do not ensure the physical, health and behavioural needs of hens are met. With only 750 sq cm per hen, there are a number of behaviours hens are not able to functionally perform in colony cages; this includes spreading her wings fully¹. It's also questionable whether a hen in a colony cage can properly nest, perch, peck or scratch. A hen in a colony cage cannot dust bathe.</p> <p>Research has shown that some hens in colony cages can be prevented from using the nest provided due to competition from other hens². Also, the limited space in colony cages is insufficient to allow hens sufficient time (on average 45 minutes³) if they want to lay at the</p>

		<p>same time.</p> <p>In order to satisfy a hen's need for perching, the housing system must be able to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient length of perching space to allow all birds to perch at the same time; and • Sufficient elevation of the perches to satisfy the hens' requirements for a perceived safe perching place at night. <p>Colony cages fulfil neither of these requirements. The standard of approximately 15cm of space per hen is an average and does not allow consideration for larger birds. Perches in colony systems are situated on average just a few centimetres from the floor of the cage. <i>'A perch positioned 5cm above floor level is 'not considered as a perch (by a hen) and has no attractive or repulsive value'.</i></p> <p>Litter is not provided in colony cage systems. Litter is imperative for hen welfare. Hens will make great efforts to access litter for pecking, scratching and dustbathing – three normal behaviours of hens⁴. When hens are unable to forage in litter, they can redirect their pecking towards other hens resulting in harmful feather pecking and even cannibalism. When hens are unable to dustbathe in litter, they can develop the dysfunctional behaviour of sham dustbathing.</p> <p>1) A hen's wingspan is approximately 75-80 centimetres which is twice the size of a traditional battery cage</p> <p>2) Guedson, V. and Faure, J. M. (2004) <i>Laying performance and egg quality in hens kept in standard or furnished cages</i>. Animal Research, 53: 45-57.</p> <p>3) Appleby, M.C. (1998) Modification of laying hen cages to improve behaviour. Poultry Science, 77: 1828-1832.</p> <p>4) Cooper, J.J. and Ablentosa, M. J. (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews, 14: 127-149.</p>
20	Layer Hens	Induced moulting
		I support the proposal to prohibit induced moulting of layer hens.
21	Llama and Alpaca	Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes, and packs
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
22	Llama and Alpaca	Companion animals
		I support the proposal that camelids must be provided with a companion animal. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
23	Llama and	Offspring (Cria) camelid companions

	Alpaca	
		I support the proposal to prohibit raising Cria without the company of other camelids. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
24	Pigs	Dry sleeping area
		Proposal: I support the proposal that all pigs have access to a dry sleeping area. Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
25	Pigs	Lying space for grower pigs
		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal for minimum space requirements for grower pigs.</p> <p>1. Error in formula</p> <p>The proposed formula used to calculate the minimum space has a type error; specifically the exponent notation has not been applied. I believes the formula intended by MPI should read "live weight^{0.67} (kg)" but instead it reads "live weight 0.67(kg)" which translates to an Area = 0.03 * liveweight * 0.67(kg) and results in a much higher space requirement.</p> <p>Therefore I contend that proposal 25 must be rewritten and resubmitted for public consultation, with the correct formula included so that the intended space requirement can be properly considered.</p> <p>2. Minimum requirement</p> <p>Recent research suggests that a k-value of 0.3 is too low. In 2006, Gonyou et al. (2006) which ADFI is reduced. More recently, a 2015 study has found that a k-value of 0.0336 might underestimate the impact of increased stocking density on ADG and ADFI².</p> <p>A k-value of 0.3 is too low to provide grower pigs with this environment and is sufficient as a minimum requirement for static space only.</p> <p>Does the proposal adequately define the appropriate systems?</p> <p>The proposal is based on a minimum standard, which is expected to occur (if at all) only where growers have reached the capacity of their pen and are shortly to be moved to a bigger pen³ not a minimum standard which is considered acceptable at all times and this should be clarified in the regulation itself.</p> <p>I consider the minimum standards of housing for pigs to be provide "sufficient space to enable them to perform natural behaviours such as lying on their side without touching another pig, standing up, turning around and performing exercise, space for separate areas for dunging and feeding, with a dunging areas situated a sufficient distance from sleeping and feeding areas as well as materials to enable them to root and forage"⁴. If these standards cannot be met by the current farming systems then we are concerned that the current farming systems are not compatible with the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour and breach the animal welfare act.</p> <p>The current regulation has no limit on the length of time during which a grower pig may be submitted to the proposed minimum standard. Overstocking is a known problem. I am concerned that grower pigs may be submitted to spaces which do not meet minimum</p>

		<p>requirement if their transfer to a new pen is delayed. I would like the regulations to be clear that it is unacceptable for growers to be kept for prolonged periods in spaces at or close to the minimum requirement. In its 2010 review, NAWAC submitted that space enough to allow for pigs to lie fully recumbent (k-value of 0.047) was recommended best practice.</p> <p>For the sake of clarity and to give effect to the intention of NAWAC, I suggest that a minimum period of time for growers kept in the lower end of the scale be added.</p> <p>Due to the above considerations, I propose that the minimum standard is amended to:</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must have lying space of at least: Area (m2) per pig = 0.040 x live weight 0.67(kg)</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must not have lying space of less than: Area (m2) per pig = 0.047 x live weight 0.67(kg) for longer than one week.</p> <p>Penalty: I support penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p> <p>Gonyou, H. W., M. C. Brumm, E. Bush, J. Deen, S. A. Edwards, T. Fangman, J. J. McGlone, M. Meunier-Salaun, R. B. Morrison, H. Spooler, P. L. Sundberg, and A. K. Johnson. 2006. Application of broken-line analysis to assess floor space requirements of nursery and grower-finisher pigs expressed on an allometric basis. J. Anim. Sci. 84: 229-235.</p> <p>Thomas, LL. "The Effects of Increasing Stocking Density on Finishing Pig Growth ..." 2015. http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=k_aesrr ibid. Page 9 "ANIMAL WELFARE (Pigs) CODE OF WELFARE 2010 REPORT." 2015. 15 May. 2016 <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/1446></p>
26	Pigs	Dry sow stalls
		<p>Proposal: I support the prohibition of dry sow stalls</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p>
27	Pigs	Size of farrowing crates
		<p>Proposal: I do not support the use of farrowing crates.</p> <p>Production systems using farrowing crates are not the only financially viable forms of pork production. It is widely accepted that sow welfare in farrowing crates is sub-optimal. Continuing a production system which is contrary to good practice and scientific knowledge is in direct violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.</p> <p>In 2016, a review of Farrowing Crates for Pigs in NZ was submitted by NAWAC. In that report, NAWAC stated that "no significant change in science, technology or good practice from 2010 when the pigs code of welfare was issued". It submitted that the levels of piglet mortality in farrowing pens is higher than in farrowing crates and used this as justification for retaining farrowing crates in New Zealand. However, there is abundant research which supports the conclusion that total piglet mortality on farms with loose farrowing systems does not differ</p>

		<p>from that of farms with crates²³.</p> <p>I submit that farrowing crates are unacceptable in modern day pork production systems and must be banned outright.</p> <p>"National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee - NZPork." 2016. 15 May. 2016 http://www.nzpork.co.nz/images/custom/farrowing-crate-advice-14-march-2016.pdf</p> <p>Weber, R. "Piglet mortality on farms using farrowing systems ... - IngentaConnect." 2007. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ufaw/aw/2007/00000016/0000002/art00042</p> <p>KilBride, AL. "A cohort study of preweaning piglet mortality and ... - ScienceDirect." 2012. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167587711003564</p>
28	Pigs	Provision of nesting material
		<p>Proposal: I support the provision of nesting material that can be manipulated to sows. However, it is clear that sows in farrowing crates will be unable to exhibit natural nesting behaviours in the confined space of a farrowing crate. To give effect to the intention of providing nesting material, the sow must be given more space in which to move. I agree that the definition of manipulable material should be made more apparent. "Material at ground level which mimics that of natural nesting material and encourages the sow to exhibit rooting behaviour" would be appropriate. However, for clarity, I recommend that examples are provided for guidance. Appropriate examples would include straw and sawdust.</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Chaloupková, H. "The effect of nesting material on the nest-building and maternal ... - NCBI." 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20889685</p>
29	Rodeos	Fireworks
		<p>I support the ban of fireworks at rodeo's, The loud noise of fireworks is well established as a stressor in companion animals (Bolster 2012; Dale et al., 2010) And Unexpected noise and movement will cause the fight or flight response in both horses and cattle (Lanier, 2000; Christensen, 2005).</p> <p>I would like to see a total ban on rodeo, rodeo is of no advantage to the economy. A petition recently submitted to parliament has 42,000 members of the public in support of such a ban. Rodeo is in breach of the animal welfare act which states that animals should be 'physically handled in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress.' The rodeo is a form of entertainment therefore making it an unnecessary activity for animals to be involved in. The likelihood of animals feeling distress while performing in rodeos could only be successfully minimised if rodeos were entirely stopped; goading animals into states of distress is fundamental to getting them to perform in rodeo events.</p> <p>As there have been many breaches of the rodeo code brought before MPI in 2014 and 2015 we strongly urge MPI to carefully consider if the codes are adequate in helping to minimise the likelihood of unreasonable and unnecessary pain or distress. We are aware of new</p>

		breaches that will be brought before MPI for a third year running, this adds to the evidence that these codes are not adequate for protecting animals, therefore we feel that the only way to ensure these breaches do not continue is for an outright ban.
30	Exotic animals	Used in circuses
		I do not support the use of exotic animals in circuses and propose that their use be banned. Given that there are currently no circuses in NZ using exotic animals the banning of the practice now will cause no industry disruption. Popular opinion both here and overseas is moving away from the use of exotic animals in circus and if this practice was to occur again in NZ it is likely that there would be a public outcry against it.
31	Cattle	Milk stimulation
		I support the proposal to prohibit the stimulation of milk let down by inserting water or air into a cow's vagina. I propose the prohibition is extended to include the insertion of any object into a cow's vagina to stimulate milk let down. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
32	Cattle and Sheep	Vehicular traction in calving or lambing
		I support the proposal to prohibit the use of a moving vehicle to provide traction in lambing or calving. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
33	Cattle and Sheep	Ingrown horns
		I support the proposal to require treatment for horns that are touching the skin or eye. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
34	Stock transport	Cuts and abrasions
		I support the proposal that transport should not result in cuts or abrasions. I propose the regulation is extended to all animals' not just cattle, sheep, deer, goats, and pigs. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
35	Stock transport	Animals with ingrown horns
		I support the proposal that animals with ingrown horns must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
36	Stock	Animals with bleeding horns or antlers

	transport	
		I support the proposal that animals with bleeding horns or antler must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
37	Stock transport	Animals with long horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with long horn or antler must not cause injury to themselves or others during transport. I could not find any rationale for the use of 110mm as a cut off value for long antler either in the code of welfare, or the report on the code. I propose that MPI publish the rationale behind the cut off value of 110mm or perform analysis of the injuries sustained from transport of animals with horns to determine if this measurement is an appropriate guide. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
38	Stock transport	Lame cattle, deer, pigs and goats
		I support the proposal that cattle, sheep, pigs and goats with lameness scores of 2 must be certified for transport by a veterinarian and that animals with a lameness score of 3 must not be transported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
39	Stock transport	Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury
		I support the proposal that animals who cannot bear weight evenly due to injury require certification from a veterinarian for transport. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
40	Stock transport	Pregnant animals
		I support the proposal that animals who are in late stages of pregnancy should not be transported. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
41	Stock transport	Animals with injured or diseased udders
		I support the proposal that animals who have diseased udders should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
42	Stock transport	Cattle or sheep with cancer eye
		I support the proposal that animals who have cancer eye which is large, not confined to the eyelid or discharging/bleeding should not be

		transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
Young calf management regulatory proposals		
43	Young Calves	Loading and unloading facilities
		I support the proposal that facilities must be provided which enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. Given the potential for severe injury and pain I propose that the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
Proposed	Young Calves	Calves must not be thrown, if they need to be manually lifted they must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick calves).
		Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading ¹ , only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage ² , presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour. http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/
Proposed	Young Calves	Minimum training standard for people handling/loading calves
		I propose a minimum training standard is put in place for people loading calves on to transportation. Footage from 2015 clearly shows inappropriate handling of calves at the time of loading ¹ . A regulation for minimum training standards for those loading calves will not just improve calf welfare but will also demonstrate the transport industry's commitment to improving their part of the calf management chain. In contrast failure for the transport industry to demonstrate willingness to improve welfare outcomes for calves could reflect badly in the media. I propose infringement penalty is prosecution due to the lack of provision of appropriate training being a corporation level infringement and therefore an appropriate penalty needs to be significant enough to deter corporations from flouting the law. http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed
Proposed	Young Calves	Same day slaughter
		I propose that all young calves received at a slaughter premises must

		<p>be slaughtered that day and cannot be held overnight. It has been recognised by MPI that time off feed is a significant welfare concern in young calves therefore reducing the time spent at a slaughter premises aims to reduce the risk of calves spending an extended period of time off feed. Although an alternative proposal could be for feeding at arrival at slaughter premises given the other welfare issues of housing young calves I consider reducing holding time to a minimum as the least bad of the options. I propose an infringement penalty set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Use of nearest slaughterhouse
		<p>Increased time spent at transport has been shown to be one of the determinants of poorer outcomes for calves'. For this reason I propose that calves are required to be slaughtered at the closest slaughter premises. I propose the infringement penalty to be set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
44	Young Calves	Shelter on farm, before and during transportation and at processing plants
		I support the proposal for minimum standards of shelter on farm, before transportation, and at slaughter premises. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
45	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – age
		<p>I propose that the minimum age of transport is increased to 10 days to bring us in line with what is considered an acceptable standard of welfare in other developed countries. MPI have stated that the 4 day standard suggested in the proposed regulation has been suggested as this reflects current industry practice. However the transport code of welfare only cites research performed in calves 5-10 days of age' therefore I propose that the absolute minimum age of transport be set at 5 days of age. I support the most conservative determination of age – that it is determined from the time the calf is separated from the dam. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p>
46	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – Physical characteristics
		I support the proposal that the list of physical characteristics provided with regulation 46 should be met prior to transport of young calves. I

		support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
47	Young Calves	Maximum time off feed
		<p>I support the proposal for regulating the maximum time off feed for young calves, however we propose this is reduced to 12 hours. The lack of physiological indicators in the 2000 Todd paper does not demonstrate that:</p> <p>this is in fact the case in calves <5 days of age or that these calves are not experiencing significant hunger or that these calves have the physiological capacity to respond to transport in a measurable way with the tools used in the study:</p> <p>I propose that calves undergoing transport are kept to the same feeding schedule they would have if they remained on farm. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p> <p>Knowles, T.G., Warriss, P.D., Brown, S.N., Edwards, J.E., Watkins, P.E. and Phillips, A.J. 1997. Effects on calves less than one month old of feeding or not feeding them during road transport of up to 24 hours. Veterinary Record 140, 116-124.</p>
48	Young Calves	Duration of transport
		<p>I support limiting the duration of transport of young calves to 8 hours or less. As length of transport has been shown to be associated with poorer outcomes for calves we propose an increase in the infringement penalty to \$1000.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
49	Young Calves	Blunt force trauma
		<p>I support the prohibition of the use of blunt force trauma for killing calves. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to receive appropriate penalties to deter this behaviour.</p>
50	Young Calves	Transport by sea across Cook Strait prohibited
		<p>I support the prohibition of transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to be held accountable.</p>
Surgical and painful procedures regulatory proposals		
51	All animals	Hot branding

		I support the prohibition of hot branding and the penalty of prosecution.
52	All animals	Embryo collection via exteriorised uterus (surgical embryo transfer)
		I do not support the collection of embryos via exteriorised uterus and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
53	All animals	Laparoscopic artificial insemination (laparoscopic AI)
		I do not support the use of laparoscopic AI and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
54	All animals	Liver biopsy
		I support the proposal for liver biopsy to be restricted to being performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students and the requirement for the use of pain relief. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
55	All animals	Dental work
		I support the proposal that any power tool used for dental work must be designed for the purpose of dentistry. I propose the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
56	Cats	Declawing
		I support the restriction of cat declawing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I

		recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
57	Compani on animals	Desexing (including stray/feral cats, dogs and other species)
		I support the restriction of desexing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence. I propose that all cats and dogs sold in pet shops be desexed and vaccinated before being released to the purchaser. This would work as a preventative step in helping reduce the number of stray/feral cats and dogs over time.
58	Dogs	Freeze branding
		I propose that freeze branding of dogs is banned. With better technology now available we can microchip dogs rather than freeze branding them. In the case that freeze branding is not prohibited I support the restriction of freeze branding to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
59	Dogs	Dog debarking (and devoicing of other species)
		I support the restriction of dog debarking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
60	Dogs	Cropping the ears
		I support the proposal to prohibit ear cropping of dogs. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
61	Dogs	Dew claws
		I support the restriction of removal of articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose restriction of removal of non-articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution.
62	Dogs	Tail docking

		I support the docking of tails in dogs for therapeutic reasons only. The procedure must be performed by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Pain relief must be used at the time of this procedure.
63	Cattle	Teats
		<p>I support the proposal for supernumerary teat removal of animals >6 weeks of age to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the removal of supernumerary teats in animals <6 weeks of age without pain relief, however the procedure could be undertaken by a skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie a vet tech). I propose that:</p> <p>the maximum of age of animals on whom supernumerary teat removal can be performed by a lay person is reduced to 4 weeks of age</p> <p>i) infringement penalty of prosecution pain relief is required for any supernumerary teat removal procedure regardless of age</p> <p>ii) infringement penalty of prosecution procedure is performed using sterilised equipment</p> <p>iii) infringement penalty of \$500 any person performing the procedure who is not a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student is signed off by a veterinarian</p> <p>iv) infringement penalty of prosecution</p>
64	Cattle	Claw removal
		I support the proposal that claw removal is restricted to being performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief is required at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) pain relief is also administered. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
65	Cattle	Teat occlusion
		I support the proposal that teat sealing can only be performed with a product registered for that specific purpose. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution.
66	Cattle	Tail docking
		I support the restriction of tail docking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons only, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
67	Cattle and sheep	Castration and shortening of the scrotum (cryptorchid)

		<p>I support the proposal for surgical castration at any age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I support the proposal that non-surgical castration in cattle and sheep over 6 months of age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the age of 6 months as an appropriate age at which lay people can no longer perform non-surgical castration and propose that this age limit is lowered to 2 months, I support limiting the manner of non-surgical castration to only the use of conventional rubber rings. I does not support performing non-surgical castration without pain relief at any age and propose that pain relief is required for any castration procedure at any age. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also required. I propose that the penalty for all infringements other than lack of NSAID use is prosecution and that the penalty for not using an NSAID is an infringement of \$300.</p>
68	Cattle, sheep and goats	Disbudding
		<p>I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian, veterinary student under direct supervision, or skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie vet tech/appropriately trained farm worker). I propose that appropriate maximum ages are determined for disbudding to be performed by a lay person. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p>
69	Cattle, sheep and goats	Dehorning
		<p>I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision. Given the much greater risk of pain, bleeding, and infection from dehorning rather than disbudding I propose that farmers are given 12 months warning after which dehorning can only be performed by veterinarians. This will give a strong message that disbudding is much preferred and much more economically viable. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p>
70	Sheep	Tail docking
		<p>I support the limiting of tail docking in sheep who are greater than 6 months of age to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and</p>

		<p>propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support restricting the techniques for tail docking in younger animals to rubber ring and hot iron only. I propose that pain relief at the time of procedure and NSAID should also be required, regardless of age at the time of tail docking.</p> <p>Furthermore I propose that the maximum age at which a lay person is able to perform a tail docking procedure is reduced to 2 months. I support the proposal that tails are not to be cut flush and are to be able to cover the vulva in a female and of a similar length in a male. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for infringements in sheep > 2 months of age and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalties of \$500 for use of non-listed methods and not cutting tails flush in sheep < 2 months of age. I propose a penalty of prosecution for not using pain relief in sheep < 2 months of age and a penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p>
71	Sheep	Mulesing
		I support the proposal to prohibit mulesing. I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
72	Deer	Develveting
		I support the proposal for develveting to be only performed by veterinarians, directly supervised veterinary students or a person with veterinary approval. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
73	Horses	Blistering, firing, or nicking
		I support the proposal to prohibit blistering, firing or nicking, and support the proposed infringement penalty.
74	Horses	Tail docking
		I support the proposal for tail docking to only be performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students, only for therapeutic reasons, only with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
75	Horses	Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal pregnancy diagnosis in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
76	Horses	Rectal examination of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal examination in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
77	Horses	Caslick's procedure
		I support the proposal for creation, opening and repair of caslick's

		<p>procedure to only be performed by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and the use of pain relief for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p> <p>I propose that a caslick's procedure may only be performed for therapeutic purposes and not for a perceived performance benefit and that the proposed infringement penalty for this breach is the same as that proposed above.</p>
78	Horses	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
79	Llama and alpaca	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in llama and alpaca to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure, and the minimum age for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalties for these infringements.
80	Pigs	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration to only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision and the required use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution. I propose that a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) is also required and that the penalty for not administering an NSAID is \$300.
81	Pigs	Tail docking
		<p>I propose that pain relief should be used for this procedure regardless of the animal's age. I support limiting the procedure to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students in animals > 7 days of age.</p> <p>I propose that a NSAID should also be administered at the time of the procedure. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and for a lay person performing the procedure in an animal > 7 days of age. I propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID administration.</p>
82	Birds	Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird
		I support the restriction of pinioning/deflighting a bird to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only being performed in the best interests of the animal, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
83	Poultry	Dubbing

		I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence to perform dubbing on breeds not usually dubbed and to not use pain relief at the time of the procedure. I oppose the surgical modification of an animal if the modification is not in the interests of the animal, therefore I propose that dubbing is prohibited with the penalty of a prosecutable offence.
84	Ostriches and emus	Declawing
		I support the prohibition of radical declawing of emu chicks. However the use of the term radical implies that some declawing is allowed and opens the regulation to subjective interpretation. I propose that the regulation prohibit all declawing of emu or ostrich unless performed by a vet for therapeutic reasons. I support the penalty of prosecutable offence.
85	Roosters	Caponising (rooster castration)
		I support the restriction of caponising to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

From: Jean Lyle § 9(2)(a)
Sent: Monday, 16 May 2016 4:13 p.m.
To: Animal Welfare Submissions
Subject: Animal welfare

I agree with the SPCA'S stance on the welfare of Bobby calves

Still not good enough I feel as will be very hard to police.

New Zealand's current animal welfare regulations don't go far enough to protect vulnerable bobby calves.

SPCA New Zealand believes the following should be practiced:

- Not transporting bobby calves before they are 10 days old.
- Not confining bobby calves for longer than 2 hours while awaiting transport.
- Providing proper bedding for bobby calves awaiting transport.
- Providing proper bedding for bobby calves during transport.
- Ensuring better and more humane methods for loading and unloading bobby calves. Throwing animals is completely unacceptable.
- The time and distance bobby calves are transported should be limited – and drivers should be trained to drive appropriately.
- If a bobby calf is to be slaughtered, this should be done on the same day as transport and should be done quickly and with care

This above echoes my opinions

Regards

Jean Lyle

§ 9(2)(a)

✓ 157

From: Meg Wilks s9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, 18 May 2016 2:34 p.m.
To: Animal Welfare Submissions
Subject: Submission on Animal Welfare Regulations

MPI Animal Welfare Codes Submission

Nathan Guy Minister for Primary Industries

In response to MPI's request for feedback on proposed animal welfare regulations I submit the following for your careful consideration.

The given consultation period (14th April to 10 May 2016) for public involvement is woefully inadequate. Five weeks is unrealistic and makes a mockery of the consultation process. The volume of proposals we are being asked to consider in this time frame isn't feasible and I ask that a more realistic time frame be given for the public to have our say.

I suggest a period of five weeks be given to each section of the proposed welfare regulations.

While the proposed regulations relating to live animal exports, the care and conduct towards animals, and surgical and painful procedures is a start, I ask that there be a full review into intensive farming practices across the agricultural industry.

The last two decades have seen the intensification of animal agriculture to levels that are unprecedented in recent history¹. The current welfare codes and proposed welfare regulations don't go nearly far enough in protecting animal welfare under increasingly intensive farming practices.

Society's moral values are constantly shifting yet these regulations have remained largely static and are vastly out of step with changing attitudes to animal welfare². I want to see a total ban on all cages for layer hens, farrowing crates for sows and a reduction in intensive dairy resulting in the slaughter of over 2m calves annually.

These farming practices can no longer be deemed humane by today's standards and cannot be incorporated as such in any welfare code. The new rules are not keeping pace with changing scientific knowledge and cannot be accepted as good practice.

- 1) From 5.3m dairy cows in 2007 to 6.4m in 2012 (23% increase in just 5 years) Statistics NZ
- 2) Switzerland banned cages for hens in 1992

Care and conduct regulatory proposals		
1	All animals	Electric prodders
		<p>I propose that the use of electric prodders be banned under all circumstances except when they are "necessary for protection, preservation or maintenance of human life"</p> <p>I do not support exemptions on the use of prodders based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the species and size of an animal b. the manner of use of an animal (circus) c. the location of the animal (slaughter premises) <p>I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p>
2	All animals	Use of goads
		<p>I support the proposal to ban the use of goads on sensitive areas of an animal's body under any circumstances. Given the deliberate cruelty involved in using goads on sensitive areas I propose an increased infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
3	All animals	Twisting an animal's tail
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit painful twisting of an animal's tail. Given the potential for significant pain and damage from this behaviour, and the deliberate nature of the act I propose the infringement penalty is set at the higher level of \$500.</p>

Proposed	All animals	Any animal requiring manual lifting must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick animals).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed 2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
4	Dogs	Pinch and Prong collars
		I support the prohibition of pinch and prong collars under any circumstances; no exemption for dogs used for special purposes (guarding, military) is supported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300. I also support the banning of the sale of these collars and associated penalties under the law.
5	Dogs	Injuries from collars or tethers
		I support the proposal to only use collars or tethers in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. Given the potential for severe injury from collars I propose the penalty is increased to a prosecutable offence.
6	Dogs	Muzzling a dog
		I support the proposal for regulating the use of muzzles so they do not cause injury or distress. I support the inclusion in the proposal that muzzles should allow for a dog to be able to drink. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
7	Dogs	Dry and shaded shelter
		I support the proposal for dogs to have access to dry and shaded shelter at all times. I propose the inclusion in the proposal that dogs also have access to fresh, palatable drinking water at all times. Given that shelter and water are basic needs of life neglecting these items has the potential to cause significant harm and even death therefore I propose the infringement penalty to be increased to a prosecutable offence. I also propose that there be a maximum time imposed that a dog is allowed to be chained for at any one time and that an infringement fee be set for exceeding that time.
8	Dogs	Dogs left in vehicles
		I support the proposal for people leaving dogs in vehicles to ensure their safety. I propose increasing the penalty to a prosecutable offence both to reflect the potential fatal nature of the injury and also to act as a suitable penalty to prevent this behaviour. Additionally increasing the penalty allows for effective prosecution of corporations who use dogs who have a responsibility to ensure dogs in their care are cared for appropriately.
9	Dogs	Secured on moving vehicles
		I support the proposal to secure dogs on moving vehicles. I propose including dogs on vehicles on private property in the regulation, and propose a speed limit of 40kph for vehicles carrying unsecured working dogs. I propose increasing the penalty for infringement to \$1000 due to the potential for severe injury, suffering, and death resulting from falling from a moving vehicle.
Proposed	Dogs	Ban export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Macau or China

		The Macau and China greyhound racing industries do not have the same standards of animal welfare as NZ. The export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Hong Kong (for further transport to Macau/China) is minimal at present. However if the export of greyhounds from other countries (Australia, Ireland) is banned or more heavily regulated then NZ could become a transport hub for dogs in this industry. This has the potential for poor welfare outcomes for dogs and very poor public perception in New Zealand. It is far better to ban an activity like this before it has the potential to become established. MPI have demonstrated their willingness to put in place infringements for uncommon industry activities which have the potential to become welfare issues in the future with proposal 50 in this document banning transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I propose the above regulation and propose the infringement penalty is set at a prosecutable offence.
10	Dogs and Cats	Drowning dogs and cats
		I support the prohibition of the killing of a dog or cat of any age by drowning. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
11	Eels	Insensible for desliming
		I support the proposal that eels must be insensible for desliming or killed before they are deslimed. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
12	Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish	Insensible before being killed
		I support the proposal that crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish must be insensible before they are killed. I dispute the NAWAC statement that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible and propose that either: a. the only legally acceptable method of rendering crabs and crayfish insensible is by electrical stunning (for which specific equipment is available for use in small restaurant premises). OR b. NAWAC conduct a review of the recent (since 2000) scientific literature on humane slaughter of crustaceans and present good quality, recent evidence to support the claim that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for failing to render a crustacean insensible prior to slaughter.
13	Goats	Tethering requirements
		I do not support the tethering of goats, on the basis that it stops goats expressing normal social behaviours, and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$500. Furthermore I share concerns with previous submissions around tethering of goats that tourists witnessing tethered goats on the road side could easily get a negative impression of animal welfare in NZ. I propose that all goats, regardless of housing system, have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$500. I also propose that as goats are social animals, all goats should be provided with a companion such as another goat, camelid, horse, donkey or sheep. I propose that failure to house a goat with a companion should attract an infringement penalty of \$300. 1. Miranda-de la Lama, G.C. and Mattiello, S. (2010). The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming. Small Ruminant Research 90, (1-3), 1-10
14	Horses	Use of a whip, lead, or any other object
		I support the prohibition of using a whip, lead or other object to strike around the head. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
15	Horses	Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.

16	Horses and Donkeys	Tethering requirements
		I do not support the tethering of horses and donkeys and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$300. I propose that all horses and donkeys have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times regardless of housing system and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$300.
17	Layer Hens	Opportunity to express normal behaviours in housing systems
		I believe that colony cages do not adequately consider the welfare of layer hens because they prohibit the ability of the hen to express a range of normal behaviours. In addition, colony cages are not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 as they do not allow owners or persons in charge of animals to take all reasonable steps to ensure that their physical, health and behavioural needs are met. 1) Sections 9, 68 Animal Welfare Act 1999
18	Layer Hens	Stocking densities
		Colony cages do not allow hens to engage in a range of normal behaviours and therefore they are in clear breach of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. With a stocking density of 13 hens per square metre or 750 square centimetres, clearly the stocking density is too high.
19	Layer Hens	Housing and equipment design
		<p>Colony cages are only slightly bigger than traditional battery cages. While they provide token welfare gestures like nest boxes, scratch pads and perches, these gestures do not ensure the physical, health and behavioural needs of hens are met. With only 750 sq cm per hen, there are a number of behaviours hens are not able to functionally perform in colony cages; this includes spreading her wings fully. It's also questionable whether a hen in a colony cage can properly nest, perch, peck or scratch. A hen in a colony cage cannot dust bathe.</p> <p>Research has shown that some hens in colony cages can be prevented from using the nest provided due to competition from other hens². Also, the limited space in colony cages is insufficient to allow hens sufficient time (on average 45 minutes³) if they want to lay at the same time.</p> <p>In order to satisfy a hen's need for perching, the housing system must be able to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient length of perching space to allow all birds to perch at the same time; and • Sufficient elevation of the perches to satisfy the hens' requirements for a perceived safe perching place at night. <p>Colony cages fulfil neither of these requirements. The standard of approximately 15cm of space per hen is an average and does not allow consideration for larger birds. Perches in colony systems are situated on average just a few centimetres from the floor of the cage. 'A perch positioned 5cm above floor level is 'not considered as a perch (by a hen) and has no attractive or repulsive value'.</p> <p>Litter is not provided in colony cage systems. Litter is imperative for hen welfare. Hens will make great efforts to access litter for pecking, scratching and dustbathing – three normal behaviours of hens⁴. When hens are unable to forage in litter, they can redirect their pecking towards other hens resulting in harmful feather pecking and even cannibalism. When hens are unable to dustbathe in litter, they can develop the dysfunctional behaviour of sham dustbathing.</p> <p>1) A hen's wingspan is approximately 75-80 centimetres which is twice the size of a traditional battery cage 2) Guedson, V. and Faure, J. M. (2004) <i>Laying performance and egg quality in hens kept in standard or furnished cages</i>. Animal Research, 53: 45-57. 3) Appleby, M.C. (1998) Modification of laying hen cages to improve behaviour. Poultry Science, 77: 1828-1832. 4) Cooper, J.J. and Ablentosa, M. J. (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews, 14: 127-149.</p>

20	Layer Hens	Induced moulting
		I support the proposal to prohibit induced moulting of layer hens.
21	Llama and Alpaca	Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes, and packs
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
22	Llama and Alpaca	Companion animals
		I support the proposal that camelids must be provided with a companion animal. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
23	Llama and Alpaca	Offspring (Cria) camelid companions
		I support the proposal to prohibit raising Cria without the company of other camelids. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
24	Pigs	Dry sleeping area
		Proposal: I support the proposal that all pigs have access to a dry sleeping area. Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
25	Pigs	Lying space for grower pigs
		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal for minimum space requirements for grower pigs.</p> <p>1. Error in formula</p> <p>The proposed formula used to calculate the minimum space has a type error; specifically the exponent notation has not been applied. I believe the formula intended by MPI should read "live weight^{0.67} (kg)" but instead it reads "live weight 0.67(kg)" which translates to an Area = 0.03 * liveweight * 0.67(kg) and results in a much higher space requirement.</p> <p>Therefore I contend that proposal 25 must be rewritten and resubmitted for public consultation, with the correct formula included so that the intended space requirement can be properly considered.</p> <p>2. Minimum requirement</p> <p>Recent research suggests that a k-value of 0.3 is too low. In 2006, Gonyou et al. (2006) which ADFI is reduced. More recently, a 2015 study has found that a k-value of 0.0336 might underestimate the impact of increased stocking density on ADG and ADFI². A k-value of 0.3 is too low to provide grower pigs with this environment and is sufficient as a minimum requirement for static space only.</p> <p>Does the proposal adequately define the appropriate systems?</p> <p>The proposal is based on a minimum standard, which is expected to occur (if at all) only where growers have reached the capacity of their pen and are shortly to be moved to a bigger pen³ not a minimum standard which is considered acceptable at all times and this should be clarified in the regulation itself.</p> <p>I consider the minimum standards of housing for pigs to be provide "sufficient space to enable them to perform natural behaviours such as lying on their side without touching another pig, standing up, turning around and performing exercise, space for separate areas for dunging and feeding, with a dunging areas situated a sufficient distance from sleeping and feeding areas as well as materials to enable them to root and forage"⁴. If these standards cannot be met by the current farming systems then we are concerned that the current farming systems are not compatible with the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour and breach the animal welfare act.</p> <p>The current regulation has no limit on the length of time during which a grower pig may be submitted to the proposed minimum standard. Overstocking is a known problem. I am concerned that grower pigs may be submitted to spaces which do not meet minimum requirement if their transfer to a new pen is delayed. I would like the regulations to be</p>

		<p>clear that it is unacceptable for growers to be kept for prolonged periods in spaces at or close to the minimum requirement. In its 2010 review, NAWAC submitted that space enough to allow for pigs to lie fully recumbent (k-value of 0.047) was recommended best practice.</p> <p>For the sake of clarity and to give effect to the intention of NAWAC, I suggest that a minimum period of time for growers kept in the lower end of the scale be added.</p> <p>Due to the above considerations, I propose that the minimum standard is amended to:</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must have lying space of at least: Area (m²) per pig = 0.040 x live weight 0.67(kg)</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must not have lying space of less than: Area (m²) per pig = 0.047 x live weight 0.67(kg) for longer than one week.</p> <p>Penalty: I support penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p> <p>Gonyou, H. W., M. C. Brumm, E. Bush, J. Deen, S. A. Edwards, T. Fangman, J. J. McGlone, M. Meunier-Salaun, R. B. Morrison, H. Spoolder, P. L. Sundberg, and A. K. Johnson. 2006. Application of broken-line analysis to assess floor space requirements of nursery and grower-finisher pigs expressed on an allometric basis. J. Anim. Sci. 84: 229-235.</p> <p>Thomas, LL. "The Effects of Increasing Stocking Density on Finishing Pig Growth ..." 2015. http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=kaesrr</p> <p>ibid. Page 9</p> <p>"ANIMAL WELFARE (Pigs) CODE OF WELFARE 2010 REPORT." 2015. 15 May. 2016 <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/1446></p>
26	Pigs	Dry sow stalls
		<p>Proposal: I support the prohibition of dry sow stalls</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p>
27	Pigs	Size of farrowing crates
		<p>Proposal: I do not support the use of farrowing crates.</p> <p>Production systems using farrowing crates are not the only financially viable forms of pork production. It is widely accepted that sow welfare in farrowing crates is sub-optimal. Continuing a production system which is contrary to good practice and scientific knowledge is in direct violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.</p> <p>In 2016, a review of Farrowing Crates for Pigs in NZ was submitted by NAWAC. In that report, NAWAC stated that "no significant change in science, technology or good practice from 2010 when the pigs code of welfare was issued". It submitted that the levels of piglet mortality in farrowing pens is higher than in farrowing crates and used this as justification for retaining farrowing crates in New Zealand. However, there is abundant research which supports the conclusion that total piglet mortality on farms with loose farrowing systems does not differ from that of farms with crates²³.</p> <p>I submit that farrowing crates are unacceptable in modern day pork production systems and must be banned outright.</p> <p>"National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee - NZPork." 2016. 15 May. 2016 http://www.nzpork.co.nz/images/custom/farrowing-crate-advice-14-march-2016.pdf</p> <p>Weber, R. "Piglet mortality on farms using farrowing systems ... - IngentaConnect." 2007. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ufaw/aw/2007/00000016/00000002/art00042</p> <p>KilBride, AL. "A cohort study of preweaning piglet mortality and ... - ScienceDirect." 2012. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167587711003564</p>
28	Pigs	Provision of nesting material
		<p>Proposal: I support the provision of nesting material that can be manipulated to sows. However, it is clear that sows in farrowing crates will be unable to exhibit natural nesting behaviours in the confined space of a farrowing crate. To give effect to the intention of providing nesting material, the sow must be given more space in which to move.</p> <p>I agree that the definition of manipulable material should be made more apparent. "Material at ground level which mimics that of natural nesting material and encourages the sow to exhibit rooting behaviour" would be appropriate. However, for clarity, I recommend that examples are provided for guidance. Appropriate examples would include straw and sawdust.</p>

		<p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Chaloupková, H. "The effect of nesting material on the nest-building and maternal ... - NCBI." 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20889685</p>
29	Rodeos	Fireworks
		<p>I support the ban of fireworks at rodeo's, The loud noise of fireworks is well established as a stressor in companion animals (Bolster 2012; Dale et al., 2010) And Unexpected noise and movement will cause the fight or flight response in both horses and cattle (Lanier, 2000; Christensen, 2005).</p> <p>I would like to see a total ban on rodeo, rodeo is of no advantage to the economy. A petition recently submitted to parliament has 42,000 members of the public in support of such a ban. Rodeo is in breach of the animal welfare act which states that animals should be 'physically handled in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress.' The rodeo is a form of entertainment therefore making it an unnecessary activity for animals to be involved in. The likelihood of animals feeling distress while performing in rodeos could only be successfully minimised if rodeos were entirely stopped; goading animals into states of distress is fundamental to getting them to perform in rodeo events.</p> <p>As there have been many breaches of the rodeo code brought before MPI in 2014 and 2015 we strongly urge MPI to carefully consider if the codes are adequate in helping to minimise the likelihood of unreasonable and unnecessary pain or distress. We are aware of new breaches that will be brought before MPI for a third year running, this adds to the evidence that these codes are not adequate for protecting animals, therefore we feel that the only way to ensure these breaches do not continue is for an outright ban.</p>
30	Exotic animals	Used in circuses
		<p>I do not support the use of exotic animals in circuses and propose that their use be banned. Given that there are currently no circuses in NZ using exotic animals the banning of the practice now will cause no industry disruption. Popular opinion both here and overseas is moving away from the use of exotic animals in circus and if this practice was to occur again in NZ it is likely that there would be a public outcry against it.</p>
31	Cattle	Milk stimulation
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit the stimulation of milk let down by inserting water or air into a cow's vagina. I propose the prohibition is extended to include the insertion of any object into a cow's vagina to stimulate milk let down. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.</p>
32	Cattle and Sheep	Vehicular traction in calving or lambing
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit the use of a moving vehicle to provide traction in lambing or calving. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
33	Cattle and Sheep	Ingrown horns
		<p>I support the proposal to require treatment for horns that are touching the skin or eye. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
34	Stock transport	Cuts and abrasions
		<p>I support the proposal that transport should not result in cuts or abrasions. I propose the regulation is extended to all animals' not just cattle, sheep, deer, goats, and pigs. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
35	Stock transport	Animals with ingrown horns

		I support the proposal that animals with ingrown horns must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
36	Stock transport	Animals with bleeding horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with bleeding horns or antler must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
37	Stock transport	Animals with long horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with long horn or antler must not cause injury to themselves or others during transport. I could not find any rationale for the use of 110mm as a cut off value for long antler either in the code of welfare, or the report on the code. I propose that MPI publish the rationale behind the cut off value of 110mm or perform analysis of the injuries sustained from transport of animals with horns to determine if this measurement is an appropriate guide. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
38	Stock transport	Lame cattle, deer, pigs and goats
		I support the proposal that cattle, sheep, pigs and goats with lameness scores of 2 must be certified for transport by a veterinarian and that animals with a lameness score of 3 must not be transported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
39	Stock transport	Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury
		I support the proposal that animals who cannot bear weight evenly due to injury require certification from a veterinarian for transport. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
40	Stock transport	Pregnant animals
		I support the proposal that animals who are in late stages of pregnancy should not be transported. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
41	Stock transport	Animals with injured or diseased udders
		I support the proposal that animals who have diseased udders should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
42	Stock transport	Cattle or sheep with cancer eye
		I support the proposal that animals who have cancer eye which is large, not confined to the eyelid or discharging/bleeding should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
Young calf management regulatory proposals		
43	Young Calves	Loading and unloading facilities

		I support the proposal that facilities must be provided which enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. Given the potential for severe injury and pain I propose that the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
Proposed	Young Calves	Calves must not be thrown, if they need to be manually lifted they must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick calves).
		Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading ¹ , only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage ² , presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour. http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/
Proposed	Young Calves	Minimum training standard for people handling/loading calves
		I propose a minimum training standard is put in place for people loading calves on to transportation. Footage from 2015 clearly shows inappropriate handling of calves at the time of loading ¹ . A regulation for minimum training standards for those loading calves will not just improve calf welfare but will also demonstrate the transport industry's commitment to improving their part of the calf management chain. In contrast failure for the transport industry to demonstrate willingness to improve welfare outcomes for calves could reflect badly in the media. I propose infringement penalty is prosecution due to the lack of provision of appropriate training being a corporation level infringement and therefore an appropriate penalty needs to be significant enough to deter corporations from flouting the law. http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed
Proposed	Young Calves	Same day slaughter
		I propose that all young calves received at a slaughter premises must be slaughtered that day and cannot be held overnight. It has been recognised by MPI that time off feed is a significant welfare concern in young calves therefore reducing the time spent at a slaughter premises aims to reduce the risk of calves spending an extended period of time off feed. Although an alternative proposal could be for feeding at arrival at slaughter premises given the other welfare issues of housing young calves I consider reducing holding time to a minimum as the least bad of the options. I propose an infringement penalty set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.
Proposed	Young Calves	Use of nearest slaughterhouse
		Increased time spent at transport has been shown to be one of the determinants of poorer outcomes for calves ¹ . For this reason I propose that calves are required to be slaughtered at the closest slaughter premises. I propose the infringement penalty to be set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law. Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84
44	Young Calves	Shelter on farm, before and during transportation and at processing plants
		I support the proposal for minimum standards of shelter on farm, before transportation, and at slaughter premises. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.

45	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – age
		<p>I propose that the minimum age of transport is increased to 10 days to bring us in line with what is considered an acceptable standard of welfare in other developed countries. MPI have stated that the 4 day standard suggested in the proposed regulation has been suggested as this reflects current industry practice. However the transport code of welfare only cites research performed in calves 5-10 days of age; therefore I propose that the absolute minimum age of transport be set at 5 days of age. I support the most conservative determination of age – that it is determined from the time the calf is separated from the dam. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p>
46	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – Physical characteristics
		I support the proposal that the list of physical characteristics provided with regulation 46 should be met prior to transport of young calves. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
47	Young Calves	Maximum time off feed
		<p>I support the proposal for regulating the maximum time off feed for young calves, however we propose this is reduced to 12 hours. The lack of physiological indicators in the 2000 Todd paper does not demonstrate that this is in fact the case in calves <5 days of age or that these calves are not experiencing significant hunger or</p> <p>that these calves have the physiological capacity to respond to transport in a measurable way with the tools used in the study;</p> <p>I propose that calves undergoing transport are kept to the same feeding schedule they would have if they remained on farm. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p> <p>Knowles, T.G., Warriss, P.D., Brown, S.N., Edwards, J.E., Watkins, P.E. and Phillips, A.J. 1997. Effects on calves less than one month old of feeding or not feeding them during road transport of up to 24 hours. Veterinary Record 140, 116-124.</p>
48	Young Calves	Duration of transport
		<p>I support limiting the duration of transport of young calves to 8 hours or less. As length of transport has been shown to be associated with poorer outcomes for calves, we propose an increase in the infringement penalty to \$1000.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
49	Young Calves	Blunt force trauma
		I support the prohibition of the use of blunt force trauma for killing calves. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to receive appropriate penalties to deter this behaviour.
50	Young Calves	Transport by sea across Cook Strait prohibited
		I support the prohibition of transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to be held accountable.

Surgical and painful procedures regulatory proposals		
51	All animals	Hot branding
		I support the prohibition of hot branding and the penalty of prosecution.
52	All animals	Embryo collection via exteriorised uterus (surgical embryo transfer)
		I do not support the collection of embryos via exteriorised uterus and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
53	All animals	Laparoscopic artificial insemination (laparoscopic AI)
		I do not support the use of laparoscopic AI and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
54	All animals	Liver biopsy
		I support the proposal for liver biopsy to be restricted to being performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students and the requirement for the use of pain relief. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
55	All animals	Dental work
		I support the proposal that any power tool used for dental work must be designed for the purpose of dentistry. I propose the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
56	Cats	Declawing
		I support the restriction of cat declawing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
57	Companion animals	Desexing (including stray/feral cats, dogs and other species)
		I support the restriction of desexing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence. I propose that all cats and dogs sold in pet shops be desexed and vaccinated before being released to the purchaser. This would work as a preventative step in helping reduce the number of stray/feral cats and dogs over time.
58	Dogs	Freeze branding

		I propose that freeze branding of dogs is banned. With better technology now available we can microchip dogs rather than freeze branding them. In the case that freeze branding is not prohibited I support the restriction of freeze branding to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
59	Dogs	Dog debarking (and devoicing of other species)
		I support the restriction of dog debarking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
60	Dogs	Cropping the ears
		I support the proposal to prohibit ear cropping of dogs. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
61	Dogs	Dew claws
		I support the restriction of removal of articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose restriction of removal of non-articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution.
62	Dogs	Tail docking
		I support the docking of tails in dogs for therapeutic reasons only. The procedure must be performed by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Pain relief must be used at the time of this procedure.
63	Cattle	Teats
		<p>I support the proposal for supernumerary teat removal of animals >6 weeks of age to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the removal of supernumerary teats in animals <6 weeks of age without pain relief, however the procedure could be undertaken by a skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie a vet tech). I propose that:</p> <p>the maximum of age of animals on whom supernumerary teat removal can be performed by a lay person is reduced to 4 weeks of age</p> <p>i) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>pain relief is required for any supernumerary teat removal procedure regardless of age</p> <p>ii) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>procedure is performed using sterilised equipment</p> <p>iii) infringement penalty of \$500</p> <p>any person performing the procedure who is not a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student is signed off by a veterinarian</p> <p>iv) infringement penalty of prosecution</p>
64	Cattle	Claw removal
		I support the proposal that claw removal is restricted to being performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief is required at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) pain relief is also administered. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
65	Cattle	Teat occlusion

		I support the proposal that teat sealing can only be performed with a product registered for that specific purpose. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution.
66	Cattle	Tail docking
		I support the restriction of tail docking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons only, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
67	Cattle and sheep	Castration and shortening of the scrotum (cryptorchid)
		I support the proposal for surgical castration at any age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I support the proposal that non-surgical castration in cattle and sheep over 6 months of age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the age of 6 months as an appropriate age at which lay people can no longer perform non-surgical castration and propose that this age limit is lowered to 2 months, I support limiting the manner of non-surgical castration to only the use of conventional rubber rings. I does not support performing non-surgical castration without pain relief at any age and propose that pain relief is required for any castration procedure at any age. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also required. I propose that the penalty for all infringements other than lack of NSAID use is prosecution and that the penalty for not using an NSAID is an infringement of \$300.
68	Cattle, sheep and goats	Disbudding
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian, veterinary student under direct supervision, or skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie vet tech/appropriately trained farm worker). I propose that appropriate maximum ages are determined for disbudding to be performed by a lay person. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
69	Cattle, sheep and goats	Dehorning
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision. Given the much greater risk of pain, bleeding, and infection from dehorning rather than disbudding I propose that farmers are given 12 months warning after which dehorning can only be performed by veterinarians. This will give a strong message that disbudding is much preferred and much more economically viable. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
70	Sheep	Tail docking
		I support the limiting of tail docking in sheep who are greater than 6 months of age to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support restricting the techniques for tail docking in younger animals to rubber ring and hot iron only. I propose that pain relief at the time of procedure and NSAID should also be required, regardless of age at the time of tail docking. Furthermore I propose that the maximum age at which a lay person is able to perform a tail docking procedure is reduced to 2 months.

		<p>I support the proposal that tails are not to be cut flush and are to be able to cover the vulva in a female and of a similar length in a male.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for infringements in sheep > 2 months of age and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalties of \$500 for use of non-listed methods and not cutting tails flush in sheep < 2 months of age. I propose a penalty of prosecution for not using pain relief in sheep <2 months of age and a penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p>
71	Sheep	Mulesing
		I support the proposal to prohibit mulesing. I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
72	Deer	Develveting
		I support the proposal for develveting to be only performed by veterinarians, directly supervised veterinary students or a person with veterinary approval. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
73	Horses	Blistering, firing, or nicking
		I support the proposal to prohibit blistering, firing or nicking, and support the proposed infringement penalty.
74	Horses	Tail docking
		I support the proposal for tail docking to only be performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students, only for therapeutic reasons, only with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
75	Horses	Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal pregnancy diagnosis in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
76	Horses	Rectal examination of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal examination in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
77	Horses	Caslick's procedure
		<p>I support the proposal for creation, opening and repair of caslick's procedure to only be performed by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and the use of pain relief for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p> <p>I propose that a caslick's procedure may only be performed for therapeutic purposes and not for a perceived performance benefit and that the proposed infringement penalty for this breach is the same as that proposed above.</p>
78	Horses	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
79	Llama and alpaca	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in llama and alpaca to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure, and the minimum age for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalties for these infringements.

80	Pigs	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration to only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision and the required use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution. I propose that a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) is also required and that the penalty for not administering an NSAID is \$300.
81	Pigs	Tail docking
		I propose that pain relief should be used for this procedure regardless of the animal's age. I support limiting the procedure to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students in animals > 7 days of age. I propose that a NSAID should also be administered at the time of the procedure. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and for a lay person performing the procedure in an animal > 7 days of age. I propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID administration.
82	Birds	Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird
		I support the restriction of pinioning/deflighting a bird to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only being performed in the best interests of the animal, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
83	Poultry	Dubbing
		I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence to perform dubbing on breeds not usually dubbed and to not use pain relief at the time of the procedure. I oppose the surgical modification of an animal if the modification is not in the interests of the animal, therefore I propose that dubbing is prohibited with the penalty of a prosecutable offence.
84	Ostriches and emus	Declawing
		I support the prohibition of radical declawing of emu chicks. However the use of the term radical implies that some declawing is allowed and opens the regulation to subjective interpretation. I propose that the regulation prohibit all declawing of emu or ostrich unless performed by a vet for therapeutic reasons. I support the penalty of prosecutable offence.
85	Roosters	Caponising (rooster castration)
		I support the restriction of caponising to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

Submitted by:

Deirdre Sims

s 9(2)(a)

MPI Animal Welfare Codes Submission

Nathan Guy

Minister for Primary Industries

In response to MPI's request for feedback on proposed animal welfare regulations I submit the following for your careful consideration.

The given consultation period (14th April to 10 May 2016) for public involvement is woefully inadequate. Five weeks is unrealistic and makes a mockery of the consultation process. The volume of proposals we are being asked to consider in this time frame isn't feasible and I ask that a more realistic time frame be given for the public to have our say.

I suggest a period of five weeks be given to each section of the proposed welfare regulations.

While the proposed regulations relating to live animal exports, the care and conduct towards animals, and surgical and painful procedures is a start, I ask that there be a full review into intensive farming practices across the agricultural industry.

The last two decades have seen the intensification of animal agriculture to levels that are unprecedented in recent history¹. The current welfare codes and proposed welfare regulations don't go nearly far enough in protecting animal welfare under increasingly intensive farming practices.

Society's moral values are constantly shifting yet these regulations have remained largely static and are vastly out of step with changing attitudes to animal welfare². I want to see a total ban on all cages for layer hens, farrowing crates for sows and a reduction in intensive dairy resulting in the slaughter of over 2m calves annually.

These farming practices can no longer be deemed humane by today's standards and cannot be incorporated as such in any welfare code. The new rules are not keeping pace with changing scientific knowledge and cannot be accepted as good practice.

1) From 5.3m dairy cows in 2007 to 6.4m in 2012 (23% increase in just 5 years) Statistics NZ

2) Switzerland banned cages for hens in 1992

Care and conduct regulatory proposals		
1	All animals	Electric prodders
		<p>I propose that the use of electric prodders be banned under all circumstances except when they are "necessary for protection, preservation or maintenance of human life"</p> <p>I do not support exemptions on the use of prodders based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the species and size of an animal b. the manner of use of an animal (circus) c. the location of the animal (slaughter premises) <p>I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p>
2	All animals	Use of goads
		<p>I support the proposal to ban the use of goads on sensitive areas of an animal's body under any circumstances. Given the deliberate cruelty involved in using goads on sensitive areas I propose an increased infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
3	All animals	Twisting an animal's tail
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit painful twisting of an animal's tail. Given the potential for significant pain and damage from this behaviour, and the deliberate nature of the act I propose the infringement penalty is set at the higher level of \$500.</p>
Proposed	All animals	Any animal requiring manual lifting must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick animals).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed 2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/
4	Dogs	Pinch and Prong collars
		<p>I support the prohibition of pinch and prong collars under any circumstances; no exemption for dogs used for special purposes (guarding, military) is supported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300. I also support the banning of the sale of these collars and associated penalties under the law.</p>
5	Dogs	Injuries from collars or tethers

		I support the proposal to only use collars or tethers in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. Given the potential for severe injury from collars I propose the penalty is increased to a prosecutable offence.
6	Dogs	Muzzling a dog
		I support the proposal for regulating the use of muzzles so they do not cause injury or distress. I support the inclusion in the proposal that muzzles should allow for a dog to be able to drink. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
7	Dogs	Dry and shaded shelter
		I support the proposal for dogs to have access to dry and shaded shelter at all times. I propose the inclusion in the proposal that dogs also have access to fresh, palatable drinking water at all times. Given that shelter and water are basic needs of life neglecting these items has the potential to cause significant harm and even death therefore I propose the infringement penalty to be increased to a prosecutable offence. I also propose that there be a maximum time imposed that a dog is allowed to be chained for at any one time and that an infringement fee be set for exceeding that time.
8	Dogs	Dogs left in vehicles
		I support the proposal for people leaving dogs in vehicles to ensure their safety. I propose increasing the penalty to a prosecutable offence both to reflect the potential fatal nature of the injury and also to act as a suitable penalty to prevent this behaviour. Additionally increasing the penalty allows for effective prosecution of corporations who use dogs who have a responsibility to ensure dogs in their care are cared for appropriately.
9	Dogs	Secured on moving vehicles
		I support the proposal to secure dogs on moving vehicles. I propose including dogs on vehicles on private property in the regulation, and propose a speed limit of 40kph for vehicles carrying unsecured working dogs. I propose increasing the penalty for infringement to \$1000 due to the potential for severe injury, suffering, and death resulting from falling from a moving vehicle.
Proposed	Dogs	Ban export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Macau or China
		The Macau and China greyhound racing industries do not have the same standards of animal welfare as NZ. The export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Hong Kong (for further transport to Macau/China) is minimal at present. However if the export of greyhounds from other countries (Australia, Ireland) is banned or more heavily regulated then NZ could become a transport hub for dogs in this industry. This has the potential for poor welfare outcomes for dogs and very poor public perception in New Zealand. It is far better to ban an activity like this before it has the potential to become established. MPI have demonstrated their willingness to put in place infringements for uncommon industry activities which have the potential to become welfare issues in the future with proposal 50 in this document banning transport of young calves across cook strait. I propose the above regulation and propose the infringement penalty is set at a prosecutable offence.
10	Dogs and Cats	Drowning dogs and cats
		I support the prohibition of the killing of a dog or cat of any age by drowning. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
11	Eels	Insensible for desliming
		I support the proposal that eels must be insensible for desliming or killed before they are deslimed. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
12	Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish	Insensible before being killed

		<p>I support the proposal that crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish must be insensible before they are killed. I dispute the NAWAC statement that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible and propose that either:</p> <p>a. the only legally acceptable method of rendering crabs and crayfish insensible is by electrical stunning (for which specific equipment is available for use in small restaurant premises). OR</p> <p>b. NAWAC conduct a review of the recent (since 2000) scientific literature on humane slaughter of crustaceans and present good quality, recent evidence to support the claim that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for failing to render a crustacean insensible prior to slaughter.</p>
13	Goats	Tethering requirements
		<p>I do not support the tethering of goats, on the basis that it stops goats expressing normal social behaviours, and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$500. Furthermore I share concerns with previous submissions around tethering of goats that tourists witnessing tethered goats on the road side could easily get a negative impression of animal welfare in NZ.</p> <p>I propose that all goats, regardless of housing system, have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$500.</p> <p>I also propose that as goats are social animals, all goats should be provided with a companion such as another goat, camelid, horse, donkey or sheep. I propose that failure to house a goat with a companion should attract an infringement penalty of \$300.</p> <p>1. Miranda-de la Lama, G.C. and Mattiello, S. (2010). The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming. Small Ruminant Research 90, (1-3), 1-10</p>
14	Horses	Use of a whip, lead, or any other object
		<p>I support the prohibition of using a whip, lead or other object to strike around the head. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.</p>
15	Horses	Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles
		<p>I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.</p>
16	Horses and Donkeys	Tethering requirements
		<p>I do not support the tethering of horses and donkeys and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$300. I propose that all horses and donkeys have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times regardless of housing system and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$300.</p>
17	Layer Hens	Opportunity to express normal behaviours in housing systems
		<p>I believe that colony cages do not adequately consider the welfare of layer hens because they prohibit the ability of the hen to express a range of normal behaviours. In addition, colony cages are not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 as they do not allow owners or persons in charge of animals to take all reasonable steps to ensure that their physical, health and behavioural needs are met.</p> <p>1) Sections 9, 68 Animal Welfare Act 1999</p>
18	Layer Hens	Stocking densities
		<p>Colony cages do not allow hens to engage in a range of normal behaviours and therefore they are in clear breach of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. With a stocking density of 13 hens per square metre or 750 square centimetres, clearly the stocking density is too high.</p>
19	Layer Hens	Housing and equipment design

		<p>Colony cages are only slightly bigger than traditional battery cages. While they provide token welfare gestures like nest boxes, scratch pads and perches, these gestures do not ensure the physical, health and behavioural needs of hens are met. With only 750 sq cm per hen, there are a number of behaviours hens are not able to functionally perform in colony cages; this includes spreading her wings fully¹. It's also questionable whether a hen in a colony cage can properly nest, perch, peck or scratch. A hen in a colony cage cannot dust bathe.</p> <p>Research has shown that some hens in colony cages can be prevented from using the nest provided due to competition from other hens². Also, the limited space in colony cages is insufficient to allow hens sufficient time (on average 45 minutes³) if they want to lay at the same time.</p> <p>In order to satisfy a hen's need for perching, the housing system must be able to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient length of perching space to allow all birds to perch at the same time; and • Sufficient elevation of the perches to satisfy the hens' requirements for a perceived safe perching place at night. <p>Colony cages fulfil neither of these requirements. The standard of approximately 15cm of space per hen is an average and does not allow consideration for larger birds. Perches in colony systems are situated on average just a few centimetres from the floor of the cage. <i>'A perch positioned 5cm above floor level is 'not considered as a perch (by a hen) and has no attractive or repulsive value'.</i></p> <p>Litter is not provided in colony cage systems. Litter is imperative for hen welfare. Hens will make great efforts to access litter for pecking, scratching and dustbathing – three normal behaviours of hens⁴. When hens are unable to forage in litter, they can redirect their pecking towards other hens resulting in harmful feather pecking and even cannibalism. When hens are unable to dustbathe in litter, they can develop the dysfunctional behaviour of sham dustbathing.</p> <p>1) A hen's wingspan is approximately 75-80 centimetres which is twice the size of a traditional battery cage 2) Guedson, V. and Faure, J. M. (2004) <i>Laying performance and egg quality in hens kept in standard or furnished cages</i>. Animal Research, 53: 45-57. 3) Appleby, M.C. (1998) Modification of laying hen cages to improve behaviour. Poultry Science, 77: 1828-1832. 4) Cooper, J.J. and Ablettosa, M. J. (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews, 14: 127-149.</p>
20	Layer Hens	Induced moulting
		I support the proposal to prohibit induced moulting of layer hens.
21	Llama and Alpaca	Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes, and packs
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
22	Llama and Alpaca	Companion animals
		I support the proposal that camelids must be provided with a companion animal. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
23	Llama and Alpaca	Offspring (Cria) camelid companions
		I support the proposal to prohibit raising Cria without the company of other camelids. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
24	Pigs	Dry sleeping area
		Proposal: I support the proposal that all pigs have access to a dry sleeping area.

		Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
25	Pigs	Lying space for grower pigs
		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal for minimum space requirements for grower pigs.</p> <p>1. Error in formula</p> <p>The proposed formula used to calculate the minimum space has a type error; specifically the exponent notation has not been applied. I believe the formula intended by MPI should read "live weight^{0.67} (kg)" but instead it reads "live weight 0.67(kg)" which translates to an Area = 0.03 * liveweight * 0.67(kg) and results in a much higher space requirement.</p> <p>Therefore I contend that proposal 25 must be rewritten and resubmitted for public consultation, with the correct formula included so that the intended space requirement can be properly considered.</p> <p>2. Minimum requirement</p> <p>Recent research suggests that a k-value of 0.3 is too low. In 2006, Gonyou et al. (2006) which ADFI is reduced. More recently, a 2015 study has found that a k-value of 0.0336 might underestimate the impact of increased stocking density on ADG and ADFI². A k-value of 0.3 is too low to provide grower pigs with this environment and is sufficient as a minimum requirement for static space only.</p> <p>Does the proposal adequately define the appropriate systems?</p> <p>The proposal is based on a minimum standard, which is expected to occur (if at all) only where growers have reached the capacity of their pen and are shortly to be moved to a bigger pen; not a minimum standard which is considered acceptable at all times and this should be clarified in the regulation itself.</p> <p>I consider the minimum standards of housing for pigs to be provide "sufficient space to enable them to perform natural behaviours such as lying on their side without touching another pig, standing up, turning around and performing exercise, space for separate areas for dunging and feeding, with a dunging areas situated a sufficient distance from sleeping and feeding areas as well as materials to enable them to root and forage" ⁴. If these standards cannot be met by the current farming systems then we are concerned that the current farming systems are not compatible with the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour and breach the animal welfare act.</p> <p>The current regulation has no limit on the length of time during which a grower pig may be submitted to the proposed minimum standard. Overstocking is a known problem. I am concerned that grower pigs may be submitted to spaces which do not meet minimum requirement if their transfer to a new pen is delayed. I would like the regulations to be clear that it is unacceptable for growers to be kept for prolonged periods in spaces at or close to the minimum requirement. In its 2010 review, NAWAC submitted that space enough to allow for pigs to lie fully recumbent (k-value of 0.047) was recommended best practice.</p> <p>For the sake of clarity and to give effect to the intention of NAWAC, I suggest that a minimum period of time for growers kept in the lower end of the scale be added.</p> <p>Due to the above considerations, I propose that the minimum standard is amended to:</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must have lying space of at least: Area (m²) per pig = 0.040 x live weight 0.67(kg)</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must not have lying space of less than: Area (m²) per pig = 0.047 x live weight 0.67(kg) for longer than one week.</p> <p>Penalty: I support penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p> <p>Gonyou, H. W., M. C. Brumm, E. Bush, J. Deen, S. A. Edwards, T. Fangman, J. J. McGlone, M. Meunier-Salaun, R. B. Morrison, H. Spooler, P. L. Sundberg, and A. K. Johnson. 2006. Application of broken-line analysis to assess floor space requirements of nursery and grower-finisher pigs expressed on an allometric basis. J. Anim. Sci. 84: 229-235.</p> <p>Thomas, LL. "The Effects of Increasing Stocking Density on Finishing Pig Growth ..." 2015. http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=kaesrr</p> <p>ibid. Page 9</p> <p>"ANIMAL WELFARE (Pigs) CODE OF WELFARE 2010 REPORT." 2015. 15 May. 2016 <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/1446></p>
26	Pigs	Dry sow stalls

		<p>Proposal: I support the prohibition of dry sow stalls</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p>
27	Pigs	<p>Size of farrowing crates</p> <p>Proposal: I do not support the use of farrowing crates. Production systems using farrowing crates are not the only financially viable forms of pork production. It is widely accepted that sow welfare in farrowing crates is sub-optimal. Continuing a production system which is contrary to good practice and scientific knowledge is in direct violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. In 2016, a review of Farrowing Crates for Pigs in NZ was submitted by NAWAC¹. In that report, NAWAC stated that "no significant change in science, technology or good practice from 2010 when the pigs code of welfare was issued". It submitted that the levels of piglet mortality in farrowing pens is higher than in farrowing crates and used this as justification for retaining farrowing crates in New Zealand. However, there is abundant research which supports the conclusion that total piglet mortality on farms with loose farrowing systems does not differ from that of farms with crates^{2,3}. I submit that farrowing crates are unacceptable in modern day pork production systems and must be banned outright.</p> <p>"National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee - NZPork." 2016. 15 May. 2016 http://www.nzpork.co.nz/images/custom/farrowing-crate-advice-14-march-2016.pdf Weber, R. "Piglet mortality on farms using farrowing systems ... - IngentaConnect." 2007. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ufaw/aw/2007/00000016/00000002/art00042 KilBride, AL. "A cohort study of preweaning piglet mortality and ... - ScienceDirect." 2012. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167587711003564</p>
28	Pigs	<p>Provision of nesting material</p> <p>Proposal: I support the provision of nesting material that can be manipulated to sows. However, it is clear that sows in farrowing crates will be unable to exhibit natural nesting behaviours in the confined space of a farrowing crate. To give effect to the intention of providing nesting material, the sow must be given more space in which to move. I agree that the definition of manipulable material should be made more apparent. "Material at ground level which mimics that of natural nesting material and encourages the sow to exhibit rooting behaviour" would be appropriate. However, for clarity, I recommend that examples are provided for guidance. Appropriate examples would include straw and sawdust.</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Chaloupková, H. "The effect of nesting material on the nest-building and maternal ... - NCBI." 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20889685</p>
29	Rodeos	<p>Fireworks</p> <p>I support the ban of fireworks at rodeo's, The loud noise of fireworks is well established as a stressor in companion animals (Bolster 2012; Dale et al., 2010) And Unexpected noise and movement will cause the fight or flight response in both horses and cattle (Lanier, 2000; Christensen, 2005).</p> <p>I would like to see a total ban on rodeo, rodeo is of no advantage to the economy. A petition recently submitted to parliament has 42,000 members of the public in support of such a ban. Rodeo is in breach of the animal welfare act which states that animals should be 'physically handled in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress.' The rodeo is a form of entertainment therefore making it an unnecessary activity for animals to be involved in. The likelihood of animals feeling distress while performing in rodeos could only be successfully minimised if rodeos were entirely stopped; goading animals into states of distress is fundamental to getting them to perform in rodeo events.</p> <p>As there have been many breaches of the rodeo code brought before MPI in 2014 and 2015 we strongly urge MPI to carefully consider if the codes are adequate in helping to minimise the likelihood of unreasonable and unnecessary pain or distress. We are aware of new breaches that will be brought before MPI for a third year running, this adds to the evidence that these codes are not adequate for protecting animals, therefore we feel that the only way to ensure these breaches do not continue is for an outright ban.</p>

30	Exotic animals	Used in circuses
		I do not support the use of exotic animals in circuses and propose that their use be banned. Given that there are currently no circuses in NZ using exotic animals the banning of the practice now will cause no industry disruption. Popular opinion both here and overseas is moving away from the use of exotic animals in circus and if this practice was to occur again in NZ it is likely that there would be a public outcry against it.
31	Cattle	Milk stimulation
		I support the proposal to prohibit the stimulation of milk let down by inserting water or air into a cow's vagina. I propose the prohibition is extended to include the insertion of any object into a cow's vagina to stimulate milk let down. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
32	Cattle and Sheep	Vehicular traction in calving or lambing
		I support the proposal to prohibit the use of a moving vehicle to provide traction in lambing or calving. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
33	Cattle and Sheep	Ingrown horns
		I support the proposal to require treatment for horns that are touching the skin or eye. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
34	Stock transport	Cuts and abrasions
		I support the proposal that transport should not result in cuts or abrasions. I propose the regulation is extended to all animals' not just cattle, sheep, deer, goats, and pigs. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
35	Stock transport	Animals with ingrown horns
		I support the proposal that animals with ingrown horns must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
36	Stock transport	Animals with bleeding horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with bleeding horns or antler must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
37	Stock transport	Animals with long horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with long horn or antler must not cause injury to themselves or others during transport. I could not find any rationale for the use of 110mm as a cut off value for long antler either in the code of welfare, or the report on the code. I propose that MPI publish the rationale behind the cut off value of 110mm or perform analysis of the injuries sustained from transport of animals with horns to determine if this measurement is an appropriate guide. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
38	Stock transport	Lame cattle, deer, pigs and goats

		I support the proposal that cattle, sheep, pigs and goats with lameness scores of 2 must be certified for transport by a veterinarian and that animals with a lameness score of 3 must not be transported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
39	Stock transport	Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury
		I support the proposal that animals who cannot bear weight evenly due to injury require certification from a veterinarian for transport. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
40	Stock transport	Pregnant animals
		I support the proposal that animals who are in late stages of pregnancy should not be transported. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
41	Stock transport	Animals with injured or diseased udders
		I support the proposal that animals who have diseased udders should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
42	Stock transport	Cattle or sheep with cancer eye
		I support the proposal that animals who have cancer eye which is large, not confined to the eyelid or discharging/bleeding should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
Young calf management regulatory proposals		
43	Young Calves	Loading and unloading facilities
		I support the proposal that facilities must be provided which enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. Given the potential for severe injury and pain I propose that the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
Proposed	Young Calves	Calves must not be thrown, if they need to be manually lifted they must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick calves).
		Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading ¹ , only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage ² , presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour. http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/
Proposed	Young Calves	Minimum training standard for people handling/loading calves

		<p>I propose a minimum training standard is put in place for people loading calves on to transportation. Footage from 2015 clearly shows inappropriate handling of calves at the time of loading¹. A regulation for minimum training standards for those loading calves will not just improve calf welfare but will also demonstrate the transport industry's commitment to improving their part of the calf management chain. In contrast failure for the transport industry to demonstrate willingness to improve welfare outcomes for calves could reflect badly in the media. I propose infringement penalty is prosecution due to the lack of provision of appropriate training being a corporation level infringement and therefore an appropriate penalty needs to be significant enough to deter corporations from flouting the law.</p> <p>http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Same day slaughter
		<p>I propose that all young calves received at a slaughter premises must be slaughtered that day and cannot be held overnight. It has been recognised by MPI that time off feed is a significant welfare concern in young calves therefore reducing the time spent at a slaughter premises aims to reduce the risk of calves spending an extended period of time off feed. Although an alternative proposal could be for feeding at arrival at slaughter premises given the other welfare issues of housing young calves I consider reducing holding time to a minimum as the least bad of the options. I propose an infringement penalty set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Use of nearest slaughterhouse
		<p>Increased time spent at transport has been shown to be one of the determinants of poorer outcomes for calves¹. For this reason I propose that calves are required to be slaughtered at the closest slaughter premises. I propose the infringement penalty to be set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
44	Young Calves	Shelter on farm, before and during transportation and at processing plants
		<p>I support the proposal for minimum standards of shelter on farm, before transportation, and at slaughter premises. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p>
45	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – age
		<p>I propose that the minimum age of transport is increased to 10 days to bring us in line with what is considered an acceptable standard of welfare in other developed countries. MPI have stated that the 4 day standard suggested in the proposed regulation has been suggested as this reflects current industry practice. However the transport code of welfare only cites research performed in calves 5-10 days of age¹ therefore I propose that the absolute minimum age of transport be set at 5 days of age. I support the most conservative determination of age – that it is determined from the time the calf is separated from the dam. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p>
46	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – Physical characteristics
		<p>I support the proposal that the list of physical characteristics provided with regulation 46 should be met prior to transport of young calves. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p>

47	Young Calves	Maximum time off feed
		<p>I support the proposal for regulating the maximum time off feed for young calves, however we propose this is reduced to 12 hours. The lack of physiological indicators in the 2000 Todd paper does not demonstrate that:</p> <p>this is in fact the case in calves <5 days of age or</p> <p>that these calves are not experiencing significant hunger or</p> <p>that these calves have the physiological capacity to respond to transport in a measurable way with the tools used in the study²</p> <p>I propose that calves undergoing transport are kept to the same feeding schedule they would have if they remained on farm. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p> <p>Knowles, T.G., Warriss, P.D., Brown, S.N., Edwards, J.E., Watkins, P.E. and Phillips, A.J. 1997. Effects on calves less than one month old of feeding or not feeding them during road transport of up to 24 hours. Veterinary Record 140, 116-124.</p>
48	Young Calves	Duration of transport
		<p>I support limiting the duration of transport of young calves to 8 hours or less. As length of transport has been shown to be associated with poorer outcomes for calves we propose an increase in the infringement penalty to \$1000.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
49	Young Calves	Blunt force trauma
		<p>I support the prohibition of the use of blunt force trauma for killing calves. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to receive appropriate penalties to deter this behaviour.</p>
50	Young Calves	Transport by sea across Cook Strait prohibited
		<p>I support the prohibition of transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to be held accountable.</p>
Surgical and painful procedures regulatory proposals		
51	All animals	Hot branding
		<p>I support the prohibition of hot branding and the penalty of prosecution.</p>
52	All animals	Embryo collection via exteriorised uterus (surgical embryo transfer)
		<p>I do not support the collection of embryos via exteriorised uterus and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).</p>
53	All animals	Laparoscopic artificial insemination (laparoscopic AI)
		<p>I do not support the use of laparoscopic AI and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians</p>

		and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
54	All animals	Liver biopsy
		I support the proposal for liver biopsy to be restricted to being performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students and the requirement for the use of pain relief. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
55	All animals	Dental work
		I support the proposal that any power tool used for dental work must be designed for the purpose of dentistry. I propose the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
56	Cats	Declawing
		I support the restriction of cat declawing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
57	Companion animals	Desexing (including stray/feral cats, dogs and other species)
		I support the restriction of desexing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence. I propose that all cats and dogs sold in pet shops be desexed and vaccinated before being released to the purchaser. This would work as a preventative step in helping reduce the number of stray/feral cats and dogs over time.
58	Dogs	Freeze branding
		I propose that freeze branding of dogs is banned. With better technology now available we can microchip dogs rather than freeze branding them. In the case that freeze branding is not prohibited I support the restriction of freeze branding to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
59	Dogs	Dog debarking (and devoicing of other species)
		I support the restriction of dog debarking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
60	Dogs	Cropping the ears
		I support the proposal to prohibit ear cropping of dogs. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
61	Dogs	Dew claws

		I support the restriction of removal of articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose restriction of removal of non-articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution.
62	Dogs	Tail docking
		I support the docking of tails in dogs for therapeutic reasons only. The procedure must be performed by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Pain relief must be used at the time of this procedure.
63	Cattle	Teats
		<p>I support the proposal for supernumerary teat removal of animals >6 weeks of age to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the removal of supernumerary teats in animals <6 weeks of age without pain relief, however the procedure could be undertaken by a skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie a vet tech). I propose that:</p> <p>the maximum of age of animals on whom supernumerary teat removal can be performed by a lay person is reduced to 4 weeks of age</p> <p>i) infringement penalty of prosecution pain relief is required for any supernumerary teat removal procedure regardless of age</p> <p>ii) infringement penalty of prosecution procedure is performed using sterilised equipment</p> <p>iii) infringement penalty of \$500 any person performing the procedure who is not a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student is signed off by a veterinarian</p> <p>iv) infringement penalty of prosecution</p>
64	Cattle	Claw removal
		I support the proposal that claw removal is restricted to being performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief is required at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) pain relief is also administered. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
65	Cattle	Teat occlusion
		I support the proposal that teat sealing can only be performed with a product registered for that specific purpose. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution.
66	Cattle	Tail docking
		I support the restriction of tail docking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons only, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
67	Cattle and sheep	Castration and shortening of the scrotum (cryptorchid)
		I support the proposal for surgical castration at any age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I support the proposal that non-surgical castration in cattle and sheep over 6 months of age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the age of 6 months as an appropriate age at which lay people can no longer perform non-surgical castration and propose that this age limit is lowered to 2 months, I support limiting the manner of non-surgical castration to only the use of conventional rubber rings. I does not support performing non-surgical castration

		without pain relief at any age and propose that pain relief is required for any castration procedure at any age. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also required. I propose that the penalty for all infringements other than lack of NSAID use is prosecution and that the penalty for not using an NSAID is an infringement of \$300.
68	Cattle, sheep and goats	Disbudding
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian, veterinary student under direct supervision, or skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie vet tech/appropriately trained farm worker). I propose that appropriate maximum ages are determined for disbudding to be performed by a lay person. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
69	Cattle, sheep and goats	Dehorning
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision. Given the much greater risk of pain, bleeding, and infection from dehorning rather than disbudding I propose that farmers are given 12 months warning after which dehorning can only be performed by veterinarians. This will give a strong message that disbudding is much preferred and much more economically viable. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
70	Sheep	Tail docking
		I support the limiting of tail docking in sheep who are greater than 6 months of age to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support restricting the techniques for tail docking in younger animals to rubber ring and hot iron only. I propose that pain relief at the time of procedure and NSAID should also be required, regardless of age at the time of tail docking. Furthermore I propose that the maximum age at which a lay person is able to perform a tail docking procedure is reduced to 2 months. I support the proposal that tails are not to be cut flush and are to be able to cover the vulva in a female and of a similar length in a male. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for infringements in sheep > 2 months of age and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use. I support the proposed penalties of \$500 for use of non-listed methods and not cutting tails flush in sheep < 2 months of age. I propose a penalty of prosecution for not using pain relief in sheep <2 months of age and a penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
71	Sheep	Mulesing
		I support the proposal to prohibit mulesing. I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
72	Deer	Develveting
		I support the proposal for develveting to be only performed by veterinarians, directly supervised veterinary students or a person with veterinary approval. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
73	Horses	Blistering, firing, or nicking
		I support the proposal to prohibit blistering, firing or nicking, and support the proposed infringement penalty.

74	Horses	Tail docking
		I support the proposal for tail docking to only be performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students, only for therapeutic reasons, only with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
75	Horses	Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal pregnancy diagnosis in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
76	Horses	Rectal examination of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal examination in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
77	Horses	Caslick's procedure
		I support the proposal for creation, opening and repair of caslick's procedure to only be performed by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and the use of pain relief for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty. I propose that a caslick's procedure may only be performed for therapeutic purposes and not for a perceived performance benefit and that the proposed infringement penalty for this breach is the same as that proposed above.
78	Horses	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
79	Llama and alpaca	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in llama and alpaca to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure, and the minimum age for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalties for these infringements.
80	Pigs	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration to only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision and the required use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution. I propose that a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) is also required and that the penalty for not administering an NSAID is \$300.
81	Pigs	Tail docking
		I propose that pain relief should be used for this procedure regardless of the animal's age. I support limiting the procedure to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students in animals > 7 days of age. I propose that a NSAID should also be administered at the time of the procedure. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and for a lay person performing the procedure in an animal > 7 days of age. I propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID administration.
82	Birds	Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird
		I support the restriction of pinioning/deflighting a bird to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only being performed in the best interests of the animal, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

83	Poultry	Dubbing
		I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence to perform dubbing on breeds not usually dubbed and to not use pain relief at the time of the procedure. I oppose the surgical modification of an animal if the modification is not in the interests of the animal, therefore I propose that dubbing is prohibited with the penalty of a prosecutable offence.
84	Ostriches and emus	Declawing
		I support the prohibition of radical declawing of emu chicks. However the use of the term radical implies that some declawing is allowed and opens the regulation to subjective interpretation. I propose that the regulation prohibit all declawing of emu or ostrich unless performed by a vet for therapeutic reasons. I support the penalty of prosecutable offence.
85	Roosters	Caponising (rooster castration)
		I support the restriction of caponising to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

From: Jenny Abraham § 9(2)(a)
Sent: Monday, 16 May 2016 2:07 p.m.
To: Animal Welfare Submissions
Subject: Submission on animal welfare regulations

New Zealand's current animal welfare regulations don't go far enough to protect vulnerable bobby calves

I want to make a submission to support the views of SPCA New Zealand which believes the following should be practiced:

- Not transporting bobby calves before they are 10 days old.
- Not confining bobby calves for longer than 2 hours while awaiting transport.
- Providing proper bedding for bobby calves awaiting transport.
- Providing proper bedding for bobby calves during transport.
- Ensuring better and more humane methods for loading and unloading bobby calves. Throwing animals is completely unacceptable.
- The time and distance bobby calves are transported should be limited — and drivers should be trained to drive appropriately.
- If a bobby calf is to be slaughtered, this should be done on the same day as transport and should be done quickly and humanely.

Jenny Abraham
§ 9(2)(a)



From: Anna de Valk s9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, 18 May 2016 2:35 p.m.
To: Animal Welfare Submissions
Subject: Submission on Animal Welfare Regulations
Categories: Blue Category

MPI Animal Welfare Codes Submission

Nathan Guy Minister for Primary Industries

In response to MPI's request for feedback on proposed animal welfare regulations I submit the following for your careful consideration.

The given consultation period (14th April to 10 May 2016) for public involvement is woefully inadequate. Five weeks is unrealistic and makes a mockery of the consultation process. The volume of proposals we are being asked to consider in this time frame isn't feasible and I ask that a more realistic time frame be given for the public to have our say.

I suggest a period of five weeks be given to each section of the proposed welfare regulations.

While the proposed regulations relating to live animal exports, the care and conduct towards animals, and surgical and painful procedures is a start, I ask that there be a full review into intensive farming practices across the agricultural industry.

The last two decades have seen the intensification of animal agriculture to levels that are unprecedented in recent history. The current welfare codes and proposed welfare regulations don't go nearly far enough in protecting animal welfare under increasingly intensive farming practices.

Society's moral values are constantly shifting yet these regulations have remained largely static and are vastly out of step with changing attitudes to animal welfare. I want to see a total ban on all cages for layer hens, farrowing crates for sows and a reduction in intensive dairy resulting in the slaughter of over 2m calves annually.

These farming practices can no longer be deemed humane by today's standards and cannot be incorporated as such in any welfare code. The new rules are not keeping pace with changing scientific knowledge and cannot be accepted as good practice.

- 1) From 5.3m dairy cows in 2007 to 6.4m in 2012 (23% increase in just 5 years) Statistics NZ
- 2) Switzerland banned cages for hens in 1992

Care and conduct regulatory proposals		
1	All animals	Electric prodders
		<p>I propose that the use of electric prodders be banned under all circumstances except when they are "necessary for protection, preservation or maintenance of human life"</p> <p>I do not support exemptions on the use of prodders based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the species and size of an animal b. the manner of use of an animal (circus) c. the location of the animal (slaughter premises) <p>I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p>
2	All animals	Use of goads
		<p>I support the proposal to ban the use of goads on sensitive areas of an animal's body under any circumstances. Given the deliberate cruelty involved in using goads on sensitive areas I propose an increased infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
3	All animals	Twisting an animal's tail
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit painful twisting of an animal's tail. Given the potential for significant pain and damage from this behaviour, and the deliberate nature of the act I propose the infringement penalty is set at the higher level of \$500.</p>

Proposed	All animals	Any animal requiring manual lifting must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick animals).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed 2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
4	Dogs	Pinch and Prong collars
		I support the prohibition of pinch and prong collars under any circumstances; no exemption for dogs used for special purposes (guarding, military) is supported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300. I also support the banning of the sale of these collars and associated penalties under the law.
5	Dogs	Injuries from collars or tethers
		I support the proposal to only use collars or tethers in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. Given the potential for severe injury from collars I propose the penalty is increased to a prosecutable offence.
6	Dogs	Muzzling a dog
		I support the proposal for regulating the use of muzzles so they do not cause injury or distress. I support the inclusion in the proposal that muzzles should allow for a dog to be able to drink. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
7	Dogs	Dry and shaded shelter
		I support the proposal for dogs to have access to dry and shaded shelter at all times. I propose the inclusion in the proposal that dogs also have access to fresh, palatable drinking water at all times. Given that shelter and water are basic needs of life neglecting these items has the potential to cause significant harm and even death therefore I propose the infringement penalty to be increased to a prosecutable offence. I also propose that there be a maximum time imposed that a dog is allowed to be chained for at any one time and that an infringement fee be set for exceeding that time.
8	Dogs	Dogs left in vehicles
		I support the proposal for people leaving dogs in vehicles to ensure their safety. I propose increasing the penalty to a prosecutable offence both to reflect the potential fatal nature of the injury and also to act as a suitable penalty to prevent this behaviour. Additionally increasing the penalty allows for effective prosecution of corporations who use dogs who have a responsibility to ensure dogs in their care are cared for appropriately.
9	Dogs	Secured on moving vehicles
		I support the proposal to secure dogs on moving vehicles. I propose including dogs on vehicles on private property in the regulation, and propose a speed limit of 40kph for vehicles carrying unsecured working dogs. I propose increasing the penalty for infringement to \$1000 due to the potential for severe injury, suffering, and death resulting from falling from a moving vehicle.
Proposed	Dogs	Ban export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Macau or China
		The Macau and China greyhound racing industries do not have the same standards of animal welfare as NZ. The export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Hong Kong (for

		<p>further transport to Macau/China) is minimal at present. However if the export of greyhounds from other countries (Australia, Ireland) is banned or more heavily regulated then NZ could become a transport hub for dogs in this industry. This has the potential for poor welfare outcomes for dogs and very poor public perception in New Zealand. It is far better to ban an activity like this before it has the potential to become established. MPI have demonstrated their willingness to put in place infringements for uncommon industry activities which have the potential to become welfare issues in the future with proposal 50 in this document banning transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I propose the above regulation and propose the infringement penalty is set at a prosecutable offence.</p>
10	Dogs and Cats	Drowning dogs and cats
		I support the prohibition of the killing of a dog or cat of any age by drowning. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
11	Eels	Insensible for desliming
		I support the proposal that eels must be insensible for desliming or killed before they are deslimed. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
12	Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish	Insensible before being killed
		<p>I support the proposal that crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish must be insensible before they are killed. I dispute the NAWAC statement that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible and propose that either:</p> <p>a. the only legally acceptable method of rendering crabs and crayfish insensible is by electrical stunning (for which specific equipment is available for use in small restaurant premises). OR</p> <p>b. NAWAC conduct a review of the recent (since 2000) scientific literature on humane slaughter of crustaceans and present good quality, recent evidence to support the claim that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for failing to render a crustacean insensible prior to slaughter.</p>
13	Goats	Tethering requirements
		<p>I do not support the tethering of goats, on the basis that it stops goats expressing normal social behaviours, and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$500. Furthermore I share concerns with previous submissions around tethering of goats that tourists witnessing tethered goats on the road side could easily get a negative impression of animal welfare in NZ.</p> <p>I propose that all goats, regardless of housing system, have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$500.</p> <p>I also propose that as goats are social animals, all goats should be provided with a companion such as another goat, camelid, horse, donkey or sheep. I propose that failure to house a goat with a companion should attract an infringement penalty of \$300.</p> <p>1. Miranda-de la Lama, G.C. and Mattiello, S. (2010). The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming. Small Ruminant Research 90, (1-3), 1-10</p>
14	Horses	Use of a whip, lead, or any other object
		I support the prohibition of using a whip, lead or other object to strike around the head. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
15	Horses	Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.

16	Horses and Donkeys	Tethering requirements
		I do not support the tethering of horses and donkeys and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$300. I propose that all horses and donkeys have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times regardless of housing system and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$300.
17	Layer Hens	Opportunity to express normal behaviours in housing systems
		<p>I believe that colony cages do not adequately consider the welfare of layer hens because they prohibit the ability of the hen to express a range of normal behaviours. In addition, colony cages are not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 as they do not allow owners or persons in charge of animals to take all reasonable steps to ensure that their physical, health and behavioural needs are met¹.</p> <p>1) Sections 9, 68 Animal Welfare Act 1999</p>
18	Layer Hens	Stocking densities
		Colony cages do not allow hens to engage in a range of normal behaviours and therefore they are in clear breach of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. With a stocking density of 13 hens per square metre or 750 square centimetres, clearly the stocking density is too high.
19	Layer Hens	Housing and equipment design
		<p>Colony cages are only slightly bigger than traditional battery cages. While they provide token welfare gestures like nest boxes, scratch pads and perches, these gestures do not ensure the physical, health and behavioural needs of hens are met. With only 750 sq cm per hen, there are a number of behaviours hens are not able to functionally perform in colony cages; this includes spreading her wings fully¹. It's also questionable whether a hen in a colony cage can properly nest, perch, peck or scratch. A hen in a colony cage cannot dust bathe.</p> <p>Research has shown that some hens in colony cages can be prevented from using the nest provided due to competition from other hens². Also, the limited space in colony cages is insufficient to allow hens sufficient time (on average 45 minutes³) if they want to lay at the same time.</p> <p>In order to satisfy a hen's need for perching, the housing system must be able to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient length of perching space to allow all birds to perch at the same time; and • Sufficient elevation of the perches to satisfy the hens' requirements for a perceived safe perching place at night. <p>Colony cages fulfil neither of these requirements. The standard of approximately 15cm of space per hen is an average and does not allow consideration for larger birds. Perches in colony systems are situated on average just a few centimetres from the floor of the cage. <i>'A perch positioned 5cm above floor level is 'not considered as a perch (by a hen) and has no attractive or repulsive value'⁴.</i></p> <p>Litter is not provided in colony cage systems. Litter is imperative for hen welfare. Hens will make great efforts to access litter for pecking, scratching and dustbathing – three normal behaviours of hens⁴. When hens are unable to forage in litter, they can redirect their pecking towards other hens resulting in harmful feather pecking and even cannibalism. When hens are unable to dustbathe in litter, they can develop the dysfunctional behaviour of sham dustbathing.</p> <p>1) A hen's wingspan is approximately 75-80 centimetres which is twice the size of a traditional battery cage 2) Guedson, V. and Faure, J. M. (2004) <i>Laying performance and egg quality in hens kept in standard or furnished cages</i>. Animal Research, 53: 45-57. 3) Appleby, M.C. (1998) Modification of laying hen cages to improve behaviour. Poultry Science, 77: 1828-1832. 4) Cooper, J.J. and Ablentosa, M. J. (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews, 14: 127-149.</p>

20	Layer Hens	Induced moulting
		I support the proposal to prohibit induced moulting of layer hens.
21	Llama and Alpaca	Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes, and packs
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
22	Llama and Alpaca	Companion animals
		I support the proposal that camelids must be provided with a companion animal. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
23	Llama and Alpaca	Offspring (Cria) camelid companions
		I support the proposal to prohibit raising Cria without the company of other camelids. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
24	Pigs	Dry sleeping area
		Proposal: I support the proposal that all pigs have access to a dry sleeping area. Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
25	Pigs	Lying space for grower pigs
		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal for minimum space requirements for grower pigs.</p> <p>1. Error in formula</p> <p>The proposed formula used to calculate the minimum space has a type error; specifically the exponent notation has not been applied. I believe the formula intended by MPI should read "live weight^{0.67} (kg)" but instead it reads "live weight 0.67(kg)" which translates to an Area = 0.03 * liveweight * 0.67(kg) and results in a much higher space requirement.</p> <p>Therefore I contend that proposal 25 must be rewritten and resubmitted for public consultation, with the correct formula included so that the intended space requirement can be properly considered.</p> <p>2. Minimum requirement</p> <p>Recent research suggests that a k-value of 0.3 is too low. In 2006, Gonyou et al. (2006) which ADFI is reduced. More recently, a 2015 study has found that a k-value of 0.0336 might underestimate the impact of increased stocking density on ADG and ADFI. A k-value of 0.3 is too low to provide grower pigs with this environment and is sufficient as a minimum requirement for static space only.</p> <p>Does the proposal adequately define the appropriate systems?</p> <p>The proposal is based on a minimum standard, which is expected to occur (if at all) only where growers have reached the capacity of their pen and are shortly to be moved to a bigger pen; not a minimum standard which is considered acceptable at all times and this should be clarified in the regulation itself.</p> <p>I consider the minimum standards of housing for pigs to be provide "sufficient space to enable them to perform natural behaviours such as lying on their side without touching another pig, standing up, turning around and performing exercise, space for separate areas for dunging and feeding, with a dunging areas situated a sufficient distance from sleeping and feeding areas as well as materials to enable them to root and forage" ⁴. If these standards cannot be met by the current farming systems then we are concerned that the current farming systems are not compatible with the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour and breach the animal welfare act.</p> <p>The current regulation has no limit on the length of time during which a grower pig may be submitted to the proposed minimum standard. Overstocking is a known problem. I am concerned that grower pigs may be submitted to spaces which do not meet minimum requirement if their transfer to a new pen is delayed. I would like the regulations to be clear that it is unacceptable for growers to be kept for prolonged periods in spaces at or</p>

		<p>close to the minimum requirement. In its 2010 review, NAWAC submitted that space enough to allow for pigs to lie fully recumbent (k-value of 0.047) was recommended best practice.</p> <p>For the sake of clarity and to give effect to the intention of NAWAC, I suggest that a minimum period of time for growers kept in the lower end of the scale be added.</p> <p>Due to the above considerations, I propose that the minimum standard is amended to:</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must have lying space of at least: Area (m²) per pig = 0.040 x live weight 0.67(kg)</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must not have lying space of less than: Area (m²) per pig = 0.047 x live weight 0.67(kg) for longer than one week.</p> <p>Penalty: I support penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p> <p>Gonyou, H. W., M. C. Brumm, E. Bush, J. Deen, S. A. Edwards, T. Fangman, J. J. McGlone, M. Meunier-Salaun, R. B. Morrison, H. Spooler, P. L. Sundberg, and A. K. Johnson. 2006. Application of broken-line analysis to assess floor space requirements of nursery and grower-finisher pigs expressed on an allometric basis. J. Anim. Sci. 84: 229-235.</p> <p>Thomas, LL. "The Effects of Increasing Stocking Density on Finishing Pig Growth ..." 2015. http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=kaesrr ibid. Page 9</p> <p>"ANIMAL WELFARE (Pigs) CODE OF WELFARE 2010 REPORT." 2015. 15 May. 2016 <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/1446></p>
26	Pigs	Dry sow stalls
		<p>Proposal: I support the prohibition of dry sow stalls</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p>
27	Pigs	Size of farrowing crates
		<p>Proposal: I do not support the use of farrowing crates.</p> <p>Production systems using farrowing crates are not the only financially viable forms of pork production. It is widely accepted that sow welfare in farrowing crates is sub-optimal. Continuing a production system which is contrary to good practice and scientific knowledge is in direct violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.</p> <p>In 2016, a review of Farrowing Crates for Pigs in NZ was submitted by NAWAC. In that report, NAWAC stated that "no significant change in science, technology or good practice from 2010 when the pigs code of welfare was issued". It submitted that the levels of piglet mortality in farrowing pens is higher than in farrowing crates and used this as justification for retaining farrowing crates in New Zealand. However, there is abundant research which supports the conclusion that total piglet mortality on farms with loose farrowing systems does not differ from that of farms with crates²³.</p> <p>I submit that farrowing crates are unacceptable in modern day pork production systems and must be banned outright.</p> <p>"National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee - NZPork." 2016. 15 May. 2016 http://www.nzpork.co.nz/images/custom/farrowing-crate-advice-14-march-2016.pdf</p> <p>Weber, R. "Piglet mortality on farms using farrowing systems ... - IngentaConnect." 2007. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ufaw/aw/2007/00000016/00000002/art00042</p> <p>KilBride, AL. "A cohort study of preweaning piglet mortality and ... - ScienceDirect." 2012. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167587711003564</p>
28	Pigs	Provision of nesting material
		<p>Proposal: I support the provision of nesting material that can be manipulated to sows. However, it is clear that sows in farrowing crates will be unable to exhibit natural nesting behaviours in the confined space of a farrowing crate. To give effect to the intention of providing nesting material, the sow must be given more space in which to move.</p> <p>I agree that the definition of manipulable material should be made more apparent. "Material at ground level which mimics that of natural nesting material and encourages the sow to exhibit rooting behaviour" would be appropriate. However, for clarity, I recommend that examples are provided for guidance. Appropriate examples would include straw and sawdust.</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p>

		Chaloupková, H. "The effect of nesting material on the nest-building and maternal ... - NCBI." 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20889685
29	Rodeos	Fireworks
		<p>I support the ban of fireworks at rodeo's, The loud noise of fireworks is well established as a stressor in companion animals (Bolster 2012; Dale et al., 2010) And Unexpected noise and movement will cause the fight or flight response in both horses and cattle (Lanier, 2000; Christensen, 2005).</p> <p>I would like to see a total ban on rodeo, rodeo is of no advantage to the economy. A petition recently submitted to parliament has 42,000 members of the public in support of such a ban. Rodeo is in breach of the animal welfare act which states that animals should be 'physically handled in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress.' The rodeo is a form of entertainment therefore making it an unnecessary activity for animals to be involved in. The likelihood of animals feeling distress while performing in rodeos could only be successfully minimised if rodeos were entirely stopped; goading animals into states of distress is fundamental to getting them to perform in rodeo events.</p> <p>As there have been many breaches of the rodeo code brought before MPI in 2014 and 2015 we strongly urge MPI to carefully consider if the codes are adequate in helping to minimise the likelihood of unreasonable and unnecessary pain or distress. We are aware of new breaches that will be brought before MPI for a third year running, this adds to the evidence that these codes are not adequate for protecting animals, therefore we feel that the only way to ensure these breaches do not continue is for an outright ban.</p>
30	Exotic animals	Used in circuses
		I do not support the use of exotic animals in circuses and propose that their use be banned. Given that there are currently no circuses in NZ using exotic animals the banning of the practice now will cause no industry disruption. Popular opinion both here and overseas is moving away from the use of exotic animals in circus and if this practice was to occur again in NZ it is likely that there would be a public outcry against it.
31	Cattle	Milk stimulation
		I support the proposal to prohibit the stimulation of milk let down by inserting water or air into a cow's vagina. I propose the prohibition is extended to include the insertion of any object into a cow's vagina to stimulate milk let down. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
32	Cattle and Sheep	Vehicular traction in calving or lambing
		I support the proposal to prohibit the use of a moving vehicle to provide traction in lambing or calving. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
33	Cattle and Sheep	Ingrown horns
		I support the proposal to require treatment for horns that are touching the skin or eye. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
34	Stock transport	Cuts and abrasions
		I support the proposal that transport should not result in cuts or abrasions. I propose the regulation is extended to all animals' not just cattle, sheep, deer, goats, and pigs. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
35	Stock transport	Animals with ingrown horns
		I support the proposal that animals with ingrown horns must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.

36	Stock transport	Animals with bleeding horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with bleeding horns or antler must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
37	Stock transport	Animals with long horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with long horn or antler must not cause injury to themselves or others during transport. I could not find any rationale for the use of 110mm as a cut off value for long antler either in the code of welfare, or the report on the code. I propose that MPI publish the rationale behind the cut off value of 110mm or perform analysis of the injuries sustained from transport of animals with horns to determine if this measurement is an appropriate guide. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
38	Stock transport	Lame cattle, deer, pigs and goats
		I support the proposal that cattle, sheep, pigs and goats with lameness scores of 2 must be certified for transport by a veterinarian and that animals with a lameness score of 3 must not be transported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
39	Stock transport	Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury
		I support the proposal that animals who cannot bear weight evenly due to injury require certification from a veterinarian for transport. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
40	Stock transport	Pregnant animals
		I support the proposal that animals who are in late stages of pregnancy should not be transported. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
41	Stock transport	Animals with injured or diseased udders
		I support the proposal that animals who have diseased udders should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
42	Stock transport	Cattle or sheep with cancer eye
		I support the proposal that animals who have cancer eye which is large, not confined to the eyelid or discharging/bleeding should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
Young calf management regulatory proposals		
43	Young Calves	Loading and unloading facilities
		I support the proposal that facilities must be provided which enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. Given the potential for severe injury and pain I propose that the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.

Proposed	Young Calves	Calves must not be thrown, if they need to be manually lifted they must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick calves).
		Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading ¹ , only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage ² , presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour. http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/
Proposed	Young Calves	Minimum training standard for people handling/loading calves
		I propose a minimum training standard is put in place for people loading calves on to transportation. Footage from 2015 clearly shows inappropriate handling of calves at the time of loading ¹ . A regulation for minimum training standards for those loading calves will not just improve calf welfare but will also demonstrate the transport industry's commitment to improving their part of the calf management chain. In contrast failure for the transport industry to demonstrate willingness to improve welfare outcomes for calves could reflect badly in the media. I propose infringement penalty is prosecution due to the lack of provision of appropriate training being a corporation level infringement and therefore an appropriate penalty needs to be significant enough to deter corporations from flouting the law. http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed
Proposed	Young Calves	Same day slaughter
		I propose that all young calves received at a slaughter premises must be slaughtered that day and cannot be held overnight. It has been recognised by MPI that time off feed is a significant welfare concern in young calves therefore reducing the time spent at a slaughter premises aims to reduce the risk of calves spending an extended period of time off feed. Although an alternative proposal could be for feeding at arrival at slaughter premises given the other welfare issues of housing young calves I consider reducing holding time to a minimum as the least bad of the options. I propose an infringement penalty set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.
Proposed	Young Calves	Use of nearest slaughterhouse
		Increased time spent at transport has been shown to be one of the determinants of poorer outcomes for calves ¹ . For this reason I propose that calves are required to be slaughtered at the closest slaughter premises. I propose the infringement penalty to be set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law. Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84
44	Young Calves	Shelter on farm, before and during transportation and at processing plants
		I support the proposal for minimum standards of shelter on farm, before transportation, and at slaughter premises. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
45	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – age

		<p>I propose that the minimum age of transport is increased to 10 days to bring us in line with what is considered an acceptable standard of welfare in other developed countries. MPI have stated that the 4 day standard suggested in the proposed regulation has been suggested as this reflects current industry practice. However the transport code of welfare only cites research performed in calves 5-10 days of age; therefore I propose that the absolute minimum age of transport be set at 5 days of age. I support the most conservative determination of age – that it is determined from the time the calf is separated from the dam. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p>
46	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – Physical characteristics
		I support the proposal that the list of physical characteristics provided with regulation 46 should be met prior to transport of young calves. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
47	Young Calves	Maximum time off feed
		<p>I support the proposal for regulating the maximum time off feed for young calves, however we propose this is reduced to 12 hours. The lack of physiological indicators in the 2000 Todd paper does not demonstrate that:</p> <p>this is in fact the case in calves <5 days of age or</p> <p>that these calves are not experiencing significant hunger or</p> <p>that these calves have the physiological capacity to respond to transport in a measurable way with the tools used in the study?</p> <p>I propose that calves undergoing transport are kept to the same feeding schedule they would have if they remained on farm. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p> <p>Knowles, T.G., Warriss, P.D., Brown, S.N., Edwards, J.E., Watkins, P.E. and Phillips, A.J. 1997. Effects on calves less than one month old of feeding or not feeding them during road transport of up to 24 hours. Veterinary Record 140, 116-124.</p>
48	Young Calves	Duration of transport
		<p>I support limiting the duration of transport of young calves to 8 hours or less. As length of transport has been shown to be associated with poorer outcomes for calves, we propose an increase in the infringement penalty to \$1000.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
49	Young Calves	Blunt force trauma
		I support the prohibition of the use of blunt force trauma for killing calves. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to receive appropriate penalties to deter this behaviour.
50	Young Calves	Transport by sea across Cook Strait prohibited
		I support the prohibition of transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to be held accountable.
Surgical and painful procedures regulatory proposals		

51	All animals	Hot branding
		I support the prohibition of hot branding and the penalty of prosecution.
52	All animals	Embryo collection via exteriorised uterus (surgical embryo transfer)
		I do not support the collection of embryos via exteriorised uterus and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
53	All animals	Laparoscopic artificial insemination (laparoscopic AI)
		I do not support the use of laparoscopic AI and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
54	All animals	Liver biopsy
		I support the proposal for liver biopsy to be restricted to being performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students and the requirement for the use of pain relief. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
55	All animals	Dental work
		I support the proposal that any power tool used for dental work must be designed for the purpose of dentistry. I propose the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
56	Cats	Declawing
		I support the restriction of cat declawing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
57	Companion animals	Desexing (including stray/feral cats, dogs and other species)
		I support the restriction of desexing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence. I propose that all cats and dogs sold in pet shops be desexed and vaccinated before being released to the purchaser. This would work as a preventative step in helping reduce the number of stray/feral cats and dogs over time.
58	Dogs	Freeze branding
		I propose that freeze branding of dogs is banned. With better technology now available we can microchip dogs rather than freeze branding them. In the case that freeze branding is not prohibited I support the restriction of freeze branding to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

59	Dogs	Dog debarking (and devoicing of other species)
		I support the restriction of dog debarking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
60	Dogs	Cropping the ears
		I support the proposal to prohibit ear cropping of dogs. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
61	Dogs	Dew claws
		I support the restriction of removal of articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose restriction of removal of non-articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution.
62	Dogs	Tail docking
		I support the docking of tails in dogs for therapeutic reasons only. The procedure must be performed by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Pain relief must be used at the time of this procedure.
63	Cattle	Teats
		<p>I support the proposal for supernumerary teat removal of animals >6 weeks of age to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the removal of supernumerary teats in animals <6 weeks of age without pain relief, however the procedure could be undertaken by a skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie a vet tech). I propose that:</p> <p>the maximum of age of animals on whom supernumerary teat removal can be performed by a lay person is reduced to 4 weeks of age</p> <p>i) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>pain relief is required for any supernumerary teat removal procedure regardless of age</p> <p>ii) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>procedure is performed using sterilised equipment</p> <p>iii) infringement penalty of \$500</p> <p>any person performing the procedure who is not a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student is signed off by a veterinarian</p> <p>iv) infringement penalty of prosecution</p>
64	Cattle	Claw removal
		I support the proposal that claw removal is restricted to being performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief is required at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) pain relief is also administered. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
65	Cattle	Teat occlusion
		I support the proposal that teat sealing can only be performed with a product registered for that specific purpose. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution.
66	Cattle	Tail docking

		I support the restriction of tail docking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons only, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
67	Cattle and sheep	Castration and shortening of the scrotum (cryptorchid)
		I support the proposal for surgical castration at any age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I support the proposal that non-surgical castration in cattle and sheep over 6 months of age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the age of 6 months as an appropriate age at which lay people can no longer perform non-surgical castration and propose that this age limit is lowered to 2 months, I support limiting the manner of non-surgical castration to only the use of conventional rubber rings. I does not support performing non-surgical castration without pain relief at any age and propose that pain relief is required for any castration procedure at any age. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also required. I propose that the penalty for all infringements other than lack of NSAID use is prosecution and that the penalty for not using an NSAID is an infringement of \$300.
68	Cattle, sheep and goats	Disbudding
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian, veterinary student under direct supervision, or skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie vet tech/appropriately trained farm worker). I propose that appropriate maximum ages are determined for disbudding to be performed by a lay person. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
69	Cattle, sheep and goats	Dehorning
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision. Given the much greater risk of pain, bleeding, and infection from dehorning rather than disbudding I propose that farmers are given 12 months warning after which dehorning can only be performed by veterinarians. This will give a strong message that disbudding is much preferred and much more economically viable. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
70	Sheep	Tail docking
		I support the limiting of tail docking in sheep who are greater than 6 months of age to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support restricting the techniques for tail docking in younger animals to rubber ring and hot iron only. I propose that pain relief at the time of procedure and NSAID should also be required, regardless of age at the time of tail docking. Furthermore I propose that the maximum age at which a lay person is able to perform a tail docking procedure is reduced to 2 months. I support the proposal that tails are not to be cut flush and are to be able to cover the vulva in a female and of a similar length in a male. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for infringements in sheep > 2 months of age and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.

		I support the proposed penalties of \$500 for use of non-listed methods and not cutting tails flush in sheep < 2 months of age. I propose a penalty of prosecution for not using pain relief in sheep <2 months of age and a penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
71	Sheep	Mulesing
		I support the proposal to prohibit mulesing. I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
72	Deer	Develveting
		I support the proposal for develveting to be only performed by veterinarians, directly supervised veterinary students or a person with veterinary approval. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
73	Horses	Blistering, firing, or nicking
		I support the proposal to prohibit blistering, firing or nicking, and support the proposed infringement penalty.
74	Horses	Tail docking
		I support the proposal for tail docking to only be performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students, only for therapeutic reasons, only with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
75	Horses	Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal pregnancy diagnosis in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
76	Horses	Rectal examination of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal examination in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
77	Horses	Caslick's procedure
		I support the proposal for creation, opening and repair of caslick's procedure to only be performed by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and the use of pain relief for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty. I propose that a caslick's procedure may only be performed for therapeutic purposes and not for a perceived performance benefit and that the proposed infringement penalty for this breach is the same as that proposed above.
78	Horses	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
79	Llama and alpaca	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in llama and alpaca to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure, and the minimum age for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalties for these infringements.
80	Pigs	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration to only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision and the required use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution. I propose that a non-

		steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) is also required and that the penalty for not administering an NSAID is \$300.
81	Pigs	Tail docking
		I propose that pain relief should be used for this procedure regardless of the animal's age. I support limiting the procedure to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students in animals > 7 days of age. I propose that a NSAID should also be administered at the time of the procedure. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and for a lay person performing the procedure in an animal > 7 days of age. I propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID administration.
82	Birds	Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird
		I support the restriction of pinioning/deflighting a bird to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only being performed in the best interests of the animal, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
83	Poultry	Dubbing
		I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence to perform dubbing on breeds not usually dubbed and to not use pain relief at the time of the procedure. I oppose the surgical modification of an animal if the modification is not in the interests of the animal, therefore I propose that dubbing is prohibited with the penalty of a prosecutable offence.
84	Ostriches and emus	Declawing
		I support the prohibition of radical declawing of emu chicks. However the use of the term radical implies that some declawing is allowed and opens the regulation to subjective interpretation. I propose that the regulation prohibit all declawing of emu or ostrich unless performed by a vet for therapeutic reasons. I support the penalty of prosecutable offence.
85	Roosters	Caponising (rooster castration)
		I support the restriction of caponising to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

Submitted by:
Deirdre Sims

s 9(2)(a)

MPI Animal Welfare Codes Submission

Nathan Guy

Minister for Primary Industries

In response to MPI's request for feedback on proposed animal welfare regulations I submit the following for your careful consideration.

The given consultation period (14th April to 10 May 2016) for public involvement is woefully inadequate. Five weeks is unrealistic and makes a mockery of the consultation process. The volume of proposals we are being asked to consider in this time frame isn't feasible and I ask that a more realistic time frame be given for the public to have our say.

I suggest a period of five weeks be given to each section of the proposed welfare regulations.

While the proposed regulations relating to live animal exports, the care and conduct towards animals, and surgical and painful procedures is a start, I ask that there be a full review into intensive farming practices across the agricultural industry.

The last two decades have seen the intensification of animal agriculture to levels that are unprecedented in recent history. The current welfare codes and proposed welfare regulations don't go nearly far enough in protecting animal welfare under increasingly intensive farming practices.

Society's moral values are constantly shifting yet these regulations have remained largely static and are vastly out of step with changing attitudes to animal welfare². I want to see a total ban on all cages for layer hens, farrowing crates for sows and a reduction in intensive dairy resulting in the slaughter of over 2m calves annually. These farming practices can no longer be deemed humane by today's standards and cannot be incorporated as such in any welfare code. The new rules are not keeping pace with changing scientific knowledge and cannot be accepted as good practice.

- 1) From 5.3m dairy cows in 2007 to 6.4m in 2012 (23% increase in just 5 years) Statistics NZ
- 2) Switzerland banned cages for hens in 1992

Care and conduct regulatory proposals		
1	All animals	Electric prodders
		<p>I propose that the use of electric prodders be banned under all circumstances except when they are "necessary for protection, preservation or maintenance of human life"</p> <p>I do not support exemptions on the use of prodders based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the species and size of an animal b. the manner of use of an animal (circus) c. the location of the animal (slaughter premises) <p>I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p>
2	All animals	Use of goads
		<p>I support the proposal to ban the use of goads on sensitive areas of an animal's body under any circumstances. Given the deliberate cruelty involved in using goads on sensitive areas I propose an increased infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
3	All animals	Twisting an animal's tail
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit painful twisting of an animal's tail. Given the potential for significant pain and damage from this behaviour, and the deliberate nature of the act I propose the infringement penalty is set at the higher level of \$500.</p>
Proposed	All animals	Any animal requiring manual lifting must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick animals).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed 2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/
4	Dogs	Pinch and Prong collars
		<p>I support the prohibition of pinch and prong collars under any circumstances; no exemption for dogs used for special purposes (guarding, military) is supported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300. I also support the banning of the sale of these collars and associated penalties under the law.</p>
5	Dogs	Injuries from collars or tethers
		<p>I support the proposal to only use collars or tethers in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. Given the potential for severe injury from collars I propose the penalty is increased to a prosecutable offence.</p>
6	Dogs	Muzzling a dog

		I support the proposal for regulating the use of muzzles so they do not cause injury or distress. I support the inclusion in the proposal that muzzles should allow for a dog to be able to drink. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
7	Dogs	Dry and shaded shelter
		I support the proposal for dogs to have access to dry and shaded shelter at all times. I propose the inclusion in the proposal that dogs also have access to fresh, palatable drinking water at all times. Given that shelter and water are basic needs of life neglecting these items has the potential to cause significant harm and even death therefore I propose the infringement penalty to be increased to a prosecutable offence. I also propose that there be a maximum time imposed that a dog is allowed to be chained for at any one time and that an infringement fee be set for exceeding that time.
8	Dogs	Dogs left in vehicles
		I support the proposal for people leaving dogs in vehicles to ensure their safety. I propose increasing the penalty to a prosecutable offence both to reflect the potential fatal nature of the injury and also to act as a suitable penalty to prevent this behaviour. Additionally increasing the penalty allows for effective prosecution of corporations who use dogs who have a responsibility to ensure dogs in their care are cared for appropriately.
9	Dogs	Secured on moving vehicles
		I support the proposal to secure dogs on moving vehicles. I propose including dogs on vehicles on private property in the regulation, and propose a speed limit of 40kph for vehicles carrying unsecured working dogs. I propose increasing the penalty for infringement to \$1000 due to the potential for severe injury, suffering, and death resulting from falling from a moving vehicle.
Proposed	Dogs	Ban export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Macau or China
		The Macau and China greyhound racing industries do not have the same standards of animal welfare as NZ. The export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Hong Kong (for further transport to Macau/China) is minimal at present. However if the export of greyhounds from other countries (Australia, Ireland) is banned or more heavily regulated then NZ could become a transport hub for dogs in this industry. This has the potential for poor welfare outcomes for dogs and very poor public perception in New Zealand. It is far better to ban an activity like this before it has the potential to become established. MPI have demonstrated their willingness to put in place infringements for uncommon industry activities which have the potential to become welfare issues in the future with proposal 50 in this document banning transport of young calves across cook strait. I propose the above regulation and propose the infringement penalty is set at a prosecutable offence.
10	Dogs and Cats	Drowning dogs and cats
		I support the prohibition of the killing of a dog or cat of any age by drowning. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
11	Eels	Insensible for desliming
		I support the proposal that eels must be insensible for desliming or killed before they are deslimed. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
12	Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish	Insensible before being killed
		I support the proposal that crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish must be insensible before they are killed. I dispute the NAWAC statement that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible and propose that either: a. the only legally acceptable method of rendering crabs and crayfish insensible is by electrical stunning (for which specific equipment is available for use in small restaurant premises). OR

		<p>b. NAWAC conduct a review of the recent (since 2000) scientific literature on humane slaughter of crustaceans and present good quality, recent evidence to support the claim that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for failing to render a crustacean insensible prior to slaughter.</p>
13	Goats	Tethering requirements
		<p>I do not support the tethering of goats, on the basis that it stops goats expressing normal social behaviours, and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$500. Furthermore I share concerns with previous submissions around tethering of goats that tourists witnessing tethered goats on the road side could easily get a negative impression of animal welfare in NZ.</p> <p>I propose that all goats, regardless of housing system, have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$500.</p> <p>I also propose that as goats are social animals: all goats should be provided with a companion such as another goat, camelid, horse, donkey or sheep. I propose that failure to house a goat with a companion should attract an infringement penalty of \$300.</p> <p>1. Miranda-de la Lama, G.C. and Mattiello, S. (2010). The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming. Small Ruminant Research 90, (1-3), 1-10</p>
14	Horses	Use of a whip, lead, or any other object
		I support the prohibition of using a whip, lead or other object to strike around the head. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
15	Horses	Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
16	Horses and Donkeys	Tethering requirements
		I do not support the tethering of horses and donkeys and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$300. I propose that all horses and donkeys have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times regardless of housing system and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$300.
17	Layer Hens	Opportunity to express normal behaviours in housing systems
		<p>I believe that colony cages do not adequately consider the welfare of layer hens because they prohibit the ability of the hen to express a range of normal behaviours. In addition, colony cages are not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 as they do not allow owners or persons in charge of animals to take all reasonable steps to ensure that their physical, health and behavioural needs are met.</p> <p>1) Sections 9, 68 Animal Welfare Act 1999</p>
18	Layer Hens	Stocking densities
		Colony cages do not allow hens to engage in a range of normal behaviours and therefore they are in clear breach of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. With a stocking density of 13 hens per square metre or 750 square centimetres, clearly the stocking density is too high.
19	Layer Hens	Housing and equipment design
		Colony cages are only slightly bigger than traditional battery cages. While they provide token welfare gestures like nest boxes, scratch pads and perches, these gestures do not ensure the physical, health and behavioural needs of hens are met. With only 750 sq cm per hen, there are a number of behaviours hens are not able to functionally perform in colony cages; this includes spreading her wings fully. It's also questionable whether a

		<p>hen in a colony cage can properly nest, perch, peck or scratch. A hen in a colony cage cannot dust bathe.</p> <p>Research has shown that some hens in colony cages can be prevented from using the nest provided due to competition from other hens. Also, the limited space in colony cages is insufficient to allow hens sufficient time (on average 45 minutes) if they want to lay at the same time.</p> <p>In order to satisfy a hen's need for perching, the housing system must be able to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient length of perching space to allow all birds to perch at the same time; and • Sufficient elevation of the perches to satisfy the hens' requirements for a perceived safe perching place at night. <p>Colony cages fulfil neither of these requirements. The standard of approximately 15cm of space per hen is an average and does not allow consideration for larger birds. Perches in colony systems are situated on average just a few centimetres from the floor of the cage. <i>'A perch positioned 5cm above floor level is 'not considered as a perch (by a hen) and has no attractive or repulsive value'.</i></p> <p>Litter is not provided in colony cage systems. Litter is imperative for hen welfare. Hens will make great efforts to access litter for pecking, scratching and dustbathing – three normal behaviours of hens. When hens are unable to forage in litter, they can redirect their pecking towards other hens resulting in harmful feather pecking and even cannibalism. When hens are unable to dustbathe in litter, they can develop the dysfunctional behaviour of sham dustbathing.</p> <p>1) A hen's wingspan is approximately 75-80 centimetres which is twice the size of a traditional battery cage</p> <p>2) Guedson, V. and Faure, J. M. (2004) <i>Laying performance and egg quality in hens kept in standard or furnished cages</i>. <i>Animal Research</i>, 53: 45-57.</p> <p>3) Appleby, M.C. (1998) Modification of laying hen cages to improve behaviour. <i>Poultry Science</i>, 77: 1828-1832.</p> <p>4) Cooper, J.J. and Abletosa, M. J. (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. <i>Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews</i>, 14: 127-149.</p>
20	Layer Hens	Induced moulting
		I support the proposal to prohibit induced moulting of layer hens.
21	Llama and Alpaca	Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes, and packs
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
22	Llama and Alpaca	Companion animals
		I support the proposal that camelids must be provided with a companion animal. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
23	Llama and Alpaca	Offspring (Cria) camelid companions
		I support the proposal to prohibit raising Cria without the company of other camelids. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
24	Pigs	Dry sleeping area
		Proposal: I support the proposal that all pigs have access to a dry sleeping area. Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
25	Pigs	Lying space for grower pigs
		Proposal: I support the proposal for minimum space requirements for grower pigs.

1. Error in formula

The proposed formula used to calculate the minimum space has a type error; specifically the exponent notation has not been applied. I believe the formula intended by MPI should read "live weight^{0.67} (kg)" but instead it reads "live weight 0.67(kg)" which translates to an Area = 0.03 * liveweight * 0.67(kg) and results in a much higher space requirement.

Therefore I contend that proposal 25 must be rewritten and resubmitted for public consultation, with the correct formula included so that the intended space requirement can be properly considered.

2. Minimum requirement

Recent research suggests that a k-value of 0.3 is too low. In 2006, Gonyou et al. (2006) which ADFI is reduced. More recently, a 2015 study has found that a k-value of 0.0336 might underestimate the impact of increased stocking density on ADG and ADFI². A k-value of 0.3 is too low to provide grower pigs with this environment and is sufficient as a minimum requirement for static space only.

Does the proposal adequately define the appropriate systems?

The proposal is based on a minimum standard, which is expected to occur (if at all) only where growers have reached the capacity of their pen and are shortly to be moved to a bigger pen³ not a minimum standard which is considered acceptable at all times and this should be clarified in the regulation itself.

I consider the minimum standards of housing for pigs to be provide "sufficient space to enable them to perform natural behaviours such as lying on their side without touching another pig, standing up, turning around and performing exercise, space for separate areas for dunging and feeding, with a dunging areas situated a sufficient distance from sleeping and feeding areas as well as materials to enable them to root and forage" ⁴. If these standards cannot be met by the current farming systems then we are concerned that the current farming systems are not compatible with the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour and breach the animal welfare act.

The current regulation has no limit on the length of time during which a grower pig may be submitted to the proposed minimum standard. Overstocking is a known problem. I am concerned that grower pigs may be submitted to spaces which do not meet minimum requirement if their transfer to a new pen is delayed. I would like the regulations to be clear that it is unacceptable for growers to be kept for prolonged periods in spaces at or close to the minimum requirement. In its 2010 review, NAWAC submitted that space enough to allow for pigs to lie fully recumbent (k-value of 0.047) was recommended best practice.

For the sake of clarity and to give effect to the intention of NAWAC, I suggest that a minimum period of time for growers kept in the lower end of the scale be added.

Due to the above considerations, I propose that the minimum standard is amended to: Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must have lying space of at least: Area (m²) per pig = 0.040 x live weight 0.67(kg)

Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must not have lying space of less than: Area (m²) per pig = 0.047 x live weight 0.67(kg) for longer than one week.

Penalty: I support penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.

Gonyou, H. W., M. C. Brumm, E. Bush, J. Deen, S. A. Edwards, T. Fangman, J. J. McGlone, M. Meunier-Salaun, R. B. Morrison, H. Spooler, P. L. Sundberg, and A. K. Johnson. 2006. Application of broken-line analysis to assess floor space requirements of nursery and grower-finisher pigs expressed on an allometric basis. J. Anim. Sci. 84: 229-235.

Thomas, LL. "The Effects of Increasing Stocking Density on Finishing Pig Growth ..." 2015. <http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=kaesrr> ibid. Page 9

"ANIMAL WELFARE (Pigs) CODE OF WELFARE 2010 REPORT." 2015. 15 May. 2016 <<https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/1446>>

26	Pigs	Dry sow stalls
		Proposal: I support the prohibition of dry sow stalls Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.
27	Pigs	Size of farrowing crates
		Proposal: I do not support the use of farrowing crates.

		<p>Production systems using farrowing crates are not the only financially viable forms of pork production. It is widely accepted that sow welfare in farrowing crates is sub-optimal. Continuing a production system which is contrary to good practice and scientific knowledge is in direct violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.</p> <p>In 2016, a review of Farrowing Crates for Pigs in NZ was submitted by NAWAC. In that report, NAWAC stated that "no significant change in science, technology or good practice from 2010 when the pigs code of welfare was issued". It submitted that the levels of piglet mortality in farrowing pens is higher than in farrowing crates and used this as justification for retaining farrowing crates in New Zealand. However, there is abundant research which supports the conclusion that total piglet mortality on farms with loose farrowing systems does not differ from that of farms with crates²³.</p> <p>I submit that farrowing crates are unacceptable in modern day pork production systems and must be banned outright.</p> <p>"National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee - NZPork." 2016. 15 May. 2016 http://www.nzpork.co.nz/images/custom/farrowing-crate-advice-14-march-2016.pdf</p> <p>Weber, R. "Piglet mortality on farms using farrowing systems ... - IngentaConnect." 2007. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ufaw/aw/2007/00000016/00000002/art00042</p> <p>KilBride, AL. "A cohort study of preweaning piglet mortality and ... - ScienceDirect." 2012. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167587711003564</p>
28	Pigs	<p>Provision of nesting material</p> <p>Proposal: I support the provision of nesting material that can be manipulated to sows. However, it is clear that sows in farrowing crates will be unable to exhibit natural nesting behaviours in the confined space of a farrowing crate. To give effect to the intention of providing nesting material, the sow must be given more space in which to move.</p> <p>I agree that the definition of manipulable material should be made more apparent. "Material at ground level which mimics that of natural nesting material and encourages the sow to exhibit rooting behaviour" would be appropriate. However, for clarity, I recommend that examples are provided for guidance. Appropriate examples would include straw and sawdust.</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Chaloupková, H. "The effect of nesting material on the nest-building and maternal ... - NCBI." 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20889685</p>
29	Rodeos	<p>Fireworks</p> <p>I support the ban of fireworks at rodeo's, The loud noise of fireworks is well established as a stressor in companion animals (Bolster 2012; Dale et al., 2010) And Unexpected noise and movement will cause the fight or flight response in both horses and cattle (Lanier, 2000; Christensen, 2005).</p> <p>I would like to see a total ban on rodeo, rodeo is of no advantage to the economy. A petition recently submitted to parliament has 42,000 members of the public in support of such a ban. Rodeo is in breach of the animal welfare act which states that animals should be 'physically handled in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress.' The rodeo is a form of entertainment therefore making it an unnecessary activity for animals to be involved in. The likelihood of animals feeling distress while performing in rodeos could only be successfully minimised if rodeos were entirely stopped; goading animals into states of distress is fundamental to getting them to perform in rodeo events.</p> <p>As there have been many breaches of the rodeo code brought before MPI in 2014 and 2015 we strongly urge MPI to carefully consider if the codes are adequate in helping to minimise the likelihood of unreasonable and unnecessary pain or distress. We are aware of new breaches that will be brought before MPI for a third year running, this adds to the evidence that these codes are not adequate for protecting animals, therefore we feel that the only way to ensure these breaches do not continue is for an outright ban.</p>
30	Exotic animals	<p>Used in circuses</p> <p>I do not support the use of exotic animals in circuses and propose that their use be banned. Given that there are currently no circuses in NZ using exotic animals the banning of the practice now will cause no industry disruption. Popular opinion both here and overseas is moving away from the use of exotic animals in circus and if this practice was to occur again in NZ it is likely that there would be a public outcry against it.</p>

31	Cattle	Milk stimulation
		I support the proposal to prohibit the stimulation of milk let down by inserting water or air into a cow's vagina. I propose the prohibition is extended to include the insertion of any object into a cow's vagina to stimulate milk let down. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
32	Cattle and Sheep	Vehicular traction in calving or lambing
		I support the proposal to prohibit the use of a moving vehicle to provide traction in lambing or calving. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
33	Cattle and Sheep	Ingrown horns
		I support the proposal to require treatment for horns that are touching the skin or eye. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
34	Stock transport	Cuts and abrasions
		I support the proposal that transport should not result in cuts or abrasions. I propose the regulation is extended to all animals' not just cattle, sheep, deer, goats, and pigs. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
35	Stock transport	Animals with ingrown horns
		I support the proposal that animals with ingrown horns must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
36	Stock transport	Animals with bleeding horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with bleeding horns or antler must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
37	Stock transport	Animals with long horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with long horn or antler must not cause injury to themselves or others during transport. I could not find any rationale for the use of 110mm as a cut off value for long antler either in the code of welfare, or the report on the code. I propose that MPI publish the rationale behind the cut off value of 110mm or perform analysis of the injuries sustained from transport of animals with horns to determine if this measurement is an appropriate guide. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
38	Stock transport	Lame cattle, deer, pigs and goats
		I support the proposal that cattle, sheep, pigs and goats with lameness scores of 2 must be certified for transport by a veterinarian and that animals with a lameness score of 3 must not be transported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
39	Stock transport	Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury
		I support the proposal that animals who cannot bear weight evenly due to injury require certification from a veterinarian for transport. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
40	Stock transport	Pregnant animals

		I support the proposal that animals who are in late stages of pregnancy should not be transported. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
41	Stock transport	Animals with injured or diseased udders
		I support the proposal that animals who have diseased udders should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
42	Stock transport	Cattle or sheep with cancer eye
		I support the proposal that animals who have cancer eye which is large, not confined to the eyelid or discharging/bleeding should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
Young calf management regulatory proposals		
43	Young Calves	Loading and unloading facilities
		I support the proposal that facilities must be provided which enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. Given the potential for severe injury and pain I propose that the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
Proposed	Young Calves	Calves must not be thrown, if they need to be manually lifted they must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick calves).
		Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading ¹ , only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage ² , presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour. http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/
Proposed	Young Calves	Minimum training standard for people handling/loading calves
		I propose a minimum training standard is put in place for people loading calves on to transportation. Footage from 2015 clearly shows inappropriate handling of calves at the time of loading ¹ . A regulation for minimum training standards for those loading calves will not just improve calf welfare but will also demonstrate the transport industry's commitment to improving their part of the calf management chain. In contrast failure for the transport industry to demonstrate willingness to improve welfare outcomes for calves could reflect badly in the media. I propose infringement penalty is prosecution due to the lack of provision of appropriate training being a corporation level infringement and therefore an appropriate penalty needs to be significant enough to deter corporations from flouting the law. http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed
Proposed	Young Calves	Same day slaughter

		<p>I propose that all young calves received at a slaughter premises must be slaughtered that day and cannot be held overnight. It has been recognised by MPI that time off feed is a significant welfare concern in young calves therefore reducing the time spent at a slaughter premises aims to reduce the risk of calves spending an extended period of time off feed. Although an alternative proposal could be for feeding at arrival at slaughter premises given the other welfare issues of housing young calves I consider reducing holding time to a minimum as the least bad of the options. I propose an infringement penalty set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Use of nearest slaughterhouse
		<p>Increased time spent at transport has been shown to be one of the determinants of poorer outcomes for calves. For this reason I propose that calves are required to be slaughtered at the closest slaughter premises. I propose the infringement penalty to be set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
44	Young Calves	Shelter on farm, before and during transportation and at processing plants
		I support the proposal for minimum standards of shelter on farm, before transportation, and at slaughter premises. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
45	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – age
		<p>I propose that the minimum age of transport is increased to 10 days to bring us in line with what is considered an acceptable standard of welfare in other developed countries. MPI have stated that the 4 day standard suggested in the proposed regulation has been suggested as this reflects current industry practice. However the transport code of welfare only cites research performed in calves 5-10 days of age therefore I propose that the absolute minimum age of transport be set at 5 days of age. I support the most conservative determination of age – that it is determined from the time the calf is separated from the dam. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p>
46	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – Physical characteristics
		I support the proposal that the list of physical characteristics provided with regulation 46 should be met prior to transport of young calves. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
47	Young Calves	Maximum time off feed
		<p>I support the proposal for regulating the maximum time off feed for young calves, however we propose this is reduced to 12 hours. The lack of physiological indicators in the 2000 Todd paper does not demonstrate that:</p> <p>this is in fact the case in calves <5 days of age or</p> <p>that these calves are not experiencing significant hunger or</p> <p>that these calves have the physiological capacity to respond to transport in a measurable way with the tools used in the study.</p> <p>I propose that calves undergoing transport are kept to the same feeding schedule they would have if they remained on farm. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution.</p>

		<p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p> <p>Knowles, T.G., Warriss, P.D., Brown, S.N., Edwards, J.E., Watkins, P.E. and Phillips, A.J. 1997. Effects on calves less than one month old of feeding or not feeding them during road transport of up to 24 hours. Veterinary Record 140, 116-124.</p>
48	Young Calves	Duration of transport
		<p>I support limiting the duration of transport of young calves to 8 hours or less. As length of transport has been shown to be associated with poorer outcomes for calves we propose an increase in the infringement penalty to \$1000.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
49	Young Calves	Blunt force trauma
		<p>I support the prohibition of the use of blunt force trauma for killing calves. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to receive appropriate penalties to deter this behaviour.</p>
50	Young Calves	Transport by sea across Cook Strait prohibited
		<p>I support the prohibition of transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to be held accountable.</p>
Surgical and painful procedures regulatory proposals		
51	All animals	Hot branding
		<p>I support the prohibition of hot branding and the penalty of prosecution.</p>
52	All animals	Embryo collection via exteriorised uterus (surgical embryo transfer)
		<p>I do not support the collection of embryos via exteriorised uterus and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).</p>
53	All animals	Laparoscopic artificial insemination (laparoscopic AI)
		<p>I do not support the use of laparoscopic AI and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).</p>
54	All animals	Liver biopsy
		<p>I support the proposal for liver biopsy to be restricted to being performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students and the requirement for the use of pain relief. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.</p>

55	All animals	Dental work
		I support the proposal that any power tool used for dental work must be designed for the purpose of dentistry. I propose the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
56	Cats	Declawing
		I support the restriction of cat declawing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
57	Companion animals	Desexing (including stray/feral cats, dogs and other species)
		I support the restriction of desexing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence. I propose that all cats and dogs sold in pet shops be desexed and vaccinated before being released to the purchaser. This would work as a preventative step in helping reduce the number of stray/feral cats and dogs over time.
58	Dogs	Freeze branding
		I propose that freeze branding of dogs is banned. With better technology now available we can microchip dogs rather than freeze branding them. In the case that freeze branding is not prohibited I support the restriction of freeze branding to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
59	Dogs	Dog debarking (and devoicing of other species)
		I support the restriction of dog debarking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
60	Dogs	Cropping the ears
		I support the proposal to prohibit ear cropping of dogs. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
61	Dogs	Dew claws
		I support the restriction of removal of articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose restriction of removal of non-articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution.
62	Dogs	Tail docking
		I support the docking of tails in dogs for therapeutic reasons only. The procedure must be performed by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Pain relief must be used at the time of this procedure.
63	Cattle	Teats

		<p>I support the proposal for supernumerary teat removal of animals >6 weeks of age to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the removal of supernumerary teats in animals <6 weeks of age without pain relief, however the procedure could be undertaken by a skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie a vet tech). I propose that:</p> <p>the maximum of age of animals on whom supernumerary teat removal can be performed by a lay person is reduced to 4 weeks of age</p> <p>i) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>pain relief is required for any supernumerary teat removal procedure regardless of age</p> <p>ii) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>procedure is performed using sterilised equipment</p> <p>iii) infringement penalty of \$500</p> <p>any person performing the procedure who is not a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student is signed off by a veterinarian</p> <p>iv) infringement penalty of prosecution</p>
64	Cattle	Claw removal
		<p>I support the proposal that claw removal is restricted to being performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief is required at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) pain relief is also administered. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.</p>
65	Cattle	Teat occlusion
		<p>I support the proposal that teat sealing can only be performed with a product registered for that specific purpose. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution.</p>
66	Cattle	Tail docking
		<p>I support the restriction of tail docking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons only, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.</p>
67	Cattle and sheep	Castration and shortening of the scrotum (cryptorchid)
		<p>I support the proposal for surgical castration at any age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I support the proposal that non-surgical castration in cattle and sheep over 6 months of age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the age of 6 months as an appropriate age at which lay people can no longer perform non-surgical castration and propose that this age limit is lowered to 2 months, I support limiting the manner of non-surgical castration to only the use of conventional rubber rings. I does not support performing non-surgical castration without pain relief at any age and propose that pain relief is required for any castration procedure at any age. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also required. I propose that the penalty for all infringements other than lack of NSAID use is prosecution and that the penalty for not using an NSAID is an infringement of \$300.</p>
68	Cattle, sheep and goats	Disbudding
		<p>I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian, veterinary student under direct supervision, or skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie vet tech/appropriately trained farm worker). I propose that appropriate maximum ages are determined for disbudding to be performed by a lay person. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief</p>

		is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
69	Cattle, sheep and goats	Dehorning
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision. Given the much greater risk of pain, bleeding, and infection from dehorning rather than disbudding I propose that farmers are given 12 months warning after which dehorning can only be performed by veterinarians. This will give a strong message that disbudding is much preferred and much more economically viable. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
70	Sheep	Tail docking
		I support the limiting of tail docking in sheep who are greater than 6 months of age to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support restricting the techniques for tail docking in younger animals to rubber ring and hot iron only. I propose that pain relief at the time of procedure and NSAID should also be required, regardless of age at the time of tail docking. Furthermore I propose that the maximum age at which a lay person is able to perform a tail docking procedure is reduced to 2 months. I support the proposal that tails are not to be cut flush and are to be able to cover the vulva in a female and of a similar length in a male. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for infringements in sheep > 2 months of age and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use. I support the proposed penalties of \$500 for use of non-listed methods and not cutting tails flush in sheep < 2 months of age. I propose a penalty of prosecution for not using pain relief in sheep <2 months of age and a penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
71	Sheep	Mulesing
		I support the proposal to prohibit mulesing. I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
72	Deer	Develveting
		I support the proposal for develveting to be only performed by veterinarians, directly supervised veterinary students or a person with veterinary approval. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
73	Horses	Blistering, firing, or nicking
		I support the proposal to prohibit blistering, firing or nicking, and support the proposed infringement penalty.
74	Horses	Tail docking
		I support the proposal for tail docking to only be performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students, only for therapeutic reasons, only with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
75	Horses	Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal pregnancy diagnosis in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
76	Horses	Rectal examination of horses

		I support the proposal for rectal examination in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
77	Horses	Caslick's procedure
		I support the proposal for creation, opening and repair of caslick's procedure to only be performed by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and the use of pain relief for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty. I propose that a caslick's procedure may only be performed for therapeutic purposes and not for a perceived performance benefit and that the proposed infringement penalty for this breach is the same as that proposed above.
78	Horses	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
79	Llama and alpaca	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in llama and alpaca to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure, and the minimum age for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalties for these infringements.
80	Pigs	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration to only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision and the required use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution. I propose that a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) is also required and that the penalty for not administering an NSAID is \$300.
81	Pigs	Tail docking
		I propose that pain relief should be used for this procedure regardless of the animal's age. I support limiting the procedure to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students in animals > 7 days of age. I propose that a NSAID should also be administered at the time of the procedure. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and for a lay person performing the procedure in an animal > 7 days of age. I propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID administration.
82	Birds	Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird
		I support the restriction of pinioning/deflighting a bird to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only being performed in the best interests of the animal, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
83	Poultry	Dubbing
		I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence to perform dubbing on breeds not usually dubbed and to not use pain relief at the time of the procedure. I oppose the surgical modification of an animal if the modification is not in the interests of the animal, therefore I propose that dubbing is prohibited with the penalty of a prosecutable offence.
84	Ostriches and emus	Declawing
		I support the prohibition of radical declawing of emu chicks. However the use of the term radical implies that some declawing is allowed and opens the regulation to subjective interpretation. I propose that the regulation prohibit all declawing of emu or ostrich unless performed by a vet for therapeutic reasons. I support the penalty of prosecutable offence.

85	Roosters	Caponising (rooster castration)
		I support the restriction of caponising to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

Anna de Valk

s 9(2)(a)



RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



141

From: Chris Harkess s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, 18 May 2016 2:45 p.m.
To: Animal Welfare Submissions
Subject: Submission on Animal Welfare Regulations'
Categories: Blue Category

MPI Animal Welfare Codes Submission

Nathan Guy

Minister for Primary Industries

In response to MPI's request for feedback on proposed animal welfare regulations I submit the following for your careful consideration.

The given consultation period (14th April to 10 May 2016) for public involvement is woefully inadequate. Five weeks is unrealistic and makes a mockery of the consultation process. The volume of proposals we are being asked to consider in this time frame isn't feasible and I ask that a more realistic time frame be given for the public to have our say.

I suggest a period of five weeks be given to each section of the proposed welfare regulations.

While the proposed regulations relating to live animal exports, the care and conduct towards animals, and surgical and painful procedures is a start, I ask that there be a full review into intensive farming practices across the agricultural industry.

The last two decades have seen the intensification of animal agriculture to levels that are unprecedented in recent history¹. The current welfare codes and proposed welfare regulations don't go nearly far enough in protecting animal welfare under increasingly intensive farming practices.

Society's moral values are constantly shifting yet these regulations have remained largely static and are vastly out of step with changing attitudes to animal welfare². I want to see a total ban on all cages for layer hens, farrowing crates for sows and a reduction in intensive dairy resulting in the slaughter of over 2m calves annually.

These farming practices can no longer be deemed humane by today's standards and cannot be incorporated as such in any welfare code. The new rules are not keeping pace with changing scientific knowledge and cannot be accepted as good practice.

- 1) From 5.3m dairy cows in 2007 to 6.4m in 2012 (23% increase in just 5 years) Statistics NZ
- 2) Switzerland banned cages for hens in 1992

Care and conduct regulatory proposals		
1	All animals	Electric prodders
		<p>I propose that the use of electric prodders be banned under all circumstances except when they are "necessary for protection, preservation or maintenance of human life"</p> <p>I do not support exemptions on the use of prodders based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the species and size of an animal b. the manner of use of an animal (circus) c. the location of the animal (slaughter premises) <p>I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p>
2	All animals	Use of goads
		<p>I support the proposal to ban the use of goads on sensitive areas of an animal's body under any circumstances. Given the deliberate cruelty involved in using goads on sensitive areas I propose an increased infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
3	All animals	Twisting an animal's tail
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit painful twisting of an animal's tail. Given the potential for significant pain and damage from this behaviour, and the deliberate nature of the act I propose the infringement penalty is set at the higher level of \$500.</p>
Proposed	All animals	Any animal requiring manual lifting must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick animals).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed</p> <p>2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
4	Dogs	Pinch and Prong collars
		<p>I support the prohibition of pinch and prong collars under any circumstances; no exemption for dogs used for special purposes (guarding, military) is supported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300. I also support the banning of the sale of these collars and associated penalties under the law.</p>
5	Dogs	Injuries from collars or tethers

		I support the proposal to only use collars or tethers in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. Given the potential for severe injury from collars I propose the penalty is increased to a prosecutable offence.
6	Dogs	Muzzling a dog
		I support the proposal for regulating the use of muzzles so they do not cause injury or distress. I support the inclusion in the proposal that muzzles should allow for a dog to be able to drink. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
7	Dogs	Dry and shaded shelter
		I support the proposal for dogs to have access to dry and shaded shelter at all times. I propose the inclusion in the proposal that dogs also have access to fresh, palatable drinking water at all times. Given that shelter and water are basic needs of life neglecting these items has the potential to cause significant harm and even death therefore I propose the infringement penalty to be increased to a prosecutable offence. I also propose that there be a maximum time imposed that a dog is allowed to be chained for at any one time and that an infringement fee be set for exceeding that time.
8	Dogs	Dogs left in vehicles
		I support the proposal for people leaving dogs in vehicles to ensure their safety. I propose increasing the penalty to a prosecutable offence both to reflect the potential fatal nature of the injury and also to act as a suitable penalty to prevent this behaviour. Additionally increasing the penalty allows for effective prosecution of corporations who use dogs who have a responsibility to ensure dogs in their care are cared for appropriately.
9	Dogs	Secured on moving vehicles
		I support the proposal to secure dogs on moving vehicles. I propose including dogs on vehicles on private property in the regulation, and propose a speed limit of 40kph for vehicles carrying unsecured working dogs. I propose increasing the penalty for infringement to \$1000 due to the potential for severe injury, suffering, and death resulting from falling from a moving vehicle.
Proposed	Dogs	Ban export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Macau or China
		The Macau and China greyhound racing industries do not have the same standards of animal welfare as NZ. The export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Hong Kong (for further transport to Macau/China) is minimal at present. However if the export of greyhounds from other countries (Australia, Ireland) is banned or more heavily regulated then NZ could become a transport hub for dogs in this industry. This has the potential for poor welfare outcomes for dogs and very poor public perception in New Zealand. It is far better to ban an activity like this before it has the potential to become established. MPI have demonstrated their willingness to put in place infringements for uncommon industry activities which have the potential to become welfare issues in the future with proposal 50 in this document banning transport of young calves across cook strait. I propose the above regulation and propose the infringement penalty is set at a prosecutable offence.
10	Dogs and Cats	Drowning dogs and cats
		I support the prohibition of the killing of a dog or cat of any age by drowning. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
11	Eels	Insensible for desliming
		I support the proposal that eels must be insensible for desliming or killed before they are deslimed. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
12	Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish	Insensible before being killed

		<p>I support the proposal that crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish must be insensible before they are killed. I dispute the NAWAC statement that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible and propose that either:</p> <p>a. the only legally acceptable method of rendering crabs and crayfish insensible is by electrical stunning (for which specific equipment is available for use in small restaurant premises). OR</p> <p>b. NAWAC conduct a review of the recent (since 2000) scientific literature on humane slaughter of crustaceans and present good quality, recent evidence to support the claim that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for failing to render a crustacean insensible prior to slaughter.</p>
13	Goats	Tethering requirements
		<p>I do not support the tethering of goats, on the basis that it stops goats expressing normal social behaviours, and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$500. Furthermore I share concerns with previous submissions around tethering of goats that tourists witnessing tethered goats on the road side could easily get a negative impression of animal welfare in NZ.</p> <p>I propose that all goats, regardless of housing system, have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$500.</p> <p>I also propose that as goats are social animals¹ all goats should be provided with a companion such as another goat, camelid, horse, donkey or sheep. I propose that failure to house a goat with a companion should attract an infringement penalty of \$300.</p> <p>1. Miranda-de la Lama, G.C. and Mattiello, S. (2010). The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming. Small Ruminant Research 90, (1-3), 1-10</p>
14	Horses	Use of a whip, lead, or any other object
		I support the prohibition of using a whip, lead or other object to strike around the head. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
15	Horses	Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
16	Horses and Donkeys	Tethering requirements
		I do not support the tethering of horses and donkeys and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$300. I propose that all horses and donkeys have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times regardless of housing system and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$300.
17	Layer Hens	Opportunity to express normal behaviours in housing systems
		<p>I believe that colony cages do not adequately consider the welfare of layer hens because they prohibit the ability of the hen to express a range of normal behaviours. In addition, colony cages are not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 as they do not allow owners or persons in charge of animals to take all reasonable steps to ensure that their physical, health and behavioural needs are met¹.</p> <p>1) Sections 9, 68 Animal Welfare Act 1999</p>

18	Layer Hens	Stocking densities
		Colony cages do not allow hens to engage in a range of normal behaviours and therefore they are in clear breach of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. With a stocking density of 13 hens per square metre or 750 square centimetres, clearly the stocking density is too high.
19	Layer Hens	Housing and equipment design
		<p>Colony cages are only slightly bigger than traditional battery cages. While they provide token welfare gestures like nest boxes, scratch pads and perches, these gestures do not ensure the physical, health and behavioural needs of hens are met. With only 750 sq cm per hen, there are a number of behaviours hens are not able to functionally perform in colony cages; this includes spreading her wings fully¹. It's also questionable whether a hen in a colony cage can properly nest, perch, peck or scratch. A hen in a colony cage cannot dust bathe.</p> <p>Research has shown that some hens in colony cages can be prevented from using the nest provided due to competition from other hens². Also, the limited space in colony cages is insufficient to allow hens sufficient time (on average 45 minutes³) if they want to lay at the same time.</p> <p>In order to satisfy a hen's need for perching, the housing system must be able to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient length of perching space to allow all birds to perch at the same time; and • Sufficient elevation of the perches to satisfy the hens' requirements for a perceived safe perching place at night. <p>Colony cages fulfil neither of these requirements. The standard of approximately 15cm of space per hen is an average and does not allow consideration for larger birds. Perches in colony systems are situated on average just a few centimetres from the floor of the cage. <i>'A perch positioned 5cm above floor level is 'not considered as a perch (by a hen) and has no attractive or repulsive value'⁴.</i></p> <p>Litter is not provided in colony cage systems. Litter is imperative for hen welfare. Hens will make great efforts to access litter for pecking, scratching and dustbathing – three normal behaviours of hens⁴. When hens are unable to forage in litter, they can redirect their pecking towards other hens resulting in harmful feather pecking and even cannibalism. When hens are unable to dustbathe in litter, they can develop the dysfunctional behaviour of sham dustbathing.</p> <p>1) A hen's wingspan is approximately 75-80 centimetres which is twice the size of a traditional battery cage</p> <p>2) Guedson, V. and Faure, J. M. (2004) <i>Laying performance and egg quality in hens kept in standard or furnished cages</i>. Animal Research, 53: 45-57.</p> <p>3) Appleby, M.C. (1998) Modification of laying hen cages to improve behaviour. Poultry Science, 77: 1828-1832.</p> <p>4) Cooper, J.J. and Ablentosa, M. J. (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews, 14: 127-149.</p>
20	Layer Hens	Induced moulting
		I support the proposal to prohibit induced moulting of layer hens.
21	Llama and Alpaca	Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes, and packs
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.

22	Llama and Alpaca	Companion animals
		I support the proposal that camelids must be provided with a companion animal. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
23	Llama and Alpaca	Offspring (Cria) camelid companions
		I support the proposal to prohibit raising Cria without the company of other camelids. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
24	Pigs	Dry sleeping area
		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal that all pigs have access to a dry sleeping area.</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.</p>
25	Pigs	Lying space for grower pigs
		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal for minimum space requirements for grower pigs.</p> <p>1. Error in formula</p> <p>The proposed formula used to calculate the minimum space has a type error; specifically the exponent notation has not been applied. I believes the formula intended by MPI should read “live weight^{0.67} (kg)” but instead it reads “live weight 0.67(kg)” which translates to an Area = 0.03 * liveweight * 0.67(kg) and results in a much higher space requirement.</p> <p>Therefore I contend that proposal 25 must be rewritten and resubmitted for public consultation, with the correct formula included so that the intended space requirement can be properly considered.</p> <p>2. Minimum requirement</p> <p>Recent research suggests that a k-value of 0.3 is too low. In 2006, Gonyou et al. (2006)¹ which ADFI is reduced. More recently, a 2015 study has found that a k-value of 0.0336 might underestimate the impact of increased stocking density on ADG and ADFI².</p> <p>A k-value of 0.3 is too low to provide grower pigs with this environment and is sufficient as a minimum requirement for static space only.</p> <p>Does the proposal adequately define the appropriate systems?</p> <p>The proposal is based on a minimum standard, which is expected to occur (if at all) only where growers have reached the capacity of their pen and are shortly to be moved to a bigger pen³ not a minimum standard which is considered acceptable at all times and this should be clarified in the regulation itself.</p> <p>I consider the minimum standards of housing for pigs to be provide “sufficient space to enable them to perform natural behaviours such as lying on their side without touching another pig, standing up, turning around and performing exercise, space for separate areas for dunging and feeding, with a dunging areas situated a sufficient distance from sleeping and feeding areas as well as materials to enable them to root and forage”⁴. If these standards cannot be met by the current farming systems then we are concerned that</p>

		<p>the current farming systems are not compatible with the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour and breach the animal welfare act.</p> <p>The current regulation has no limit on the length of time during which a grower pig may be submitted to the proposed minimum standard. Overstocking is a known problem. I am concerned that grower pigs may be submitted to spaces which do not meet minimum requirement if their transfer to a new pen is delayed. I would like the regulations to be clear that it is unacceptable for growers to be kept for prolonged periods in spaces at or close to the minimum requirement. In its 2010 review, NAWAC submitted that space enough to allow for pigs to lie fully recumbent (k-value of 0.047) was recommended best practice.</p> <p>For the sake of clarity and to give effect to the intention of NAWAC, I suggest that a minimum period of time for growers kept in the lower end of the scale be added.</p> <p>Due to the above considerations, I propose that the minimum standard is amended to:</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must have lying space of at least: Area (m²) per pig = 0.040 x live weight 0.67(kg)</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must not have lying space of less than: Area (m²) per pig = 0.047 x live weight 0.67(kg) for longer than one week.</p> <p>Penalty: I support penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p> <p>Gonyou, H. W., M. C. Brumm, E. Bush, J. Deen, S. A. Edwards, T. Fangman, J. J. McGlone, M. Meunier-Salaun, R. B. Morrison, H. Spoolder, P. L. Sundberg, and A. K. Johnson. 2006. Application of broken-line analysis to assess floor space requirements of nursery and grower-finisher pigs expressed on an allometric basis. J. Anim. Sci. 84: 229-235.</p> <p>Thomas, LL. "The Effects of Increasing Stocking Density on Finishing Pig Growth ..." 2015. http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=kaesrr</p> <p>ibid. Page 9</p> <p>"ANIMAL WELFARE (Pigs) CODE OF WELFARE 2010 REPORT." 2015. 15 May. 2016 <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/1446></p>
26	Pigs	Dry sow stalls
		<p>Proposal: I support the prohibition of dry sow stalls</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p>
27	Pigs	Size of farrowing crates
		<p>Proposal: I do not support the use of farrowing crates.</p> <p>Production systems using farrowing crates are not the only financially viable forms of pork production. It is widely accepted that sow welfare in farrowing crates is sub-optimal. Continuing a production system which is contrary to good practice and scientific knowledge is in direct violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.</p> <p>In 2016, a review of Farrowing Crates for Pigs in NZ was submitted by NAWAC¹. In that report, NAWAC stated that "no significant change in science, technology or good practice from 2010 when the pigs code of welfare was issued". It submitted that the levels of piglet mortality in farrowing pens is higher than in farrowing crates and used this as justification for retaining farrowing crates in New Zealand. However, there is</p>

		<p>abundant research which supports the conclusion that total piglet mortality on farms with loose farrowing systems does not differ from that of farms with crates^{2,3}.</p> <p>I submit that farrowing crates are unacceptable in modern day pork production systems and must be banned outright.</p> <p>"National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee - NZPork." 2016. 15 May. 2016 http://www.nzpork.co.nz/images/custom/farrowing-crate-advice-14-march-2016.pdf</p> <p>Weber, R. "Piglet mortality on farms using farrowing systems ... - IngentaConnect." 2007. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ufaw/aw/2007/00000016/00000002/art00042</p> <p>KilBride, AL. "A cohort study of preweaning piglet mortality and ... - ScienceDirect." 2012. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167587711003564</p>
28	Pigs	Provision of nesting material
		<p>Proposal: I support the provision of nesting material that can be manipulated to sows. However, it is clear that sows in farrowing crates will be unable to exhibit natural nesting behaviours in the confined space of a farrowing crate. To give effect to the intention of providing nesting material, the sow must be given more space in which to move.</p> <p>I agree that the definition of manipulable material should be made more apparent. "Material at ground level which mimics that of natural nesting material and encourages the sow to exhibit rooting behaviour" would be appropriate. However, for clarity, I recommend that examples are provided for guidance. Appropriate examples would include straw and sawdust¹</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Chaloupková, H. "The effect of nesting material on the nest-building and maternal ... - NCBI." 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20889685</p>
29	Rodeos	Fireworks
		<p>I support the ban of fireworks at rodeo's, The loud noise of fireworks is well established as a stressor in companion animals (Bolster 2012; Dale et al., 2010) And Unexpected noise and movement will cause the fight or flight response in both horses and cattle (Lanier, 2000; Christensen, 2005).</p> <p>I would like to see a total ban on rodeo, rodeo is of no advantage to the economy. A petition recently submitted to parliament has 42,000 members of the public in support of such a ban. Rodeo is in breach of the animal welfare act which states that animals should be 'physically handled in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress.' The rodeo is a form of entertainment therefore making it an unnecessary activity for animals to be involved in. The likelihood of animals feeling distress while performing in rodeos could only be successfully minimised if rodeos were entirely stopped; goading animals into states of distress is fundamental to getting them to perform in rodeo events.</p> <p>As there have been many breaches of the rodeo code brought before MPI in 2014 and 2015 we strongly urge MPI to carefully consider if the codes are adequate in helping to minimise the likelihood of unreasonable and unnecessary pain or distress. We are aware of new breaches that will be brought before MPI for a third year running, this adds to the evidence that these codes are not adequate for protecting animals, therefore we feel that the only way to ensure these breaches do not continue is for an outright ban.</p>
30	Exotic animals	Used in circuses
		<p>I do not support the use of exotic animals in circuses and propose that their use be banned. Given that there are currently no circuses in NZ using exotic animals the banning of the practice now will cause no industry disruption. Popular opinion both here</p>

		and overseas is moving away from the use of exotic animals in circus and if this practice was to occur again in NZ it is likely that there would be a public outcry against it.
31	Cattle	Milk stimulation
		I support the proposal to prohibit the stimulation of milk let down by inserting water or air into a cow's vagina. I propose the prohibition is extended to include the insertion of any object into a cow's vagina to stimulate milk let down. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
32	Cattle and Sheep	Vehicular traction in calving or lambing
		I support the proposal to prohibit the use of a moving vehicle to provide traction in lambing or calving. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
33	Cattle and Sheep	Ingrown horns
		I support the proposal to require treatment for horns that are touching the skin or eye. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
34	Stock transport	Cuts and abrasions
		I support the proposal that transport should not result in cuts or abrasions. I propose the regulation is extended to all animals' not just cattle, sheep, deer, goats, and pigs. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
35	Stock transport	Animals with ingrown horns
		I support the proposal that animals with ingrown horns must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
36	Stock transport	Animals with bleeding horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with bleeding horns or antler must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
37	Stock transport	Animals with long horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with long horn or antler must not cause injury to themselves or others during transport. I could not find any rationale for the use of 110mm as a cut off value for long antler either in the code of welfare, or the report on the code. I propose that MPI publish the rationale behind the cut off value of 110mm or perform analysis of the injuries sustained from transport of animals with horns to determine if this measurement is an appropriate guide. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
38	Stock transport	Lame cattle, deer, pigs and goats
		I support the proposal that cattle, sheep, pigs and goats with lameness scores of 2 must be certified for transport by a veterinarian and that animals with a lameness score of 3 must not be transported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
39	Stock transport	Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury
		I support the proposal that animals who cannot bear weight evenly due to injury require certification from a veterinarian for transport. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.

40	Stock transport	Pregnant animals
		I support the proposal that animals who are in late stages of pregnancy should not be transported. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
41	Stock transport	Animals with injured or diseased udders
		I support the proposal that animals who have diseased udders should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
42	Stock transport	Cattle or sheep with cancer eye
		I support the proposal that animals who have cancer eye which is large, not confined to the eyelid or discharging/bleeding should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
Young calf management regulatory proposals		
43	Young Calves	Loading and unloading facilities
		I support the proposal that facilities must be provided which enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. Given the potential for severe injury and pain I propose that the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
Proposed	Young Calves	Calves must not be thrown, if they need to be manually lifted they must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick calves).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed</p> <p>https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Minimum training standard for people handling/loading calves
		I propose a minimum training standard is put in place for people loading calves on to transportation. Footage from 2015 clearly shows inappropriate handling of calves at the time of loading ¹ . A regulation for minimum training standards for those loading calves will not just improve calf welfare but will also demonstrate the transport industry's commitment to improving their part of the calf management chain. In contrast failure for the transport industry to demonstrate willingness to improve welfare outcomes for calves could reflect badly in the media. I propose infringement penalty is prosecution due to the lack of provision of appropriate training being a corporation level infringement and

		<p>therefore an appropriate penalty needs to be significant enough to deter corporations from flouting the law.</p> <p>http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Same day slaughter
		<p>I propose that all young calves received at a slaughter premises must be slaughtered that day and cannot be held overnight. It has been recognised by MPI that time off feed is a significant welfare concern in young calves therefore reducing the time spent at a slaughter premises aims to reduce the risk of calves spending an extended period of time off feed. Although an alternative proposal could be for feeding at arrival at slaughter premises given the other welfare issues of housing young calves I consider reducing holding time to a minimum as the least bad of the options. I propose an infringement penalty set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Use of nearest slaughterhouse
		<p>Increased time spent at transport has been shown to be one of the determinants of poorer outcomes for calves¹. For this reason I propose that calves are required to be slaughtered at the closest slaughter premises. I propose the infringement penalty to be set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
44	Young Calves	Shelter on farm, before and during transportation and at processing plants
		<p>I support the proposal for minimum standards of shelter on farm, before transportation, and at slaughter premises. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p>
45	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – age
		<p>I propose that the minimum age of transport is increased to 10 days to bring us in line with what is considered an acceptable standard of welfare in other developed countries. MPI have stated that the 4 day standard suggested in the proposed regulation has been suggested as this reflects current industry practice. However the transport code of welfare only cites research performed in calves 5-10 days of age¹ therefore I propose that the absolute minimum age of transport be set at 5 days of age. I support the most conservative determination of age – that it is determined from the time the calf is separated from the dam. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p>
46	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – Physical characteristics
		<p>I support the proposal that the list of physical characteristics provided with regulation 46 should be met prior to transport of young calves. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p>
47	Young Calves	Maximum time off feed

		<p>I support the proposal for regulating the maximum time off feed for young calves, however we propose this is reduced to 12 hours. The lack of physiological indicators in the 2000 Todd paper¹ does not demonstrate that:</p> <p>this is in fact the case in calves <5 days of age or</p> <p>that these calves are not experiencing significant hunger or</p> <p>that these calves have the physiological capacity to respond to transport in a measurable way with the tools used in the study²</p> <p>I propose that calves undergoing transport are kept to the same feeding schedule they would have if they remained on farm. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p> <p>Knowles, T.G., Warriss, P.D., Brown, S.N., Edwards, J.E., Watkins, P.E. and Phillips, A.J. 1997. Effects on calves less than one month old of feeding or not feeding them during road transport of up to 24 hours. Veterinary Record 140, 116-124.</p>
48	Young Calves	Duration of transport
		<p>I support limiting the duration of transport of young calves to 8 hours or less. As length of transport has been shown to be associated with poorer outcomes for calves¹ we propose an increase in the infringement penalty to \$1000.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
49	Young Calves	Blunt force trauma
		I support the prohibition of the use of blunt force trauma for killing calves. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to receive appropriate penalties to deter this behaviour.
50	Young Calves	Transport by sea across Cook Strait prohibited
		I support the prohibition of transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to be held accountable.
Surgical and painful procedures regulatory proposals		
51	All animals	Hot branding
		I support the prohibition of hot branding and the penalty of prosecution.
52	All animals	Embryo collection via exteriorised uterus (surgical embryo transfer)
		<p>I do not support the collection of embryos via exteriorised uterus and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).</p>

53	All animals	Laparoscopic artificial insemination (laparoscopic AI)
		I do not support the use of laparoscopic AI and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
54	All animals	Liver biopsy
		I support the proposal for liver biopsy to be restricted to being performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students and the requirement for the use of pain relief. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
55	All animals	Dental work
		I support the proposal that any power tool used for dental work must be designed for the purpose of dentistry. I propose the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
56	Cats	Declawing
		I support the restriction of cat declawing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
57	Companion animals	Desexing (including stray/feral cats, dogs and other species)
		I support the restriction of desexing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence. I propose that all cats and dogs sold in pet shops be desexed and vaccinated before being released to the purchaser. This would work as a preventative step in helping reduce the number of stray/feral cats and dogs over time.
58	Dogs	Freeze branding
		I propose that freeze branding of dogs is banned. With better technology now available we can microchip dogs rather than freeze branding them. In the case that freeze branding is not prohibited I support the restriction of freeze branding to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
59	Dogs	Dog debarking (and devoicing of other species)
		I support the restriction of dog debarking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
60	Dogs	Cropping the ears
		I support the proposal to prohibit ear cropping of dogs. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

61	Dogs	Dew claws
		I support the restriction of removal of articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose restriction of removal of non-articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution.
62	Dogs	Tail docking
		I support the docking of tails in dogs for therapeutic reasons only. The procedure must be performed by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Pain relief must be used at the time of this procedure.
63	Cattle	Teats
		<p>I support the proposal for supernumerary teat removal of animals >6 weeks of age to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief must be used. I do not support the removal of supernumerary teats in animals <6 weeks of age without pain relief, however the procedure could be undertaken by a skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie a vet tech). I propose that:</p> <p>the maximum of age of animals on whom supernumerary teat removal can be performed by a lay person is reduced to 4 weeks of age</p> <p>i) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>pain relief is required for any supernumerary teat removal procedure regardless of age</p> <p>ii) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>procedure is performed using sterilised equipment</p> <p>iii) infringement penalty of \$500</p> <p>any person performing the procedure who is not a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student is signed off by a veterinarian</p> <p>iv) infringement penalty of prosecution</p>
64	Cattle	Claw removal
		I support the proposal that claw removal is restricted to being performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief is required at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) pain relief is also administered. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
65	Cattle	Teat occlusion
		I support the proposal that teat sealing can only be performed with a product registered for that specific purpose. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution.
66	Cattle	Tail docking
		I support the restriction of tail docking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons only, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.

67	Cattle and sheep	Castration and shortening of the scrotum (cryptorchid)
		I support the proposal for surgical castration at any age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I support the proposal that non-surgical castration in cattle and sheep over 6 months of age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the age of 6 months as an appropriate age at which lay people can no longer perform non-surgical castration and propose that this age limit is lowered to 2 months, I support limiting the manner of non-surgical castration to only the use of conventional rubber rings. I does not support performing non-surgical castration without pain relief at any age and propose that pain relief is required for any castration procedure at any age. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also required. I propose that the penalty for all infringements other than lack of NSAID use is prosecution and that the penalty for not using an NSAID is an infringement of \$300.
68	Cattle, sheep and goats	Disbudding
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian, veterinary student under direct supervision, or skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie vet tech/appropriately trained farm worker). I propose that appropriate maximum ages are determined for disbudding to be performed by a lay person. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
69	Cattle, sheep and goats	Dehorning
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision. Given the much greater risk of pain, bleeding, and infection from dehorning rather than disbudding I propose that farmers are given 12 months warning after which dehorning can only be performed by veterinarians. This will give a strong message that disbudding is much preferred and much more economically viable. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
70	Sheep	Tail docking
		<p>I support the limiting of tail docking in sheep who are greater than 6 months of age to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered.</p> <p>I support restricting the techniques for tail docking in younger animals to rubber ring and hot iron only. I propose that pain relief at the time of procedure and NSAID should also be required, regardless of age at the time of tail docking.</p> <p>Furthermore I propose that the maximum age at which a lay person is able to perform a tail docking procedure is reduced to 2 months.</p> <p>I support the proposal that tails are not to be cut flush and are to be able to cover the vulva in a female and of a similar length in a male.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for infringements in sheep > 2 months of age and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p>

		I support the proposed penalties of \$500 for use of non-listed methods and not cutting tails flush in sheep < 2 months of age. I propose a penalty of prosecution for not using pain relief in sheep <2 months of age and a penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
71	Sheep	Mulesing
		I support the proposal to prohibit mulesing. I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
72	Deer	Develveting
		I support the proposal for develveting to be only performed by veterinarians, directly supervised veterinary students or a person with veterinary approval. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
73	Horses	Blistering, firing, or nicking
		I support the proposal to prohibit blistering, firing or nicking, and support the proposed infringement penalty.
74	Horses	Tail docking
		I support the proposal for tail docking to only be performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students, only for therapeutic reasons, only with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
75	Horses	Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal pregnancy diagnosis in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
76	Horses	Rectal examination of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal examination in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
77	Horses	Caslick's procedure
		I support the proposal for creation, opening and repair of caslick's procedure to only be performed by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and the use of pain relief for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty. I propose that a caslick's procedure may only be performed for therapeutic purposes and not for a perceived performance benefit and that the proposed infringement penalty for this breach is the same as that proposed above.
78	Horses	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
79	Llama and alpaca	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in llama and alpaca to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure, and the minimum age for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalties for these infringements.
80	Pigs	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration to only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision and the required use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution. I propose that a non-

		steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) is also required and that the penalty for not administering an NSAID is \$300.
81	Pigs	Tail docking
		I propose that pain relief should be used for this procedure regardless of the animal's age. I support limiting the procedure to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students in animals > 7 days of age. I propose that a NSAID should also be administered at the time of the procedure. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and for a lay person performing the procedure in an animal > 7 days of age. I propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID administration.
82	Birds	Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird
		I support the restriction of pinioning/deflighting a bird to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only being performed in the best interests of the animal, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
83	Poultry	Dubbing
		I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence to perform dubbing on breeds not usually dubbed and to not use pain relief at the time of the procedure. I oppose the surgical modification of an animal if the modification is not in the interests of the animal, therefore I propose that dubbing is prohibited with the penalty of a prosecutable offence.
84	Ostriches and emus	Declawing
		I support the prohibition of radical declawing of emu chicks. However the use of the term radical implies that some declawing is allowed and opens the regulation to subjective interpretation. I propose that the regulation prohibit all declawing of emu or ostrich unless performed by a vet for therapeutic reasons. I support the penalty of prosecutable offence.
85	Roosters	Caponising (rooster castration)
		I support the restriction of caponising to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

Submitted by:

Deirdre Sims

s 9(2)(a)

MPI Animal Welfare Codes Submission

Nathan Guy

Minister for Primary Industries

In response to MPI's request for feedback on proposed animal welfare regulations I submit the following for your careful consideration.

The given consultation period (14th April to 10 May 2016) for public involvement is woefully inadequate. Five weeks is unrealistic and makes a mockery of the consultation process. The volume of proposals we are being asked to consider in this time frame isn't feasible and I ask that a more realistic time frame be given for the public to have our say.

I suggest a period of five weeks be given to each section of the proposed welfare regulations.

While the proposed regulations relating to live animal exports, the care and conduct towards animals, and surgical and painful procedures is a start, I ask that there be a full review into intensive farming practices across the agricultural industry.

The last two decades have seen the intensification of animal agriculture to levels that are unprecedented in recent history¹. The current welfare codes and proposed welfare regulations don't go nearly far enough in protecting animal welfare under increasingly intensive farming practices.

Society's moral values are constantly shifting yet these regulations have remained largely static and are vastly out of step with changing attitudes to animal welfare². I want to see a total ban on all cages for layer hens, farrowing crates for sows and a reduction in intensive dairy resulting in the slaughter of over 2m calves annually.

These farming practices can no longer be deemed humane by today's standards and cannot be incorporated as such in any welfare code. The new rules are not keeping pace with changing scientific knowledge and cannot be accepted as good practice.

- 1) From 5.3m dairy cows in 2007 to 6.4m in 2012 (23% increase in just 5 years) Statistics NZ
- 2) Switzerland banned cages for hens in 1992

Care and conduct regulatory proposals		
1	All animals	Electric prodders
		<p>I propose that the use of electric prodders be banned under all circumstances except when they are "necessary for protection, preservation or maintenance of human life"</p> <p>I do not support exemptions on the use of prodders based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the species and size of an animal b. the manner of use of an animal (circus) c. the location of the animal (slaughter premises) <p>I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p>

2	All animals	Use of goads
		I support the proposal to ban the use of goads on sensitive areas of an animal's body under any circumstances. Given the deliberate cruelty involved in using goads on sensitive areas I propose an increased infringement penalty of \$500.
3	All animals	Twisting an animal's tail
		I support the proposal to prohibit painful twisting of an animal's tail. Given the potential for significant pain and damage from this behaviour, and the deliberate nature of the act I propose the infringement penalty is set at the higher level of \$500.
Proposed	All animals	Any animal requiring manual lifting must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick animals).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed</p> <p>2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
4	Dogs	Pinch and Prong collars
		I support the prohibition of pinch and prong collars under any circumstances; no exemption for dogs used for special purposes (guarding, military) is supported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300. I also support the banning of the sale of these collars and associated penalties under the law.
5	Dogs	Injuries from collars or tethers
		I support the proposal to only use collars or tethers in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. Given the potential for severe injury from collars I propose the penalty is increased to a prosecutable offence.
6	Dogs	Muzzling a dog
		I support the proposal for regulating the use of muzzles so they do not cause injury or distress. I support the inclusion in the proposal that muzzles should allow for a dog to be able to drink. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
7	Dogs	Dry and shaded shelter
		I support the proposal for dogs to have access to dry and shaded shelter at all times. I propose the inclusion in the proposal that dogs also have access to fresh, palatable drinking water at all times. Given that shelter and water are basic needs of life neglecting these items has the potential to cause significant harm and even death therefore I propose the infringement penalty to be increased to a prosecutable offence. I also propose that there be a maximum time imposed that a dog is allowed to be chained for at any one time and that an infringement fee be set for exceeding that time.
8	Dogs	Dogs left in vehicles
		I support the proposal for people leaving dogs in vehicles to ensure their safety. I propose increasing the penalty to a prosecutable offence both to reflect the potential fatal nature of the injury and also to act as a suitable penalty to prevent this behaviour. Additionally increasing the penalty allows for effective prosecution of corporations who use dogs who have a responsibility to ensure dogs in their care are cared for appropriately.

9	Dogs	Secured on moving vehicles
		I support the proposal to secure dogs on moving vehicles. I propose including dogs on vehicles on private property in the regulation, and propose a speed limit of 40kph for vehicles carrying unsecured working dogs. I propose increasing the penalty for infringement to \$1000 due to the potential for severe injury, suffering, and death resulting from falling from a moving vehicle.
Proposed	Dogs	Ban export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Macau or China
		The Macau and China greyhound racing industries do not have the same standards of animal welfare as NZ. The export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Hong Kong (for further transport to Macau/China) is minimal at present. However if the export of greyhounds from other countries (Australia, Ireland) is banned or more heavily regulated then NZ could become a transport hub for dogs in this industry. This has the potential for poor welfare outcomes for dogs and very poor public perception in New Zealand. It is far better to ban an activity like this before it has the potential to become established. MPI have demonstrated their willingness to put in place infringements for uncommon industry activities which have the potential to become welfare issues in the future with proposal 50 in this document banning transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I propose the above regulation and propose the infringement penalty is set at a prosecutable offence.
10	Dogs and Cats	Drowning dogs and cats
		I support the prohibition of the killing of a dog or cat of any age by drowning. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
11	Eels	Insensible for desliming
		I support the proposal that eels must be insensible for desliming or killed before they are deslimed. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
12	Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish	Insensible before being killed
		<p>I support the proposal that crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish must be insensible before they are killed. I dispute the NAWAC statement that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible and propose that either:</p> <p>a. the only legally acceptable method of rendering crabs and crayfish insensible is by electrical stunning (for which specific equipment is available for use in small restaurant premises). OR</p> <p>b. NAWAC conduct a review of the recent (since 2000) scientific literature on humane slaughter of crustaceans and present good quality, recent evidence to support the claim that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for failing to render a crustacean insensible prior to slaughter.</p>
13	Goats	Tethering requirements
		<p>I do not support the tethering of goats, on the basis that it stops goats expressing normal social behaviours, and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$500. Furthermore I share concerns with previous submissions around tethering of goats that tourists witnessing tethered goats on the road side could easily get a negative impression of animal welfare in NZ.</p> <p>I propose that all goats, regardless of housing system, have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$500.</p>

		<p>I also propose that as goats are social animals¹ all goats should be provided with a companion such as another goat, camelid, horse, donkey or sheep. I propose that failure to house a goat with a companion should attract an infringement penalty of \$300.</p> <p>1. Miranda-de la Lama, G.C. and Mattiello, S. (2010). The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming. Small Ruminant Research 90, (1-3), 1-10</p>
14	Horses	Use of a whip, lead, or any other object
		I support the prohibition of using a whip, lead or other object to strike around the head. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
15	Horses	Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
16	Horses and Donkeys	Tethering requirements
		I do not support the tethering of horses and donkeys and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$300. I propose that all horses and donkeys have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times regardless of housing system and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$300.
17	Layer Hens	Opportunity to express normal behaviours in housing systems
		<p>I believe that colony cages do not adequately consider the welfare of layer hens because they prohibit the ability of the hen to express a range of normal behaviours. In addition, colony cages are not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 as they do not allow owners or persons in charge of animals to take all reasonable steps to ensure that their physical, health and behavioural needs are met¹.</p> <p>1) Sections 9, 68 Animal Welfare Act 1999</p>
18	Layer Hens	Stocking densities
		Colony cages do not allow hens to engage in a range of normal behaviours and therefore they are in clear breach of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. With a stocking density of 13 hens per square metre or 750 square centimetres, clearly the stocking density is too high.
19	Layer Hens	Housing and equipment design
		<p>Colony cages are only slightly bigger than traditional battery cages. While they provide token welfare gestures like nest boxes, scratch pads and perches, these gestures do not ensure the physical, health and behavioural needs of hens are met. With only 750 sq cm per hen, there are a number of behaviours hens are not able to functionally perform in colony cages; this includes spreading her wings fully¹. It's also questionable whether a hen in a colony cage can properly nest, perch, peck or scratch. A hen in a colony cage cannot dust bathe.</p> <p>Research has shown that some hens in colony cages can be prevented from using the nest provided due to competition from other hens². Also, the limited space in colony cages is insufficient to allow hens sufficient time (on average 45 minutes³) if they want to lay at the same time.</p> <p>In order to satisfy a hen's need for perching, the housing system must be able to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient length of perching space to allow all birds to perch at the same time; and

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient elevation of the perches to satisfy the hens' requirements for a perceived safe perching place at night. <p>Colony cages fulfil neither of these requirements. The standard of approximately 15cm of space per hen is an average and does not allow consideration for larger birds. Perches in colony systems are situated on average just a few centimetres from the floor of the cage. <i>'A perch positioned 5cm above floor level is 'not considered as a perch (by a hen) and has no attractive or repulsive value'⁴.</i></p> <p>Litter is not provided in colony cage systems. Litter is imperative for hen welfare. Hens will make great efforts to access litter for pecking, scratching and dustbathing – three normal behaviours of hens⁴. When hens are unable to forage in litter, they can redirect their pecking towards other hens resulting in harmful feather pecking and even cannibalism. When hens are unable to dustbathe in litter, they can develop the dysfunctional behaviour of sham dustbathing.</p> <p>1) A hen's wingspan is approximately 75-80 centimetres which is twice the size of a traditional battery cage</p> <p>2) Guedson, V. and Faure, J. M. (2004) <i>Laying performance and egg quality in hens kept in standard or furnished cages</i>. Animal Research, 53: 45-57.</p> <p>3) Appleby, M.C. (1998) Modification of laying hen cages to improve behaviour. Poultry Science, 77: 1828-1832.</p> <p>4) Cooper, J.J. and Ablettosa, M. J. (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews, 14: 127-149.</p>
20	Layer Hens	Induced moulting
		I support the proposal to prohibit induced moulting of layer hens.
21	Llama and Alpaca	Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes, and packs
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
22	Llama and Alpaca	Companion animals
		I support the proposal that camelids must be provided with a companion animal. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
23	Llama and Alpaca	Offspring (Cria) camelid companions
		I support the proposal to prohibit raising Cria without the company of other camelids. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
24	Pigs	Dry sleeping area
		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal that all pigs have access to a dry sleeping area.</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.</p>
25	Pigs	Lying space for grower pigs
		Proposal: I support the proposal for minimum space requirements for grower pigs.

1. Error in formula

The proposed formula used to calculate the minimum space has a type error; specifically the exponent notation has not been applied. I believe the formula intended by MPI should read "live weight^{0.67} (kg)" but instead it reads "live weight 0.67(kg)" which translates to an Area = 0.03 * liveweight * 0.67(kg) and results in a much higher space requirement.

Therefore I contend that proposal 25 must be rewritten and resubmitted for public consultation, with the correct formula included so that the intended space requirement can be properly considered.

2. Minimum requirement

Recent research suggests that a k-value of 0.3 is too low. In 2006, Gonyou et al. (2006)¹ which ADFI is reduced. More recently, a 2015 study has found that a k-value of 0.0336 might underestimate the impact of increased stocking density on ADG and ADFI².

A k-value of 0.3 is too low to provide grower pigs with this environment and is sufficient as a minimum requirement for static space only.

Does the proposal adequately define the appropriate systems?

The proposal is based on a minimum standard, which is expected to occur (if at all) only where growers have reached the capacity of their pen and are shortly to be moved to a bigger pen³ not a minimum standard which is considered acceptable at all times and this should be clarified in the regulation itself.

I consider the minimum standards of housing for pigs to be provide "sufficient space to enable them to perform natural behaviours such as lying on their side without touching another pig, standing up, turning around and performing exercise, space for separate areas for dunging and feeding, with a dunging areas situated a sufficient distance from sleeping and feeding areas as well as materials to enable them to root and forage"⁴. If these standards cannot be met by the current farming systems then we are concerned that the current farming systems are not compatible with the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour and breach the animal welfare act.

The current regulation has no limit on the length of time during which a grower pig may be submitted to the proposed minimum standard. Overstocking is a known problem. I am concerned that grower pigs may be submitted to spaces which do not meet minimum requirement if their transfer to a new pen is delayed. I would like the regulations to be clear that it is unacceptable for growers to be kept for prolonged periods in spaces at or close to the minimum requirement. In its 2010 review, NAWAC submitted that space enough to allow for pigs to lie fully recumbent (k-value of 0.047) was recommended best practice.

For the sake of clarity and to give effect to the intention of NAWAC, I suggest that a minimum period of time for growers kept in the lower end of the scale be added.

Due to the above considerations, I propose that the minimum standard is amended to:

Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must have lying space of at least: Area (m²) per pig = 0.040 x live weight 0.67(kg)

Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must not have lying space of less than: Area (m²) per pig = 0.047 x live weight 0.67(kg) for longer than one week.

Penalty: I support penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.

		<p>Gonyou, H. W., M. C. Brumm, E. Bush, J. Deen, S. A. Edwards, T. Fangman, J. J. McGlone, M. Meunier-Salaun, R. B. Morrison, H. Spoolder, P. L. Sundberg, and A. K. Johnson. 2006. Application of broken-line analysis to assess floor space requirements of nursery and grower-finisher pigs expressed on an allometric basis. J. Anim. Sci. 84: 229-235.</p> <p>Thomas, LL. "The Effects of Increasing Stocking Density on Finishing Pig Growth ...". 2015. http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=kaesrr</p> <p>ibid. Page 9</p> <p>"ANIMAL WELFARE (Pigs) CODE OF WELFARE 2010 REPORT." 2015. 15 May. 2016 <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/1446></p>
26	Pigs	Dry sow stalls
		<p>Proposal: I support the prohibition of dry sow stalls</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p>
27	Pigs	Size of farrowing crates
		<p>Proposal: I do not support the use of farrowing crates.</p> <p>Production systems using farrowing crates are not the only financially viable forms of pork production. It is widely accepted that sow welfare in farrowing crates is sub-optimal. Continuing a production system which is contrary to good practice and scientific knowledge is in direct violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.</p> <p>In 2016, a review of Farrowing Crates for Pigs in NZ was submitted by NAWAC¹. In that report, NAWAC stated that "no significant change in science, technology or good practice from 2010 when the pigs code of welfare was issued". It submitted that the levels of piglet mortality in farrowing pens is higher than in farrowing crates and used this as justification for retaining farrowing crates in New Zealand. However, there is abundant research which supports the conclusion that total piglet mortality on farms with loose farrowing systems does not differ from that of farms with crates^{2,3}.</p> <p>I submit that farrowing crates are unacceptable in modern day pork production systems and must be banned outright.</p> <p>"National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee - NZPork." 2016. 15 May. 2016 http://www.nzpork.co.nz/images/custom/farrowing-crate-advice-14-march-2016.pdf</p> <p>Weber, R. "Piglet mortality on farms using farrowing systems ... - IngentaConnect." 2007. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ufaw/aw/2007/00000016/00000002/art00042</p> <p>KilBride, AL. "A cohort study of preweaning piglet mortality and ... - ScienceDirect." 2012. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167587711003564</p>
28	Pigs	Provision of nesting material
		<p>Proposal: I support the provision of nesting material that can be manipulated to sows. However, it is clear that sows in farrowing crates will be unable to exhibit natural nesting behaviours in the confined space of a farrowing crate. To give effect to the intention of providing nesting material, the sow must be given more space in which to move.</p> <p>I agree that the definition of manipulable material should be made more apparent. "Material at ground level which mimics that of natural nesting material and encourages the sow to exhibit rooting behaviour" would be appropriate. However, for</p>

		<p>clarity, I recommend that examples are provided for guidance. Appropriate examples would include straw and sawdust¹</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Chaloupková, H. "The effect of nesting material on the nest-building and maternal ... - NCBI." 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20889685</p>
29	Rodeos	Fireworks
		<p>I support the ban of fireworks at rodeo's, The loud noise of fireworks is well established as a stressor in companion animals (Bolster 2012; Dale et al., 2010) And Unexpected noise and movement will cause the fight or flight response in both horses and cattle (Lanier, 2000; Christensen, 2005).</p> <p>I would like to see a total ban on rodeo, rodeo is of no advantage to the economy. A petition recently submitted to parliament has 42,000 members of the public in support of such a ban. Rodeo is in breach of the animal welfare act which states that animals should be 'physically handled in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress.' The rodeo is a form of entertainment therefore making it an unnecessary activity for animals to be involved in. The likelihood of animals feeling distress while performing in rodeos could only be successfully minimised if rodeos were entirely stopped; goading animals into states of distress is fundamental to getting them to perform in rodeo events.</p> <p>As there have been many breaches of the rodeo code brought before MPI in 2014 and 2015 we strongly urge MPI to carefully consider if the codes are adequate in helping to minimise the likelihood of unreasonable and unnecessary pain or distress. We are aware of new breaches that will be brought before MPI for a third year running, this adds to the evidence that these codes are not adequate for protecting animals, therefore we feel that the only way to ensure these breaches do not continue is for an outright ban.</p>
30	Exotic animals	Used in circuses
		<p>I do not support the use of exotic animals in circuses and propose that their use be banned. Given that there are currently no circuses in NZ using exotic animals the banning of the practice now will cause no industry disruption. Popular opinion both here and overseas is moving away from the use of exotic animals in circus and if this practice was to occur again in NZ it is likely that there would be a public outcry against it.</p>
31	Cattle	Milk stimulation
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit the stimulation of milk let down by inserting water or air into a cow's vagina. I propose the prohibition is extended to include the insertion of any object into a cow's vagina to stimulate milk let down. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.</p>
32	Cattle and Sheep	Vehicular traction in calving or lambing
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit the use of a moving vehicle to provide traction in lambing or calving. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
33	Cattle and Sheep	Ingrown horns
		<p>I support the proposal to require treatment for horns that are touching the skin or eye. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
34	Stock transport	Cuts and abrasions

		I support the proposal that transport should not result in cuts or abrasions. I propose the regulation is extended to all animals' not just cattle, sheep, deer, goats, and pigs. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
35	Stock transport	Animals with ingrown horns
		I support the proposal that animals with ingrown horns must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
36	Stock transport	Animals with bleeding horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with bleeding horns or antler must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
37	Stock transport	Animals with long horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with long horn or antler must not cause injury to themselves or others during transport. I could not find any rationale for the use of 110mm as a cut off value for long antler either in the code of welfare, or the report on the code. I propose that MPI publish the rationale behind the cut off value of 110mm or perform analysis of the injuries sustained from transport of animals with horns to determine if this measurement is an appropriate guide. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
38	Stock transport	Lame cattle, deer, pigs and goats
		I support the proposal that cattle, sheep, pigs and goats with lameness scores of 2 must be certified for transport by a veterinarian and that animals with a lameness score of 3 must not be transported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
39	Stock transport	Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury
		I support the proposal that animals who cannot bear weight evenly due to injury require certification from a veterinarian for transport. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
40	Stock transport	Pregnant animals
		I support the proposal that animals who are in late stages of pregnancy should not be transported. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
41	Stock transport	Animals with injured or diseased udders
		I support the proposal that animals who have diseased udders should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
42	Stock transport	Cattle or sheep with cancer eye
		I support the proposal that animals who have cancer eye which is large, not confined to the eyelid or discharging/bleeding should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.

Young calf management regulatory proposals		
43	Young Calves	Loading and unloading facilities
		I support the proposal that facilities must be provided which enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. Given the potential for severe injury and pain I propose that the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
Proposed	Young Calves	Calves must not be thrown, if they need to be manually lifted they must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick calves).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed</p> <p>https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Minimum training standard for people handling/loading calves
		<p>I propose a minimum training standard is put in place for people loading calves on to transportation. Footage from 2015 clearly shows inappropriate handling of calves at the time of loading¹. A regulation for minimum training standards for those loading calves will not just improve calf welfare but will also demonstrate the transport industry's commitment to improving their part of the calf management chain. In contrast failure for the transport industry to demonstrate willingness to improve welfare outcomes for calves could reflect badly in the media. I propose infringement penalty is prosecution due to the lack of provision of appropriate training being a corporation level infringement and therefore an appropriate penalty needs to be significant enough to deter corporations from flouting the law.</p> <p>http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Same day slaughter
		I propose that all young calves received at a slaughter premises must be slaughtered that day and cannot be held overnight. It has been recognised by MPI that time off feed is a significant welfare concern in young calves therefore reducing the time spent at a slaughter premises aims to reduce the risk of calves spending an extended period of time off feed. Although an alternative proposal could be for feeding at arrival at slaughter premises given the other welfare issues of housing young calves I consider reducing holding time to a minimum as the least bad of the options. I propose an infringement penalty set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.
Proposed	Young Calves	Use of nearest slaughterhouse
		Increased time spent at transport has been shown to be one of the determinants of poorer outcomes for calves ¹ . For this reason I propose that calves are required to be slaughtered at the closest slaughter premises. I propose the infringement penalty to be set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.

		Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84
44	Young Calves	Shelter on farm, before and during transportation and at processing plants
		I support the proposal for minimum standards of shelter on farm, before transportation, and at slaughter premises. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
45	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – age
		<p>I propose that the minimum age of transport is increased to 10 days to bring us in line with what is considered an acceptable standard of welfare in other developed countries. MPI have stated that the 4 day standard suggested in the proposed regulation has been suggested as this reflects current industry practice. However the transport code of welfare only cites research performed in calves 5-10 days of age¹ therefore I propose that the absolute minimum age of transport be set at 5 days of age. I support the most conservative determination of age – that it is determined from the time the calf is separated from the dam. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p>
46	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – Physical characteristics
		I support the proposal that the list of physical characteristics provided with regulation 46 should be met prior to transport of young calves. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
47	Young Calves	Maximum time off feed
		<p>I support the proposal for regulating the maximum time off feed for young calves, however we propose this is reduced to 12 hours. The lack of physiological indicators in the 2000 Todd paper¹ does not demonstrate that:</p> <p>this is in fact the case in calves <5 days of age or</p> <p>that these calves are not experiencing significant hunger or</p> <p>that these calves have the physiological capacity to respond to transport in a measurable way with the tools used in the study²</p> <p>I propose that calves undergoing transport are kept to the same feeding schedule they would have if they remained on farm. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p> <p>Knowles, T.G., Warriss, P.D., Brown, S.N., Edwards, J.E., Watkins, P.E. and Phillips, A.J. 1997. Effects on calves less than one month old of feeding or not feeding them during road transport of up to 24 hours. Veterinary Record 140, 116-124.</p>
48	Young Calves	Duration of transport

		<p>I support limiting the duration of transport of young calves to 8 hours or less. As length of transport has been shown to be associated with poorer outcomes for calves¹ we propose an increase in the infringement penalty to \$1000.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
49	Young Calves	Blunt force trauma
		I support the prohibition of the use of blunt force trauma for killing calves. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to receive appropriate penalties to deter this behaviour.
50	Young Calves	Transport by sea across Cook Strait prohibited
		I support the prohibition of transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to be held accountable.
Surgical and painful procedures regulatory proposals		
51	All animals	Hot branding
		I support the prohibition of hot branding and the penalty of prosecution.
52	All animals	Embryo collection via exteriorised uterus (surgical embryo transfer)
		I do not support the collection of embryos via exteriorised uterus and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
53	All animals	Laparoscopic artificial insemination (laparoscopic AI)
		I do not support the use of laparoscopic AI and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
54	All animals	Liver biopsy
		I support the proposal for liver biopsy to be restricted to being performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students and the requirement for the use of pain relief. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
55	All animals	Dental work
		I support the proposal that any power tool used for dental work must be designed for the purpose of dentistry. I propose the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
56	Cats	Declawing
		I support the restriction of cat declawing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's

		best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
57	Companion animals	Desexing (including stray/feral cats, dogs and other species)
		I support the restriction of desexing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence. I purpose that all cats and dogs sold in pet shops be desexed and vaccinated before being released to the purchaser. This would work as a preventative step in helping reduce the number of stray/feral cats and dogs over time.
58	Dogs	Freeze branding
		I propose that freeze branding of dogs is banned. With better technology now available we can microchip dogs rather than freeze branding them. In the case that freeze branding is not prohibited I support the restriction of freeze branding to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
59	Dogs	Dog debarking (and devoicing of other species)
		I support the restriction of dog debarking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
60	Dogs	Cropping the ears
		I support the proposal to prohibit ear cropping of dogs. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
61	Dogs	Dew claws
		I support the restriction of removal of articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose restriction of removal of non-articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution.
62	Dogs	Tail docking
		I support the docking of tails in dogs for therapeutic reasons only. The procedure must be performed by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Pain relief must be used at the time of this procedure.
63	Cattle	Teats
		I support the proposal for supernumerary teat removal of animals >6 weeks of age to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the removal of supernumerary teats in animals <6 weeks of age without pain relief, however the procedure could be undertaken by a skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie a vet tech). I propose that: the maximum of age of animals on whom supernumerary teat removal can be performed by a lay person is reduced to 4 weeks of age

		<p>i) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>pain relief is required for any supernumerary teat removal procedure regardless of age</p> <p>ii) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>procedure is performed using sterilised equipment</p> <p>iii) infringement penalty of \$500</p> <p>any person performing the procedure who is not a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student is signed off by a veterinarian</p> <p>iv) infringement penalty of prosecution</p>
64	Cattle	Claw removal
		<p>I support the proposal that claw removal is restricted to being performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief is required at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) pain relief is also administered. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.</p>
65	Cattle	Teat occlusion
		<p>I support the proposal that teat sealing can only be performed with a product registered for that specific purpose. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution.</p>
66	Cattle	Tail docking
		<p>I support the restriction of tail docking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons only, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.</p>
67	Cattle and sheep	Castration and shortening of the scrotum (cryptorchid)
		<p>I support the proposal for surgical castration at any age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I support the proposal that non-surgical castration in cattle and sheep over 6 months of age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the age of 6 months as an appropriate age at which lay people can no longer perform non-surgical castration and propose that this age limit is lowered to 2 months, I support limiting the manner of non-surgical castration to only the use of conventional rubber rings. I does not support performing non-surgical castration without pain relief at any age and propose that pain relief is required for any castration procedure at any age. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also required. I propose that the penalty for all infringements other than lack of NSAID use is prosecution and that the penalty for not using an NSAID is an infringement of \$300.</p>
68	Cattle, sheep and goats	Disbudding
		<p>I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian, veterinary student under direct supervision, or skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie vet tech/appropriately trained farm worker). I propose that appropriate maximum ages are determined for disbudding to be performed by a lay person. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief</p>

		is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
69	Cattle, sheep and goats	Dehorning
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision. Given the much greater risk of pain, bleeding, and infection from dehorning rather than disbudding I propose that farmers are given 12 months warning after which dehorning can only be performed by veterinarians. This will give a strong message that disbudding is much preferred and much more economically viable. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
70	Sheep	Tail docking
		<p>I support the limiting of tail docking in sheep who are greater than 6 months of age to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered.</p> <p>I support restricting the techniques for tail docking in younger animals to rubber ring and hot iron only. I propose that pain relief at the time of procedure and NSAID should also be required, regardless of age at the time of tail docking.</p> <p>Furthermore I propose that the maximum age at which a lay person is able to perform a tail docking procedure is reduced to 2 months.</p> <p>I support the proposal that tails are not to be cut flush and are to be able to cover the vulva in a female and of a similar length in a male.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for infringements in sheep > 2 months of age and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalties of \$500 for use of non-listed methods and not cutting tails flush in sheep < 2 months of age. I propose a penalty of prosecution for not using pain relief in sheep < 2 months of age and a penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p>
71	Sheep	Mulesing
		I support the proposal to prohibit mulesing. I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
72	Deer	Develvetting
		I support the proposal for develvetting to be only performed by veterinarians, directly supervised veterinary students or a person with veterinary approval. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
73	Horses	Blistering, firing, or nicking
		I support the proposal to prohibit blistering, firing or nicking, and support the proposed infringement penalty.
74	Horses	Tail docking
		I support the proposal for tail docking to only be performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students, only for therapeutic reasons, only with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
75	Horses	Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses

		I support the proposal for rectal pregnancy diagnosis in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
76	Horses	Rectal examination of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal examination in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
77	Horses	Caslick's procedure
		I support the proposal for creation, opening and repair of caslick's procedure to only be performed by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and the use of pain relief for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty. I propose that a caslick's procedure may only be performed for therapeutic purposes and not for a perceived performance benefit and that the proposed infringement penalty for this breach is the same as that proposed above.
78	Horses	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
79	Llama and alpaca	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in llama and alpaca to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure, and the minimum age for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalties for these infringements.
80	Pigs	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration to only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision and the required use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution. I propose that a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) is also required and that the penalty for not administering an NSAID is \$300.
81	Pigs	Tail docking
		I propose that pain relief should be used for this procedure regardless of the animal's age. I support limiting the procedure to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students in animals > 7 days of age. I propose that a NSAID should also be administered at the time of the procedure. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and for a lay person performing the procedure in an animal > 7 days of age. I propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID administration.
82	Birds	Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird
		I support the restriction of pinioning/deflighting a bird to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only being performed in the best interests of the animal, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
83	Poultry	Dubbing
		I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence to perform dubbing on breeds not usually dubbed and to not use pain relief at the time of the procedure. I oppose the surgical modification of an animal if the modification is not in the interests of the animal, therefore I propose that dubbing is prohibited with the penalty of a prosecutable offence.

84	Ostriches and emus	Declawing
		I support the prohibition of radical declawing of emu chicks. However the use of the term radical implies that some declawing is allowed and opens the regulation to subjective interpretation. I propose that the regulation prohibit all declawing of emu or ostrich unless performed by a vet for therapeutic reasons. I support the penalty of prosecutable offence.
85	Roosters	Caponising (rooster castration)
		I support the restriction of caponising to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

Chris

Chris Harkess

s 9(2)(a)

Submission on Animal Welfare Regulations

15th May 2016

Proposed Animal Welfare Regulations – Care & Conduct and Surgical & Painful Procedures

Jenny Weston

s 9(2)(a)

I am a veterinarian with 22 years' experience of working predominantly with dairy cattle in club practice in Taranaki and then at the Massey University Veterinary Teaching Hospital. Additionally I have been the President of the New Zealand Veterinary Association and am the current President of the Dairy Cattle branch of the NZVA and the Acting Dean of Veterinary Sciences at Massey University. Although this is my personal submission, I will be sharing it with the NZVA for their consideration towards an NZVA submission.

I strongly support the introduction of animal welfare regulations as a means of identifying and enforcing required standards of animal welfare. This will provide an easy method of dealing with breaches in a way that is not too onerous on either the regulator or those who may breach standards. This should assist all people responsible for the care of animals to ensure that they are aware of societal and legal expectations with regards animal welfare.

I attended the public meeting to discuss these regulations in Palmerston North on the 28th April and my comments are informed by the discussion that was had at that meeting in addition to my experience as a veterinarian.

Responses to the Questions within Part A

Q1) These should come into force at the same time as the regulations rather than waiting until 2020 as there is little substantive change from what is currently in force or that would require significant changes to practice that would be logistically difficult to achieve within a short timeframe.

Q2) The penalty for non-compliance with a Compliance Notice should be more than is proposed in some instances (currently \$500). Instances where the breach of the regulation applies to multiple animals e.g. a proportion of a herd of cattle with broken tails, or a group of calves that have been disbudded without pain relief. In these instances, and where the animals are part of a commercial operation, this should be a minimum of \$1,000 given that the person has already been informed that they are non-compliant with the Act and have been provided with time to rectify the situation yet remain non-compliant. The fine for infringement for section 156I should also be higher given that the individual has already been served with a compliance notice. The infringement fee for section 36(3) is appropriate as it may be physically and logistically difficult to get around trap lines in the required timeframe.

Q3) Not that I can think of.

Q4) Not that I can think of.

Q5) No

Q6) N/A

Q7) No – other animal welfare issues should not be addressed through non-regulatory initiatives. The example of reducing the induction of premature calving in dairy cattle addressed a specific issue that is not commonly undertaken in most other farming countries. I was integrally involved with the process to reduce then eliminate induction of premature calving so can speak to this issue. This relied on cooperation between stakeholders which, although successful, took longer than anticipated to get to the point where inductions could only be carried out by special exemption. The process was never tested, for example if one of the stakeholders to the Memorandum of Understanding did not agree then it was not clear how the other parties would have made progress. Also, the process of reducing the incidence of induction of premature calving had no legal prohibitions put in place and I am aware of many instances where the guidelines were not followed. In those instances, a farmer (presumably with oversight from a veterinarian) acted outside of the MoU and there was no real process to take action against them. Given that breaches of animal welfare can impact an entire industry and New Zealand's reputation for animal welfare I do not believe that it is reasonable to leave standard setting or the changing of expectations to non-regulatory initiatives.

Q8) The proposed regulations will change the way that some animal owners operate in that they will now need to provide a higher level of animal welfare. None of the changes will be particularly difficult to implement from a logistical point of view but may incur some extra cost e.g. requirement for provision of pain relief for all calf disbudding / dehorning. The costs are not anticipated to be prohibitive, for example the cost for local anaesthetic for each calf at disbudding is unlikely to exceed 50 cents per animal. There will be a need to increase the level of technical skill for administration of local anaesthetic and some of the regulations will also require a level of auditing to ensure that the desired outcomes are being achieved (i.e. that local anaesthetic is being administered correctly to provide pain relief). It is important to remember however, that the New Zealand economy relies heavily on agricultural exports so it is reasonable to act now to maintain New Zealand's reputation as a leader in animal welfare. The regulations that relate to significant surgical procedures of dogs which are commonly carried out by dog breeders at the moment (this being tail docking and dew claw removal) will not incur further costs as these are completely unnecessary procedures for puppies and the incidence of needing to perform tail or dew claw amputations due to injury is very low. If an individual dog has excessively large dew claws which could reasonably be anticipated to be problematic, these can be removed under general anaesthetic at the time of desexing. It may be necessary to provide a 12 month lead-in for farmers to build loading facilities for bobby calves so that they are at truck height for loading given that calves will be sent for processing in less than two months' time.

Q9) I have some concerns about determining whether an infringement is causing a low-level of harm or a moderate level of harm; also what constitutes a small number of animals. I believe it would be useful to have an infringement offence for the higher amount of at least \$1,000 where a larger number of animals is affected e.g. a group of 60 calves that have been disbudded without the use of pain relief. This maintains the intent of the regulations in expediently dealing with an offence and

not needing to take a prosecution. A fine of higher than \$500, and probably more than \$1,000 may be necessary to change behaviour for some large commercial operators.

Q10) I am concerned that prosecutions will still only be taken in the most extreme cases of animal abuse or neglect. As above, my recommendation would be an infringement notice to a higher amount for cases where many animals are involved or where moderate harm has been caused – in these instances, the offender is likely to be a person who makes a significant amount of money from their animal operation and therefore the financial penalty needs to be a sufficient deterrent. People's interpretation of moderate harm may be affected by the fact that some of these procedures have been legal up till now e.g. disbudding/dehorning up to the age of 9 months without provision of pain relief.

Q11) Assuming that there is a reasonable education campaign which is supported by the animal industries then lack of knowledge of the new regulations should not be a defence against prosecution. Similarly intent or recklessness is difficult to prove and should not be included.

Q12) The defences listed in section 4.1.5 are reasonable.

Q13) The definition should be expanded to include protecting animal life.

Q14) This will be answered throughout my responses to Section B

Q15-17) I support the second approach whereby the codes of welfare are amended only where the regulations provide a higher standard as this would allow the codes of welfare to continue to come into play in prosecutions for Act offences.

Q18) There are already a number of fora which provide feedback to MPI including the Farm to Processor Animal Welfare Forum and NAWAC. Additionally, industry leaders meet with senior MPI officials and can lobby the Minister to provide feedback.

Responses to Specific Proposals (the Regulations in part B)

1. All animals electric prodders: I agree with this regulation in principle but believe that electric prodders should only be used in situations where the animal, other animals or people are at risk of injury and not as a routine method of encouraging animals to move. Exceptions to this would be for loading animals onto transport which is not a procedure that the animal would be familiar with and therefore the animal may be unlikely to move with other inducements and when loading a stunning pen. In the exceptions suggested there may well be a risk of injury to people if they were to get in with the animals. There would be few other situations on a farm or in a circus where it is justified to use electric prodders compared to other means of encouraging animals to move. A rare example for use of an electric prod would be as part of a clinical /neurological examination of a recumbent animal to test reflexes and/or encourage them to stand as remaining recumbent is likely to cause the animal's condition to worsen. However, as a veterinarian I have not used an electric prod to encourage a recumbent cow to stand for more than 15 years and believe that hosing water on them or flapping a raincoat or shed apron at their head or body is just as effective and less painful to the

animal. There should be a limit to the number of times that an individual animal can be shocked in a single situation – I would suggest no more than three shocks or prods, if the animal has not responded as desired then further use of an electric prod is not warranted. Regulations around the strength of shock that can be delivered by an electric prod should also be considered to further protect animal welfare.

The proposed fee is appropriate for instances where one animal was affected but it should be more (at least \$1,000) if it can be proven that this regulation was breached across multiple animals e.g. excessive or inappropriate use of electric prodders when loading livestock for transport.

A point that is raised from this regulation is around the use of animals in circuses. I do not believe that it is possible to meet the needs of animals other than commonly domesticated species such as dogs and horses within the physical constraints of a circus and that keeping exotic animals such as elephants, monkeys or big cats in a circus should be prohibited.

2. All animals – use of goads: I believe that this regulation should be expanded to include all of the head of the animal and not just the eyes, and that the penis/prepuce should also be included as an area where a goad must not be used. There is no situation in which it is justified to use a goad (including an electric prod) in any of these areas. As above, \$300 fine for a single instance but a higher fine when multiple animals are affected or where the goad has been used specifically to cause pain to the animal – I recognise that this will be hard to define.

3. All animals – twisting an animal's tail: I am in full agreement with this but it needs to be clear in additional information that lifting an animal's tail (specifically with cattle) is a reasonable method of reducing the risk of a person being kicked (or at least being kicked with a lot of force) when having to treat the animal such as insertion of intramammary treatments or placing a leg rope to lift a hoof to investigate lameness. Again, the lifting of the tail needs to be straight to be effective and must not be used with such force as to cause more than temporary discomfort or to fracture the tail. There needs to be a clear distinction between tail lifting in cattle and tail twisting in all species.

4. Dogs and pinch/prong collars: completely agree with prohibition. The sale of such collars should also be prohibited. A fee of \$300 would be reasonable for a first offence but it should be higher if the person (or someone in the same household) is a repeat offender.

5. Dogs – injuries from collars or tethers: completely agree with this.

6. Dogs – muzzling a dog: agree with this except there are occasions when a muzzle is used to restrain a dog e.g. for intravenous injection or other veterinary examination when it is necessary that a firm muzzle is placed to prevent people being bitten. I would suggest that this statement could be revised to state that a muzzle that restricts panting can only be used when the dog is not left unattended; this would ensure that the muzzle could be removed if the dog was in respiratory distress.

7. Dogs – dry and shaded shelter: fully agree. Higher fee if multiple dogs affected at the same property or if the owner is a repeat offender.

8. Dogs – left in vehicles: fully agree. A fine for infringement is likely to increase owner compliance although many owners already would not want to harm their dog. There is a lack of understanding about how hot it can get in cars, even in a short period of time.

9. Dogs - secured on moving vehicles: fully agree. I also recommend that, in instances where the dog may be jumping on and off the vehicle because they are working and moving a mob of livestock on a public road, that the vehicle be restricted to travelling at no more than 20 km/hr if the dogs are not secured. If the dogs are actively working then there is no way that the vehicle should be travelling faster than that. This would ensure that dogs are properly secured for the trip home when the livestock have been moved or that the vehicle is limited in speed on the return journey if the dogs are not secured.

10. Prohibit the drowning of dogs and cats: agree with this proposal but suggest that other species should be included. However, there needs to be consideration for pest species such as possums as to whether there is a feasible alternative available as not every farmer has access to a firearm and it is often not possible to restrain a possum for it to be humanely killed by blunt force trauma (or for this to be done humanely if the animal is struggling). Although drowning is not a humane form of killing animals, consideration needs to be given to the benefit of eradicating pest animals when it might not be possible or reasonable to take a captured pest animal to a veterinarian for euthanasia. It may be necessary to include hanging or strangulation as similar prohibitions for the killing of cats and dogs.

11. Eels insensible for desliming: I do not have enough knowledge of this procedure to make an informed comment.

12. Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish – insensible before being killed: fully agree.

13. Goats – tethering requirements: fully agree. There should also be clarification that the length of the tether must prevent the goat reaching the road in cases where the goat is tethered on the side of a public road to minimise the risk of injury to the goat.

14. Horses – use of a whip, lead or any other object: fully agree, although this should be allowed in a situation where a person is at risk of injury e.g. when a horse is attempting to bite a person. I believe it would be reasonable for the person to respond (in a manner similar to which another horse would respond if attacked) by striking with their hand or lead rope at the time of the incident or immediately afterwards as self defence or as part of a training process. Striking the horse some short time after the event as punishment is not an effective training method to protect people from being bitten by the horse in the future.

15. Horses – injuries from tack: fully agree. Could it just be stated that equipment and tack (includes bridles and boots etc) not cause cuts, abrasions or swelling?

16. Horses and donkeys tethering – fully agree. I'm not sure if it is covered under any other animal welfare or safety law but horses and donkeys should not be tethered on the side of a public road

during the hours of darkness as they are more likely to be frightened and injure themselves or become loose and cause an accident.

17-28. A variety of proposals: fully agree with all of these.

29. The use of fireworks at rodeos: fully agree. Further I believe that fireworks are distressing to many animals and their sale and use should be restricted to public displays and they should not be able to be sold to or used by members of the public. Additionally, events at rodeos which are potentially risky or distressing to animals should be banned; such events include roping where animals can be brought to a sudden stop and events where a rider launches from a horse to restrain a running cattle beast. Events where animals which are not used to being ridden e.g. bull and bronco (horse) riding should be banned as these animals are goaded to experience fear and distress as part of the mechanism to make them buck. The suggested penalties are appropriate.

30. Exotic animals in circuses: as mentioned previously, I fully support the prohibition of using exotic animals in circuses as I do not believe it is possible to meet their behavioural needs. Domesticated species such as horses, goats and dogs can be provided with adequate space for grazing and to display normal behaviour as they are domesticated and can easily be restrained within appropriate spaces. The suggested penalties are appropriate.

31. Cattle – milk stimulation: Fully agree, fee should be \$500 and more if multiple animals affected. I have heard of the practice but imagine it would be a rare occurrence now.

32. Cattle and sheep – vehicular traction: Fully agree. I am not aware that this practice is currently occurring but it is still worthwhile to include it as a regulation.

33: Ingrown horns: include goats in this proposal, fully support. Fee should be higher if more than one animal is involved. Regulation and fee at this level is appropriate and it should still be possible to prosecute in severe cases where the horn has grown into the skin so that there is a wound created. A higher fee if multiple animals are affected. I would always use local anaesthetic even when shortening a horn as I do not believe it is possible to accurately gauge at what point the horn may be innervated – particularly in breeds with more significant horns such as Highland cattle. If the horn is being shortened solely for transport to slaughter then pain relief should be provided. If the horn is being shortened because it is close to touching the skin then a complete removal should be undertaken using pain relief as the horn will re-grow if only shortened.

34: Stock transport: include horses in this proposal, fully support. It could be difficult to enforce or determine the cut-off for very minor abrasions, possibly from another animal compared to serious back rubs or multiple animals injured due to poor loading or transport facilities. If the injury is due to overcrowding then the transport operator should be held responsible. Transport operators should refuse to load stock if the facilities are deemed to be inadequate or unsafe for the animals.

35- 38, also 41 and 42: Transport of animals with abnormalities: fully support. I believe it is worthwhile to have regulation 35 in addition to 33 (ingrown horns) as there will be two parties complicit, the animal owner for allowing animals to get to that state and the transport operator for

loading the animals. Many cases of ingrown horns are only detected when animals are sent for slaughter. However, you need to be able to take action when this is detected on-farm as well as after transport. Deer with velvet antler (37) should not be transported at all as this tissue is sensitive and easily damaged, resulting in pain. I do not believe it is feasible to prohibit or regulate the transport of animals with a lameness score of 1 (on a 0-3 scale). The level of stockmanship on some farms means that animals with a grade 1 lameness might not be able to be identified. I would imagine, in most instances, that an animal with a grade 2 lameness would not be judged as fit for transport or receive a certificate from a veterinarian. Suggested fees are appropriate for a single animal but should be included (or multiplied) when more than one animal is affected.

39: Stock transport, bearing weight evenly: I am not sure why this needs to be included as it seems to be covered by proposal 38. If the animal has a subtle injury so that it is not bearing weight evenly but would be classified as lameness score 1 (from proposal 38) then that should be fit for transport. If the degree of lameness is more than 1 then the criteria from proposal 38 should be sufficient. There should not be a distinction whether the lameness is due to injury or disease.

40. Transport of pregnant animals: while I support this proposal in principle I believe it would be difficult to ascertain whether the person in charge of the animal would have known it was likely to give birth during transport or within 24 hours. If the evidence is that the animal did give birth then this could have been obvious to the person responsible or might not have been – for example if the animal aborts the fetus. I think that further consideration needs to be given as to how this could be monitored and how it would be decided if the regulation has been breached or not. When the cow or ewe delivers a full-term calf or lamb, that should be grounds for penalty.

Young calf management regulatory proposals

I fully support all of these proposals but believe that these need to be applied to all young calves and not just calves derived from the dairy industry which are being transported to slaughter. Although calves which have been separated from their mothers (generally in the dairy industry) and have been sold for rearing into the beef industry are generally of higher monetary value and are more likely to be well cared for, the regulations should still apply to them as they may still be transported long distances. The penalty should be more than \$500 in instances where more than one calf will have been affected by non-compliance – that would be the case for most of these proposed regulations.

Another situation that should be considered is where a farmer has multiple properties or a nearby run-off property and might be moving calves greater distances for rearing e.g. to another property with calf-rearing facilities. If the calf is younger than 4 days old, then these calves should not be transported a distance greater than 5 km and the requirements for shelter during transport must also be met.

43. Loading and unloading facilities: fully support although this should be made clear that this is for when loading and unloading calves at a height of a normal livestock truck and not when putting calves on a low trailer for transport to the barn from the paddock or between properties on a small scale. It is mainly when the calves need to be lifted higher that there is a risk of rough handling. It is also acknowledged that very young calves may not move as desired when encouraged to do so and

they may need pushing to get them to move along a ramp or onto a truck and that they may not completely move by their own action as would be expected of an older cattle beast. This is the only regulation which might need a 12 month lead-in time to achieve given that we are close to the spring calving season and it might not be possible for all farmers to have appropriately constructed facilities. Travelator type systems would also be acceptable for loading calves but would be expensive and are not a requirement. The requirement for adequate loading and unloading facilities at the height of a stock truck would also assist with health & safety compliance for transport operators due to the difficulty of lifting calves, some of which can weigh more than 30-40 kg.

44. Young calves shelter: Fully support this and acknowledge that this requirement only applies to young calves that are separated from their mother. This also needs to be applied to calves going through saleyards and not just for loading for transport and at slaughter premises.

45. Age at transport for slaughter: this wording makes it more likely that calves will be at least 4 days old rather than possibly being in their fourth day since birth. Calves need to be healthy and strong and their feeding regime up till that point will be an important component of that. For example, if a calf is separated from its mother at 2 days of age, it might take a further 2 days for it to become used to being fed in the calf shed and so might not have received adequate feed in the few days prior to transport. It should be stated that calves should have been separated from their mother for 4 days before being allowed to be transported as that is more likely to ensure the required outcomes. It would be very uncommon for a calf to remain with its mother for more than 1-2 days so this should not be unreasonable to comply with.

46-48. Further regulations around transport: fully support. The health criteria for transport need to be met in addition to the minimum age for transport, it would not be sufficient for the criteria in 46 to be met and the calf to be transported at younger than a minimum of 4 days old. With regards proposal 47, I do not believe that it is feasible for bobby calves to be adequately fed in lairage to hold them over for slaughter the next morning. It would be difficult to ensure that all calves in the group were adequately fed and there may not be experienced staff, feed or equipment at the slaughter premises or transit facility. Young calves should not go more than 24 hours without feed – it doesn't matter at which point the loading occurs since time off feed, the main concern is around total time since fed. The regulation should be that all calves are slaughtered within 24 hours of their last feed. Keeping the statement around feeding within 24 hours should only be applied when calves are being transported for sale or to other rearing properties as there is greater incentive to ensure that all animals are adequately fed.

49. Young calves blunt force trauma: support although there may occasionally be emergency situations where the calf should be killed expediently and it is not reasonable to delay humane euthanasia until a firearm or captive bolt can be accessed.

50. Young calves transport across the Cook Strait: fully support, transporting young calves across Cook Strait for slaughter is completely unnecessary. I would also support the prohibition of transporting cull cows/ewes across the Cook Strait unless that would be their closest slaughter premises by transport time.

Surgical and Painful Procedures

For all surgical and painful procedures, consideration needs to be given as to the potential benefits to human or animal welfare (safety) from carrying out any surgical or painful procedures and whether or not there is any justification to carry out the procedure in the first place. Some procedures such as castration, disbudding/dehorning and tail docking (but only in sheep) bring significant welfare and safety benefits which justify their being carried out. Tail docking in other species and the routine removal of dew claws brings no benefit to the animal except in extreme cases or when there has been an injury. Some procedures are performed as part of reproductive technology and are performed for genetic gain and financial benefit for the owner – in those instances, the highest level of pain relief and expertise needs to be employed.

51. Hot branding: fully support

53 & 53. Embryo collection and laparoscopic AI. This would meet the criteria for a significant surgical procedure due to entering a body cavity and so should be restricted to being performed only by veterinarians or veterinary students under the direct supervision of a veterinarian and pain relief to be administered.

54. Liver biopsy: fully support, as above, this is a significant surgical procedure.

55. Dental work: This should clarify that the instrument needs to be designed for the purpose of dentistry but many of these are also designed to attach to a standard power pack for power tools which may not be specifically designed for veterinary uses. Should include (here or elsewhere) that pain relief must be provided if the procedure is likely to be painful e.g. extraction of teeth rather than just rasping of a horse's teeth. Dentistry procedures where teeth are being extracted (in all species) is a significant surgical procedure due to exposure down to the bone and should only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under supervision.

56, 59, 60, 61 & 62. Various surgical procedures on dogs and cats. There is no justification to benefit the animal's welfare in carrying out these procedures as a matter of course. There may be rare occasions when to undertake these surgical procedures is in the best interests of the animal. Tail docking of dogs and removal of dew claws in particular has no benefit and can in fact be detrimental to the dog for communication and behavioural purposes. The comparison with tail docking of lambs ignores the benefit that tail docking in sheep can bring in preventing flystrike. We should take a utilitarian approach to animal welfare in that the disadvantages and advantages are considered. For dog tail docking, there is no benefit and many other countries have already moved to ban tail docking. Breeders of docked breeds will continue to insist that this is a necessary procedure but there is no evidence for this. They may complain that this will incur further costs to their breeding operation if this has to be carried out by a veterinarian. The reality is that veterinarians will not conduct the procedure unless it is in the animal's best interests and they are bound by the Veterinarians' Act in this area. This is not an attempt by veterinarians to drum up business.

57 & 58. Desexing of companion animals and freeze branding of dogs: desexing is recommended for most companion animals and freeze branding of dogs can be useful in some circumstances. These

procedures must only be conducted by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under supervision of a veterinarian and pain relief must be provided.

63, 64, 65, 66: Various surgical procedures of cattle: Fully support. These should only be conducted in rare circumstances to correct an animal health problem that would, in itself, cause more of a welfare concern for the animal. Pain relief must be provided and the procedure must only be conducted by a veterinarian or veterinary student. The exception would be removal of supernumerary teats in cattle which could be undertaken by non-veterinarians in cattle up to the age of 6 weeks.

67: Castration and shortening of the scrotum: It is not recommended to use conventional rubber rings on cattle over the age of 3 months as, by this age, the tissue is likely to have become too large and developed for the method to be effective and it is not uncommon for the procedure to be ineffective and for the tissue that is occluded by the rubber ring to become swollen and infected. This then requires a difficult and costly surgical procedure by a veterinarian to correct. In the meantime, the animal will have suffered unreasonable pain and possibly die. This proposal should cover animals up to the age of 3 months if it is to be undertaken by any person. Once the animal is more than 3 months old, it must be undertaken by a veterinarian or supervised veterinary student and pain relief must be used. This is a significant surgical procedure and the only justification that it be carried out without pain relief and by non-veterinarians is the sheer logistical difficulty in having the procedure performed by a veterinarian given the large numbers of male cattle and sheep born each year.

68 & 69. Disbudding and dehorning: Fully support. This is a huge improvement to make pain relief required at all ages. There needs to be a comprehensive training programme for individuals to perform the procedure correctly and safely and to ensure that the local anaesthetic is placed correctly and that sufficient time elapses to ensure that pain relief is provided. Veterinarians will still have the responsibility for authorising the use of local anaesthetic and it may be that not all farmers or technicians who wish to access local anaesthetic will meet the required competence to be dispensed local anaesthetic. Additionally, there is no requirement for veterinarians to authorise Restricted Veterinary Medicines to any client in all circumstances. Managing animal health and welfare remains the responsibility of the authorising veterinarian. Hot iron or gas cautery disbudding is the most effective means of disbudding to ensure that the horn bud is removed or destroyed. Caustic pastes should be prohibited as they act slowly, are often ineffective and can cause injury to other parts of the body if the paste is transferred from another animal. Pain relief should be necessary regardless of which method is used. Disbudding/dehorning goats is a much more significant procedure due to the extent of which the horn bud is part of the skull (makes it a significant surgical procedure) and should only be allowed to be performed by a veterinarian or a supervised veterinary student and it is recommended that general anaesthetic be used (alfaxalone is recommended).

70. Sheep tail docking: tail docking in sheep should be carried out as early as possible. Under commercial farming systems this is usually done in the first few weeks of life. The smaller the lamb when it is done the better. The age that this can be carried out without pain relief should be no more than 3 months old (which would align for my suggested timeframe for castration in cattle and

sheep). This would not be a significant change to current farming practice. The development of rubber rings impregnated with local anaesthetic of the application of a topical local anaesthetic that would improve animal welfare should be vigorously pursued. If the sheep is older than 3 months of age, this procedure should only be performed by a veterinarian or supervised veterinary student and pain relief should be compulsory. Given that veterinarians have a responsibility for animal welfare under the Veterinarians' Act, any of these significant surgical procedures would be performed using pain relief if undertaken by a veterinarian. Sheep are the only domesticated species where it is reasonable to remove part of the tail as a prophylactic measure due to the risk of flystrike.

71. Mulesing: fully support prohibition as this procedure is not warranted in NZ.

72 – 78. Deer and horses: fully support all proposals due to the risk of poor animal welfare outcomes if this level of veterinary oversight or involvement is not adhered to.

79. Camelid castration: fully support that castration can only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student. I do not have the background to comment on whether the proposed age limits are appropriate or not.

80 – 85. Pigs and birds / poultry: I do not have specific knowledge in these as but the proposals seem reasonable to me.

Thank you for the development of these regulations and the opportunity to comment. I am sure that you will receive many submissions from interested parties who have historically been able to conduct some of these procedures themselves and without the provision of pain relief. I ask that submissions be considered on their scientific merit and that the submitter is knowledgeable in the area and does not have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo rather than improving animal welfare. It needs to be recognised that all animals are capable of feeling pain as well as distress and fear – even neonates. Therefore, any significant surgical procedure needs to be justified on the grounds of human or animal welfare or safety for it to be considered reasonable in any circumstance to be carried out routinely as opposed to when it is in the best interests of an individual animal e.g. tail docking following a significant injury to the tail. If it is reasonable for a procedure to be performed routinely e.g. disbudding/dehorning, castration then pain relief should be provided if it is feasible to do so.

Yours sincerely,

Jenny Weston BVSc BPhil PhD PGDipEdAdminLead

✓143

From: Ali Simpson s9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, 18 May 2016 4:55 p.m.
To: Animal Welfare Submissions
Subject: Submission on Animal Welfare Regulations

Categories: Blue Category

MPI Animal Welfare Codes Submission

Nathan Guy Minister for Primary Industries

In response to MPI's request for feedback on proposed animal welfare regulations I submit the following for your careful consideration.

The given consultation period (14th April to 10 May 2016) for public involvement is woefully inadequate. Five weeks is unrealistic and makes a mockery of the consultation process. The volume of proposals we are being asked to consider in this time frame isn't feasible and I ask that a more realistic time frame be given for the public to have our say.

I suggest a period of five weeks be given to each section of the proposed welfare regulations.

While the proposed regulations relating to live animal exports, the care and conduct towards animals, and surgical and painful procedures is a start, I ask that there be a full review into intensive farming practices across the agricultural industry.

The last two decades have seen the intensification of animal agriculture to levels that are unprecedented in recent history. The current welfare codes and proposed welfare regulations don't go nearly far enough in protecting animal welfare under increasingly intensive farming practices.

Society's moral values are constantly shifting yet these regulations have remained largely static and are vastly out of step with changing attitudes to animal welfare. I want to see a total ban on all cages for layer hens, farrowing crates for sows and a reduction in intensive dairy resulting in the slaughter of over 2m calves annually.

These farming practices can no longer be deemed humane by today's standards and cannot be incorporated as such in any welfare code. The new rules are not keeping pace with changing scientific knowledge and cannot be accepted as good practice.

1) From 5.3m dairy cows in 2007 to 6.4m in 2012 (23% increase in just 5 years) Statistics NZ

2) Switzerland banned cages for hens in 1992

Care and conduct regulatory proposals		
1	All animals	Electric prodders
		<p>I propose that the use of electric prodders be banned under all circumstances except when they are "necessary for protection, preservation or maintenance of human life"</p> <p>I do not support exemptions on the use of prodders based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the species and size of an animal b. the manner of use of an animal (circus) c. the location of the animal (slaughter premises) <p>I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p>
2	All animals	Use of goads
		<p>I support the proposal to ban the use of goads on sensitive areas of an animal's body under any circumstances. Given the deliberate cruelty involved in using goads on sensitive areas I propose an increased infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
3	All animals	Twisting an animal's tail
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit painful twisting of an animal's tail. Given the potential for significant pain and damage from this behaviour, and the deliberate nature of the act I propose the infringement penalty is set at the higher level of \$500.</p>

Proposed	All animals	Any animal requiring manual lifting must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick animals).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed 2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
4	Dogs	Pinch and Prong collars
		I support the prohibition of pinch and prong collars under any circumstances; no exemption for dogs used for special purposes (guarding, military) is supported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300. I also support the banning of the sale of these collars and associated penalties under the law.
5	Dogs	Injuries from collars or tethers
		I support the proposal to only use collars or tethers in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. Given the potential for severe injury from collars I propose the penalty is increased to a prosecutable offence.
6	Dogs	Muzzling a dog
		I support the proposal for regulating the use of muzzles so they do not cause injury or distress. I support the inclusion in the proposal that muzzles should allow for a dog to be able to drink. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
7	Dogs	Dry and shaded shelter
		I support the proposal for dogs to have access to dry and shaded shelter at all times. I propose the inclusion in the proposal that dogs also have access to fresh, palatable drinking water at all times. Given that shelter and water are basic needs of life neglecting these items has the potential to cause significant harm and even death therefore I propose the infringement penalty to be increased to a prosecutable offence. I also propose that there be a maximum time imposed that a dog is allowed to be chained for at any one time and that an infringement fee be set for exceeding that time.
8	Dogs	Dogs left in vehicles
		I support the proposal for people leaving dogs in vehicles to ensure their safety. I propose increasing the penalty to a prosecutable offence both to reflect the potential fatal nature of the injury and also to act as a suitable penalty to prevent this behaviour. Additionally increasing the penalty allows for effective prosecution of corporations who use dogs who have a responsibility to ensure dogs in their care are cared for appropriately.
9	Dogs	Secured on moving vehicles
		I support the proposal to secure dogs on moving vehicles. I propose including dogs on vehicles on private property in the regulation, and propose a speed limit of 40kph for vehicles carrying unsecured working dogs. I propose increasing the penalty for infringement to \$1000 due to the potential for severe injury, suffering, and death resulting from falling from a moving vehicle.
Proposed	Dogs	Ban export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Macau or China

		<p>The Macau and China greyhound racing industries do not have the same standards of animal welfare as NZ. The export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Hong Kong (for further transport to Macau/China) is minimal at present. However if the export of greyhounds from other countries (Australia, Ireland) is banned or more heavily regulated then NZ could become a transport hub for dogs in this industry. This has the potential for poor welfare outcomes for dogs and very poor public perception in New Zealand. It is far better to ban an activity like this before it has the potential to become established. MPI have demonstrated their willingness to put in place infringements for uncommon industry activities which have the potential to become welfare issues in the future with proposal 50 in this document banning transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I propose the above regulation and propose the infringement penalty is set at a prosecutable offence.</p>
10	Dogs and Cats	Drowning dogs and cats
		I support the prohibition of the killing of a dog or cat of any age by drowning. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
11	Eels	Insensible for desliming
		I support the proposal that eels must be insensible for desliming or killed before they are deslimed. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
12	Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish	Insensible before being killed
		<p>I support the proposal that crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish must be insensible before they are killed. I dispute the NAWAC statement that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible and propose that either:</p> <p>a. the only legally acceptable method of rendering crabs and crayfish insensible is by electrical stunning (for which specific equipment is available for use in small restaurant premises). OR</p> <p>b. NAWAC conduct a review of the recent (since 2000) scientific literature on humane slaughter of crustaceans and present good quality, recent evidence to support the claim that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for failing to render a crustacean insensible prior to slaughter.</p>
13	Goats	Tethering requirements
		<p>I do not support the tethering of goats, on the basis that it stops goats expressing normal social behaviours, and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$500. Furthermore I share concerns with previous submissions around tethering of goats that tourists witnessing tethered goats on the road side could easily get a negative impression of animal welfare in NZ.</p> <p>I propose that all goats, regardless of housing system, have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$500.</p> <p>I also propose that as goats are social animals, all goats should be provided with a companion such as another goat, camelid, horse, donkey or sheep. I propose that failure to house a goat with a companion should attract an infringement penalty of \$300.</p> <p>1. Miranda-de la Lama, G.C. and Mattiello, S. (2010). The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming. Small Ruminant Research 90, (1-3), 1-10</p>
14	Horses	Use of a whip, lead, or any other object
		I support the prohibition of using a whip, lead or other object to strike around the head. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
15	Horses	Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.

16	Horses and Donkeys	Tethering requirements
		I do not support the tethering of horses and donkeys and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$300. I propose that all horses and donkeys have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times regardless of housing system and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$300.
17	Layer Hens	Opportunity to express normal behaviours in housing systems
		<p>I believe that colony cages do not adequately consider the welfare of layer hens because they prohibit the ability of the hen to express a range of normal behaviours. In addition, colony cages are not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 as they do not allow owners or persons in charge of animals to take all reasonable steps to ensure that their physical, health and behavioural needs are met:</p> <p>1) Sections 9, 68 Animal Welfare Act 1999</p>
18	Layer Hens	Stocking densities
		Colony cages do not allow hens to engage in a range of normal behaviours and therefore they are in clear breach of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. With a stocking density of 13 hens per square metre or 750 square centimetres, clearly the stocking density is too high.
19	Layer Hens	Housing and equipment design
		<p>Colony cages are only slightly bigger than traditional battery cages. While they provide token welfare gestures like nest boxes, scratch pads and perches, these gestures do not ensure the physical, health and behavioural needs of hens are met. With only 750 sq cm per hen, there are a number of behaviours hens are not able to functionally perform in colony cages; this includes spreading her wings fully¹. It's also questionable whether a hen in a colony cage can properly nest, perch, peck or scratch. A hen in a colony cage cannot dust bathe.</p> <p>Research has shown that some hens in colony cages can be prevented from using the nest provided due to competition from other hens². Also, the limited space in colony cages is insufficient to allow hens sufficient time (on average 45 minutes³) if they want to lay at the same time.</p> <p>In order to satisfy a hen's need for perching, the housing system must be able to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient length of perching space to allow all birds to perch at the same time; and • Sufficient elevation of the perches to satisfy the hens' requirements for a perceived safe perching place at night. <p>Colony cages fulfil neither of these requirements. The standard of approximately 15cm of space per hen is an average and does not allow consideration for larger birds. Perches in colony systems are situated on average just a few centimetres from the floor of the cage. 'A perch positioned 5cm above floor level is 'not considered as a perch (by a hen) and has no attractive or repulsive value'⁴.</p> <p>Litter is not provided in colony cage systems. Litter is imperative for hen welfare. Hens will make great efforts to access litter for pecking, scratching and dustbathing – three normal behaviours of hens⁵. When hens are unable to forage in litter, they can redirect their pecking towards other hens resulting in harmful feather pecking and even cannibalism. When hens are unable to dustbathe in litter, they can develop the dysfunctional behaviour of sham dustbathing.</p> <p>1) A hen's wingspan is approximately 75-80 centimetres which is twice the size of a traditional battery cage 2) Guedson, V. and Faure, J. M. (2004) <i>Laying performance and egg quality in hens kept in standard or furnished cages</i>. Animal Research, 53: 45-57. 3) Appleby, M.C. (1998) Modification of laying hen cages to improve behaviour. Poultry Science, 77: 1828-1832. 4) Cooper, J.J. and Ablentosa, M. J. (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews, 14: 127-149.</p>

20	Layer Hens	Induced moulting
		I support the proposal to prohibit induced moulting of layer hens.
21	Llama and Alpaca	Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes, and packs
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
22	Llama and Alpaca	Companion animals
		I support the proposal that camelids must be provided with a companion animal. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
23	Llama and Alpaca	Offspring (Cria) camelid companions
		I support the proposal to prohibit raising Cria without the company of other camelids. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
24	Pigs	Dry sleeping area
		Proposal: I support the proposal that all pigs have access to a dry sleeping area. Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
25	Pigs	Lying space for grower pigs
		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal for minimum space requirements for grower pigs.</p> <p>1. Error in formula</p> <p>The proposed formula used to calculate the minimum space has a type error; specifically the exponent notation has not been applied. I believe the formula intended by MPI should read "live weight^{0.67} (kg)" but instead it reads "live weight 0.67(kg)" which translates to an Area = 0.03 * liveweight * 0.67(kg) and results in a much higher space requirement.</p> <p>Therefore I contend that proposal 25 must be rewritten and resubmitted for public consultation, with the correct formula included so that the intended space requirement can be properly considered.</p> <p>2. Minimum requirement</p> <p>Recent research suggests that a k-value of 0.3 is too low. In 2006, Gonyou et al. (2006) which ADFI is reduced. More recently, a 2015 study has found that a k-value of 0.0336 might underestimate the impact of increased stocking density on ADG and ADFI². A k-value of 0.3 is too low to provide grower pigs with this environment and is sufficient as a minimum requirement for static space only.</p> <p>Does the proposal adequately define the appropriate systems?</p> <p>The proposal is based on a minimum standard, which is expected to occur (if at all) only where growers have reached the capacity of their pen and are shortly to be moved to a bigger pen³ not a minimum standard which is considered acceptable at all times and this should be clarified in the regulation itself.</p> <p>I consider the minimum standards of housing for pigs to be provide "sufficient space to enable them to perform natural behaviours such as lying on their side without touching another pig, standing up, turning around and performing exercise, space for separate areas for dunging and feeding, with a dunging areas situated a sufficient distance from sleeping and feeding areas as well as materials to enable them to root and forage" ⁴. If these standards cannot be met by the current farming systems then we are concerned that the current farming systems are not compatible with the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour and breach the animal welfare act.</p> <p>The current regulation has no limit on the length of time during which a grower pig may be submitted to the proposed minimum standard. Overstocking is a known problem. I am concerned that grower pigs may be submitted to spaces which do not meet minimum requirement if their transfer to a new pen is delayed. I would like the regulations to be</p>

		<p>clear that it is unacceptable for growers to be kept for prolonged periods in spaces at or close to the minimum requirement. In its 2010 review, NAWAC submitted that space enough to allow for pigs to lie fully recumbent (k-value of 0.047) was recommended best practice.</p> <p>For the sake of clarity and to give effect to the intention of NAWAC, I suggest that a minimum period of time for growers kept in the lower end of the scale be added.</p> <p>Due to the above considerations, I propose that the minimum standard is amended to:</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must have lying space of at least: Area (m²) per pig = 0.040 x live weight 0.67(kg)</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must not have lying space of less than: Area (m²) per pig = 0.047 x live weight 0.67(kg) for longer than one week.</p> <p>Penalty: I support penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p> <p>1) Gonyou, H. W., M. C. Brumm, E. Bush, J. Deen, S. A. Edwards, T. Fangman, J. J. McGlone, M. Meunier-Salaun, R. B. Morrison, H. Spooler, P. L. Sundberg, and A. K. Johnson. 2006. Application of broken-line analysis to assess floor space requirements of nursery and grower-finisher pigs expressed on an allometric basis. J. Anim. Sci. 84: 229-235.</p> <p>2) Thomas, LL. "The Effects of Increasing Stocking Density on Finishing Pig Growth ..." 2015. http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=kaesrr</p> <p>3) ibid. Page 9</p> <p>4) "ANIMAL WELFARE (Pigs) CODE OF WELFARE 2010 REPORT." 2015. 15 May. 2016 <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/1446></p>
26	Pigs	Dry sow stalls
		<p>Proposal: I support the prohibition of dry sow stalls</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p>
27	Pigs	Size of farrowing crates
		<p>Proposal: I do not support the use of farrowing crates.</p> <p>Production systems using farrowing crates are not the only financially viable forms of pork production. It is widely accepted that sow welfare in farrowing crates is sub-optimal. Continuing a production system which is contrary to good practice and scientific knowledge is in direct violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.</p> <p>In 2016, a review of Farrowing Crates for Pigs in NZ was submitted by NAWAC. In that report, NAWAC stated that "no significant change in science, technology or good practice from 2010 when the pigs code of welfare was issued". It submitted that the levels of piglet mortality in farrowing pens is higher than in farrowing crates and used this as justification for retaining farrowing crates in New Zealand. However, there is abundant research which supports the conclusion that total piglet mortality on farms with loose farrowing systems does not differ from that of farms with crates³.</p> <p>I submit that farrowing crates are unacceptable in modern day pork production systems and must be banned outright.</p> <p>1) "National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee - NZPork." 2016. 15 May. 2016 http://www.nzpork.co.nz/images/custom/farrowing-crate-advice-14-march-2016.pdf</p> <p>2) Weber, R. "Piglet mortality on farms using farrowing systems ..." - IngentaConnect." 2007. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ufaw/aw/2007/00000016/00000002/art00042</p> <p>3) KilBride, AL. "A cohort study of preweaning piglet mortality and ..." - ScienceDirect." 2012. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167587711003564</p>
28	Pigs	Provision of nesting material
		<p>Proposal: I support the provision of nesting material that can be manipulated to sows. However, it is clear that sows in farrowing crates will be unable to exhibit natural nesting behaviours in the confined space of a farrowing crate. To give effect to the intention of providing nesting material, the sow must be given more space in which to move.</p> <p>I agree that the definition of manipulable material should be made more apparent. "Material at ground level which mimics that of natural nesting material and encourages the sow to exhibit rooting behaviour" would be appropriate. However, for</p>

		<p>clarity, I recommend that examples are provided for guidance. Appropriate examples would include straw and sawdust</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>1) Chaloupková, H. "The effect of nesting material on the nest-building and maternal ... - NCBI." 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20889685</p>
29	Rodeos	Fireworks
		<p>I support the ban of fireworks at rodeo's, The loud noise of fireworks is well established as a stressor in companion animals (Bolster 2012; Dale et al., 2010) And Unexpected noise and movement will cause the fight or flight response in both horses and cattle (Lanier, 2000; Christensen, 2005).</p> <p>I would like to see a total ban on rodeo, rodeo is of no advantage to the economy. A petition recently submitted to parliament has 42,000 members of the public in support of such a ban. Rodeo is in breach of the animal welfare act which states that animals should be 'physically handled in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress.' The rodeo is a form of entertainment therefore making it an unnecessary activity for animals to be involved in. The likelihood of animals feeling distress while performing in rodeos could only be successfully minimised if rodeos were entirely stopped; goading animals into states of distress is fundamental to getting them to perform in rodeo events.</p> <p>As there have been many breaches of the rodeo code brought before MPI in 2014 and 2015 we strongly urge MPI to carefully consider if the codes are adequate in helping to minimise the likelihood of unreasonable and unnecessary pain or distress. We are aware of new breaches that will be brought before MPI for a third year running, this adds to the evidence that these codes are not adequate for protecting animals, therefore we feel that the only way to ensure these breaches do not continue is for an outright ban.</p>
30	Exotic animals	Used in circuses
		<p>I do not support the use of exotic animals in circuses and propose that their use be banned. Given that there are currently no circuses in NZ using exotic animals the banning of the practice now will cause no industry disruption. Popular opinion both here and overseas is moving away from the use of exotic animals in circus and if this practice was to occur again in NZ it is likely that there would be a public outcry against it.</p>
31	Cattle	Milk stimulation
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit the stimulation of milk let down by inserting water or air into a cow's vagina. I propose the prohibition is extended to include the insertion of any object into a cow's vagina to stimulate milk let down. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.</p>
32	Cattle and Sheep	Vehicular traction in calving or lambing
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit the use of a moving vehicle to provide traction in lambing or calving. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
33	Cattle and Sheep	Ingrown horns
		<p>I support the proposal to require treatment for horns that are touching the skin or eye. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
34	Stock transport	Cuts and abrasions
		<p>I support the proposal that transport should not result in cuts or abrasions. I propose the regulation is extended to all animals' not just cattle, sheep, deer, goats, and pigs. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
35	Stock transport	Animals with ingrown horns

		I support the proposal that animals with ingrown horns must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
36	Stock transport	Animals with bleeding horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with bleeding horns or antler must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
37	Stock transport	Animals with long horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with long horn or antler must not cause injury to themselves or others during transport. I could not find any rationale for the use of 110mm as a cut off value for long antler either in the code of welfare, or the report on the code. I propose that MPI publish the rationale behind the cut off value of 110mm or perform analysis of the injuries sustained from transport of animals with horns to determine if this measurement is an appropriate guide. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
38	Stock transport	Lame cattle, deer, pigs and goats
		I support the proposal that cattle, sheep, pigs and goats with lameness scores of 2 must be certified for transport by a veterinarian and that animals with a lameness score of 3 must not be transported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
39	Stock transport	Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury
		I support the proposal that animals who cannot bear weight evenly due to injury require certification from a veterinarian for transport. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
40	Stock transport	Pregnant animals
		I support the proposal that animals who are in late stages of pregnancy should not be transported. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
41	Stock transport	Animals with injured or diseased udders
		I support the proposal that animals who have diseased udders should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
42	Stock transport	Cattle or sheep with cancer eye
		I support the proposal that animals who have cancer eye which is large, not confined to the eyelid or discharging/bleeding should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
Young calf management regulatory proposals		
43	Young Calves	Loading and unloading facilities

		I support the proposal that facilities must be provided which enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. Given the potential for severe injury and pain I propose that the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
Proposed	Young Calves	Calves must not be thrown, if they need to be manually lifted they must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick calves).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed 2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Minimum training standard for people handling/loading calves
		<p>I propose a minimum training standard is put in place for people loading calves on to transportation. Footage from 2015 clearly shows inappropriate handling of calves at the time of loading¹. A regulation for minimum training standards for those loading calves will not just improve calf welfare but will also demonstrate the transport industry's commitment to improving their part of the calf management chain. In contrast failure for the transport industry to demonstrate willingness to improve welfare outcomes for calves could reflect badly in the media. I propose infringement penalty is prosecution due to the lack of provision of appropriate training being a corporation level infringement and therefore an appropriate penalty needs to be significant enough to deter corporations from flouting the law.</p> <p>1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Same day slaughter
		I propose that all young calves received at a slaughter premises must be slaughtered that day and cannot be held overnight. It has been recognised by MPI that time off feed is a significant welfare concern in young calves therefore reducing the time spent at a slaughter premises aims to reduce the risk of calves spending an extended period of time off feed. Although an alternative proposal could be for feeding at arrival at slaughter premises given the other welfare issues of housing young calves I consider reducing holding time to a minimum as the least bad of the options. I propose an infringement penalty set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.
Proposed	Young Calves	Use of nearest slaughterhouse
		<p>Increased time spent at transport has been shown to be one of the determinants of poorer outcomes for calves¹. For this reason I propose that calves are required to be slaughtered at the closest slaughter premises. I propose the infringement penalty to be set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p> <p>1) Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
44	Young Calves	Shelter on farm, before and during transportation and at processing plants
		I support the proposal for minimum standards of shelter on farm, before transportation, and at slaughter premises. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.

45	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – age
		<p>I propose that the minimum age of transport is increased to 10 days to bring us in line with what is considered an acceptable standard of welfare in other developed countries. MPI have stated that the 4 day standard suggested in the proposed regulation has been suggested as this reflects current industry practice. However the transport code of welfare only cites research performed in calves 5-10 days of age; therefore I propose that the absolute minimum age of transport be set at 5 days of age. I support the most conservative determination of age – that it is determined from the time the calf is separated from the dam. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>1) Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p>
46	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – Physical characteristics
		<p>I support the proposal that the list of physical characteristics provided with regulation 46 should be met prior to transport of young calves. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p>
47	Young Calves	Maximum time off feed
		<p>I support the proposal for regulating the maximum time off feed for young calves, however we propose this is reduced to 12 hours. The lack of physiological indicators in the 2000 Todd paper does not demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) this is in fact the case in calves <5 days of age or b) that these calves are not experiencing significant hunger or c) that these calves have the physiological capacity to respond to transport in a measurable way with the tools used in the study <p>I propose that calves undergoing transport are kept to the same feeding schedule they would have if they remained on farm. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>1) Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p> <p>2) Knowles, T.G., Warriss, P.D., Brown, S.N., Edwards, J.E., Watkins, P.E. and Phillips, A.J. 1997. Effects on calves less than one month old of feeding or not feeding them during road transport of up to 24 hours. Veterinary Record 140, 116-124.</p>
48	Young Calves	Duration of transport
		<p>I support limiting the duration of transport of young calves to 8 hours or less. As length of transport has been shown to be associated with poorer outcomes for calves, we propose an increase in the infringement penalty to \$1000.</p> <p>1) Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
49	Young Calves	Blunt force trauma
		<p>I support the prohibition of the use of blunt force trauma for killing calves. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to receive appropriate penalties to deter this behaviour.</p>
50	Young Calves	Transport by sea across Cook Strait prohibited
		<p>I support the prohibition of transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to be held accountable.</p>

Surgical and painful procedures regulatory proposals		
51	All animals	Hot branding
		I support the prohibition of hot branding and the penalty of prosecution.
52	All animals	Embryo collection via exteriorised uterus (surgical embryo transfer)
		I do not support the collection of embryos via exteriorised uterus and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
53	All animals	Laparoscopic artificial insemination (laparoscopic AI)
		I do not support the use of laparoscopic AI and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
54	All animals	Liver biopsy
		I support the proposal for liver biopsy to be restricted to being performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students and the requirement for the use of pain relief. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
55	All animals	Dental work
		I support the proposal that any power tool used for dental work must be designed for the purpose of dentistry. I propose the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
56	Cats	Declawing
		I support the restriction of cat declawing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
57	Companion animals	Desexing (including stray/feral cats, dogs and other species)
		I support the restriction of desexing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence. I propose that all cats and dogs sold in pet shops be desexed and vaccinated before being released to the purchaser. This would work as a preventative step in helping reduce the number of stray/feral cats and dogs over time.
58	Dogs	Freeze branding

		I propose that freeze branding of dogs is banned. With better technology now available we can microchip dogs rather than freeze branding them. In the case that freeze branding is not prohibited I support the restriction of freeze branding to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
59	Dogs	Dog debarking (and devoicing of other species)
		I support the restriction of dog debarking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
60	Dogs	Cropping the ears
		I support the proposal to prohibit ear cropping of dogs. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
61	Dogs	Dew claws
		I support the restriction of removal of articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose restriction of removal of non-articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution.
62	Dogs	Tail docking
		I support the docking of tails in dogs for therapeutic reasons only. The procedure must be performed by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Pain relief must be used at the time of this procedure.
63	Cattle	Teats
		<p>I support the proposal for supernumerary teat removal of animals >6 weeks of age to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the removal of supernumerary teats in animals <6 weeks of age without pain relief, however the procedure could be undertaken by a skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie a vet tech). I propose that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the maximum of age of animals on whom supernumerary teat removal can be performed by a lay person is reduced to 4 weeks of age <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) infringement penalty of prosecution b) pain relief is required for any supernumerary teat removal procedure regardless of age <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) infringement penalty of prosecution c) procedure is performed using sterilised equipment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) infringement penalty of \$500 d) any person performing the procedure who is not a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student is signed off by a veterinarian <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv) infringement penalty of prosecution
64	Cattle	Claw removal
		I support the proposal that claw removal is restricted to being performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief is required at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) pain relief is also administered. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.

65	Cattle	Teat occlusion
		I support the proposal that teat sealing can only be performed with a product registered for that specific purpose. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution.
66	Cattle	Tail docking
		I support the restriction of tail docking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons only, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
67	Cattle and sheep	Castration and shortening of the scrotum (cryptorchid)
		I support the proposal for surgical castration at any age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I support the proposal that non-surgical castration in cattle and sheep over 6 months of age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the age of 6 months as an appropriate age at which lay people can no longer perform non-surgical castration and propose that this age limit is lowered to 2 months, I support limiting the manner of non-surgical castration to only the use of conventional rubber rings. I does not support performing non-surgical castration without pain relief at any age and propose that pain relief is required for any castration procedure at any age. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also required. I propose that the penalty for all infringements other than lack of NSAID use is prosecution and that the penalty for not using an NSAID is an infringement of \$300.
68	Cattle, sheep and goats	Disbudding
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian, veterinary student under direct supervision, or skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie vet tech/appropriately trained farm worker). I propose that appropriate maximum ages are determined for disbudding to be performed by a lay person. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
69	Cattle, sheep and goats	Dehorning
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision. Given the much greater risk of pain, bleeding, and infection from dehorning rather than disbudding I propose that farmers are given 12 months warning after which dehorning can only be performed by veterinarians. This will give a strong message that disbudding is much preferred and much more economically viable. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
70	Sheep	Tail docking
		I support the limiting of tail docking in sheep who are greater than 6 months of age to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support restricting the techniques for tail docking in younger animals to rubber ring and hot iron only. I propose that pain relief at the time of procedure and NSAID should also be required, regardless of age at the time of tail docking.

		<p>Furthermore I propose that the maximum age at which a lay person is able to perform a tail docking procedure is reduced to 2 months.</p> <p>I support the proposal that tails are not to be cut flush and are to be able to cover the vulva in a female and of a similar length in a male.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for infringements in sheep > 2 months of age and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalties of \$500 for use of non-listed methods and not cutting tails flush in sheep < 2 months of age. I propose a penalty of prosecution for not using pain relief in sheep <2 months of age and a penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p>
71	Sheep	Mulesing
		I support the proposal to prohibit mulesing. I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
72	Deer	Develveting
		I support the proposal for develveting to be only performed by veterinarians, directly supervised veterinary students or a person with veterinary approval. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
73	Horses	Blistering, firing, or nicking
		I support the proposal to prohibit blistering, firing or nicking, and support the proposed infringement penalty.
74	Horses	Tail docking
		I support the proposal for tail docking to only be performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students, only for therapeutic reasons, only with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
75	Horses	Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal pregnancy diagnosis in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
76	Horses	Rectal examination of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal examination in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
77	Horses	Caslick's procedure
		<p>I support the proposal for creation, opening and repair of caslick's procedure to only be performed by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and the use of pain relief for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p> <p>I propose that a caslick's procedure may only be performed for therapeutic purposes and not for a perceived performance benefit and that the proposed infringement penalty for this breach is the same as that proposed above.</p>
78	Horses	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
79	Llama and alpaca	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in llama and alpaca to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the

		time of the procedure, and the minimum age for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalties for these infringements.
80	Pigs	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration to only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision and the required use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution. I propose that a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) is also required and that the penalty for not administering an NSAID is \$300.
81	Pigs	Tail docking
		I propose that pain relief should be used for this procedure regardless of the animal's age. I support limiting the procedure to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students in animals > 7 days of age. I propose that a NSAID should also be administered at the time of the procedure. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and for a lay person performing the procedure in an animal > 7 days of age. I propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID administration.
82	Birds	Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird
		I support the restriction of pinioning/deflighting a bird to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only being performed in the best interests of the animal, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
83	Poultry	Dubbing
		I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence to perform dubbing on breeds not usually dubbed and to not use pain relief at the time of the procedure. I oppose the surgical modification of an animal if the modification is not in the interests of the animal, therefore I propose that dubbing is prohibited with the penalty of a prosecutable offence.
84	Ostriches and emus	Declawing
		I support the prohibition of radical declawing of emu chicks. However the use of the term radical implies that some declawing is allowed and opens the regulation to subjective interpretation. I propose that the regulation prohibit all declawing of emu or ostrich unless performed by a vet for therapeutic reasons. I support the penalty of prosecutable offence.
85	Roosters	Caponising (rooster castration)
		I support the restriction of caponising to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

Submitted by:

Deirdre Sims

s 9(2)(a)

MPI Animal Welfare Codes Submission

Nathan Guy

Minister for Primary Industries

In response to MPI's request for feedback on proposed animal welfare regulations I submit the following for your careful consideration.

The given consultation period (14th April to 10 May 2016) for public involvement is woefully inadequate. Five weeks is unrealistic and makes a mockery of the consultation process. The volume of proposals we are being asked to consider in this time frame isn't feasible and I ask that a more realistic time frame be given for the public to have our say.

I suggest a period of five weeks be given to each section of the proposed welfare regulations.

While the proposed regulations relating to live animal exports, the care and conduct towards animals, and surgical and painful procedures is a start, I ask that there be a full review into intensive farming practices across the agricultural industry.

The last two decades have seen the intensification of animal agriculture to levels that are unprecedented in recent history¹. The current welfare codes and proposed welfare regulations don't go nearly far enough in protecting animal welfare under increasingly intensive farming practices.

Society's moral values are constantly shifting yet these regulations have remained largely static and are vastly out of step with changing attitudes to animal welfare². I want to see a total ban on all cages for layer hens, farrowing crates for sows and a reduction in intensive dairy resulting in the slaughter of over 2m calves annually.

These farming practices can no longer be deemed humane by today's standards and cannot be incorporated as such in any welfare code. The new rules are not keeping pace with changing scientific knowledge and cannot be accepted as good practice.

1) From 5.3m dairy cows in 2007 to 6.4m in 2012 (23% increase in just 5 years) Statistics NZ

2) Switzerland banned cages for hens in 1992

Care and conduct regulatory proposals		
1	All animals	Electric prodders
		<p>I propose that the use of electric prodders be banned under all circumstances except when they are "necessary for protection, preservation or maintenance of human life"</p> <p>I do not support exemptions on the use of prodders based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the species and size of an animal b. the manner of use of an animal (circus) c. the location of the animal (slaughter premises) <p>I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p>
2	All animals	Use of goads
		<p>I support the proposal to ban the use of goads on sensitive areas of an animal's body under any circumstances. Given the deliberate cruelty involved in using goads on sensitive areas I propose an increased infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
3	All animals	Twisting an animal's tail
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit painful twisting of an animal's tail. Given the potential for significant pain and damage from this behaviour, and the deliberate nature of the act I propose the infringement penalty is set at the higher level of \$500.</p>
Proposed	All animals	Any animal requiring manual lifting must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick animals).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed 2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/
4	Dogs	Pinch and Prong collars
		<p>I support the prohibition of pinch and prong collars under any circumstances; no exemption for dogs used for special purposes (guarding, military) is supported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300. I also support the banning of the sale of these collars and associated penalties under the law.</p>
5	Dogs	Injuries from collars or tethers

		I support the proposal to only use collars or tethers in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. Given the potential for severe injury from collars I propose the penalty is increased to a prosecutable offence.
6	Dogs	Muzzling a dog
		I support the proposal for regulating the use of muzzles so they do not cause injury or distress. I support the inclusion in the proposal that muzzles should allow for a dog to be able to drink. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
7	Dogs	Dry and shaded shelter
		I support the proposal for dogs to have access to dry and shaded shelter at all times. I propose the inclusion in the proposal that dogs also have access to fresh, palatable drinking water at all times. Given that shelter and water are basic needs of life neglecting these items has the potential to cause significant harm and even death therefore I propose the infringement penalty to be increased to a prosecutable offence. I also propose that there be a maximum time imposed that a dog is allowed to be chained for at any one time and that an infringement fee be set for exceeding that time.
8	Dogs	Dogs left in vehicles
		I support the proposal for people leaving dogs in vehicles to ensure their safety. I propose increasing the penalty to a prosecutable offence both to reflect the potential fatal nature of the injury and also to act as a suitable penalty to prevent this behaviour. Additionally increasing the penalty allows for effective prosecution of corporations who use dogs who have a responsibility to ensure dogs in their care are cared for appropriately.
9	Dogs	Secured on moving vehicles
		I support the proposal to secure dogs on moving vehicles. I propose including dogs on vehicles on private property in the regulation, and propose a speed limit of 40kph for vehicles carrying unsecured working dogs. I propose increasing the penalty for infringement to \$1000 due to the potential for severe injury, suffering, and death resulting from falling from a moving vehicle.
Proposed	Dogs	Ban export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Macau or China
		The Macau and China greyhound racing industries do not have the same standards of animal welfare as NZ. The export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Hong Kong (for further transport to Macau/China) is minimal at present. However if the export of greyhounds from other countries (Australia, Ireland) is banned or more heavily regulated then NZ could become a transport hub for dogs in this industry. This has the potential for poor welfare outcomes for dogs and very poor public perception in New Zealand. It is far better to ban an activity like this before it has the potential to become established. MPI have demonstrated their willingness to put in place infringements for uncommon industry activities which have the potential to become welfare issues in the future with proposal 50 in this document banning transport of young calves across cook strait. I propose the above regulation and propose the infringement penalty is set at a prosecutable offence.
10	Dogs and Cats	Drowning dogs and cats
		I support the prohibition of the killing of a dog or cat of any age by drowning. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
11	Eels	Insensible for desliming
		I support the proposal that eels must be insensible for desliming or killed before they are deslimed. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
12	Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish	Insensible before being killed

		<p>I support the proposal that crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish must be insensible before they are killed. I dispute the NAWAC statement that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible and propose that either:</p> <p>a. the only legally acceptable method of rendering crabs and crayfish insensible is by electrical stunning (for which specific equipment is available for use in small restaurant premises). OR</p> <p>b. NAWAC conduct a review of the recent (since 2000) scientific literature on humane slaughter of crustaceans and present good quality, recent evidence to support the claim that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for failing to render a crustacean insensible prior to slaughter.</p>
13	Goats	Tethering requirements
		<p>I do not support the tethering of goats, on the basis that it stops goats expressing normal social behaviours, and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$500. Furthermore I share concerns with previous submissions around tethering of goats that tourists witnessing tethered goats on the road side could easily get a negative impression of animal welfare in NZ.</p> <p>I propose that all goats, regardless of housing system, have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$500.</p> <p>I also propose that as goats are social animals all goats should be provided with a companion such as another goat, camelid, horse, donkey or sheep. I propose that failure to house a goat with a companion should attract an infringement penalty of \$300.</p> <p>1. Miranda-de la Lama, G.C. and Mattiello, S. (2010). The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming. Small Ruminant Research 90, (1-3), 1-10</p>
14	Horses	Use of a whip, lead, or any other object
		<p>I support the prohibition of using a whip, lead or other object to strike around the head. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.</p>
15	Horses	Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles
		<p>I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.</p>
16	Horses and Donkeys	Tethering requirements
		<p>I do not support the tethering of horses and donkeys and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$300. I propose that all horses and donkeys have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times regardless of housing system and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$300.</p>
17	Layer Hens	Opportunity to express normal behaviours in housing systems
		<p>I believe that colony cages do not adequately consider the welfare of layer hens because they prohibit the ability of the hen to express a range of normal behaviours. In addition, colony cages are not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 as they do not allow owners or persons in charge of animals to take all reasonable steps to ensure that their physical, health and behavioural needs are met.</p> <p>1) Sections 9, 68 Animal Welfare Act 1999</p>
18	Layer Hens	Stocking densities
		<p>Colony cages do not allow hens to engage in a range of normal behaviours and therefore they are in clear breach of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. With a stocking density of 13 hens per square metre or 750 square centimetres, clearly the stocking density is too high.</p>
19	Layer Hens	Housing and equipment design

		<p>Colony cages are only slightly bigger than traditional battery cages. While they provide token welfare gestures like nest boxes, scratch pads and perches, these gestures do not ensure the physical, health and behavioural needs of hens are met. With only 750 sq cm per hen, there are a number of behaviours hens are not able to functionally perform in colony cages; this includes spreading her wings fully. It's also questionable whether a hen in a colony cage can properly nest, perch, peck or scratch. A hen in a colony cage cannot dust bathe.</p> <p>Research has shown that some hens in colony cages can be prevented from using the nest provided due to competition from other hens². Also, the limited space in colony cages is insufficient to allow hens sufficient time (on average 45 minutes³) if they want to lay at the same time.</p> <p>In order to satisfy a hen's need for perching, the housing system must be able to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient length of perching space to allow all birds to perch at the same time; and • Sufficient elevation of the perches to satisfy the hens' requirements for a perceived safe perching place at night. <p>Colony cages fulfil neither of these requirements. The standard of approximately 15cm of space per hen is an average and does not allow consideration for larger birds. Perches in colony systems are situated on average just a few centimetres from the floor of the cage. 'A perch positioned 5cm above floor level is 'not considered as a perch (by a hen) and has no attractive or repulsive value'.</p> <p>Litter is not provided in colony cage systems. Litter is imperative for hen welfare. Hens will make great efforts to access litter for pecking, scratching and dustbathing – three normal behaviours of hens⁴. When hens are unable to forage in litter, they can redirect their pecking towards other hens resulting in harmful feather pecking and even cannibalism. When hens are unable to dustbathe in litter, they can develop the dysfunctional behaviour of sham dustbathing.</p> <p>1) A hen's wingspan is approximately 75-80 centimetres which is twice the size of a traditional battery cage</p> <p>2) Guedson, V. and Faure, J. M. (2004) <i>Laying performance and egg quality in hens kept in standard or furnished cages</i>. Animal Research, 53: 45-57.</p> <p>3) Appleby, M.C. (1998) Modification of laying hen cages to improve behaviour. Poultry Science, 77: 1828-1832.</p> <p>4) Cooper, J.J. and Ablettosa, M. J. (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews, 14: 127-149.</p>
20	Layer Hens	Induced moulting
		I support the proposal to prohibit induced moulting of layer hens.
21	Llama and Alpaca	Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes, and packs
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
22	Llama and Alpaca	Companion animals
		I support the proposal that camelids must be provided with a companion animal. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
23	Llama and Alpaca	Offspring (Cria) camelid companions
		I support the proposal to prohibit raising Cria without the company of other camelids. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
24	Pigs	Dry sleeping area
		Proposal: I support the proposal that all pigs have access to a dry sleeping area.

		Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
25	Pigs	<p>Lying space for grower pigs</p> <p>Proposal: I support the proposal for minimum space requirements for grower pigs.</p> <p>1. Error in formula</p> <p>The proposed formula used to calculate the minimum space has a type error; specifically the exponent notation has not been applied. I believes the formula intended by MPI should read "live weight^{0.67} (kg)" but instead it reads "live weight 0.67(kg)" which translates to an Area = 0.03 * liveweight * 0.67(kg) and results in a much higher space requirement.</p> <p>Therefore I contend that proposal 25 must be rewritten and resubmitted for public consultation, with the correct formula included so that the intended space requirement can be properly considered.</p> <p>2. Minimum requirement</p> <p>Recent research suggests that a k-value of 0.3 is too low. In 2006, Gonyou et al. (2006) which ADFI is reduced. More recently, a 2015 study has found that a k-value of 0.0336 might underestimate the impact of increased stocking density on ADG and ADFI². A k-value of 0.3 is too low to provide grower pigs with this environment and is sufficient as a minimum requirement for static space only.</p> <p>Does the proposal adequately define the appropriate systems?</p> <p>The proposal is based on a minimum standard, which is expected to occur (if at all) only where growers have reached the capacity of their pen and are shortly to be moved to a bigger pen³ not a minimum standard which is considered acceptable at all times and this should be clarified in the regulation itself.</p> <p>I consider the minimum standards of housing for pigs to be provide "sufficient space to enable them to perform natural behaviours such as lying on their side without touching another pig, standing up, turning around and performing exercise, space for separate areas for dunging and feeding, with a dunging areas situated a sufficient distance from sleeping and feeding areas as well as materials to enable them to root and forage" ⁴. If these standards cannot be met by the current farming systems then we are concerned that the current farming systems are not compatible with the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour and breach the animal welfare act.</p> <p>The current regulation has no limit on the length of time during which a grower pig may be submitted to the proposed minimum standard. Overstocking is a known problem. I am concerned that grower pigs may be submitted to spaces which do not meet minimum requirement if their transfer to a new pen is delayed. I would like the regulations to be clear that it is unacceptable for growers to be kept for prolonged periods in spaces at or close to the minimum requirement. In its 2010 review, NAWAC submitted that space enough to allow for pigs to lie fully recumbent (k-value of 0.047) was recommended best practice.</p> <p>For the sake of clarity and to give effect to the intention of NAWAC, I suggest that a minimum period of time for growers kept in the lower end of the scale be added.</p> <p>Due to the above considerations, I propose that the minimum standard is amended to:</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must have lying space of at least: Area (m²) per pig = 0.040 x live weight 0.67(kg)</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must not have lying space of less than: Area (m²) per pig = 0.047 x live weight 0.67(kg) for longer than one week.</p> <p>Penalty: I support penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p> <p>1) Gonyou, H. W., M. C. Brumm, E. Bush, J. Deen, S. A. Edwards, T. Fangman, J. J. McGlone, M. Meunier-Salaun, R. B. Morrison, H. Spoolder, P. L. Sundberg, and A. K. Johnson. 2006. Application of broken-line analysis to assess floor space requirements of nursery and grower-finisher pigs expressed on an allometric basis. J. Anim. Sci. 84: 229-235.</p> <p>2) Thomas, LL. "The Effects of Increasing Stocking Density on Finishing Pig Growth ..." 2015. http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=kaesrr</p> <p>3) ibid. Page 9</p> <p>4) "ANIMAL WELFARE (Pigs) CODE OF WELFARE 2010 REPORT." 2015. 15 May. 2016 <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/1446></p>
26	Pigs	Dry sow stalls

		<p>Proposal: I support the prohibition of dry sow stalls</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p>
27	Pigs	<p>Size of farrowing crates</p> <p>Proposal: I do not support the use of farrowing crates.</p> <p>Production systems using farrowing crates are not the only financially viable forms of pork production. It is widely accepted that sow welfare in farrowing crates is sub-optimal. Continuing a production system which is contrary to good practice and scientific knowledge is in direct violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.</p> <p>In 2016, a review of Farrowing Crates for Pigs in NZ was submitted by NAWAC¹. In that report, NAWAC stated that "no significant change in science, technology or good practice from 2010 when the pigs code of welfare was issued". It submitted that the levels of piglet mortality in farrowing pens is higher than in farrowing crates and used this as justification for retaining farrowing crates in New Zealand. However, there is abundant research which supports the conclusion that total piglet mortality on farms with loose farrowing systems does not differ from that of farms with crates^{2,3}.</p> <p>I submit that farrowing crates are unacceptable in modern day pork production systems and must be banned outright.</p> <p>1) "National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee - NZPork." 2016. 15 May. 2016 http://www.nzpork.co.nz/images/custom/farrowing-crate-advice-14-march-2016.pdf</p> <p>2) Weber, R. "Piglet mortality on farms using farrowing systems ... - IngentaConnect." 2007. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ufaw/aw/2007/00000016/00000002/art00042</p> <p>3) KilBride, AL. "A cohort study of preweaning piglet mortality and ... - ScienceDirect." 2012. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167587711003564</p>
28	Pigs	<p>Provision of nesting material</p> <p>Proposal: I support the provision of nesting material that can be manipulated to sows. However, it is clear that sows in farrowing crates will be unable to exhibit natural nesting behaviours in the confined space of a farrowing crate. To give effect to the intention of providing nesting material, the sow must be given more space in which to move.</p> <p>I agree that the definition of manipulable material should be made more apparent. "Material at ground level which mimics that of natural nesting material and encourages the sow to exhibit rooting behaviour" would be appropriate. However, for clarity, I recommend that examples are provided for guidance. Appropriate examples would include straw and sawdust.</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>1) Chaloupková, H. "The effect of nesting material on the nest-building and maternal ... - NCBI." 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20889685</p>
29	Rodeos	<p>Fireworks</p> <p>I support the ban of fireworks at rodeo's, The loud noise of fireworks is well established as a stressor in companion animals (Bolster 2012; Dale et al., 2010) And Unexpected noise and movement will cause the fight or flight response in both horses and cattle (Lanier, 2000; Christensen, 2005).</p> <p>I would like to see a total ban on rodeo, rodeo is of no advantage to the economy. A petition recently submitted to parliament has 42,000 members of the public in support of such a ban. Rodeo is in breach of the animal welfare act which states that animals should be 'physically handled in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress.' The rodeo is a form of entertainment therefore making it an unnecessary activity for animals to be involved in. The likelihood of animals feeling distress while performing in rodeos could only be successfully minimised if rodeos were entirely stopped; goading animals into states of distress is fundamental to getting them to perform in rodeo events.</p> <p>As there have been many breaches of the rodeo code brought before MPI in 2014 and 2015 we strongly urge MPI to carefully consider if the codes are adequate in helping to minimise the likelihood of unreasonable and unnecessary pain or distress. We are aware of new breaches that will be brought before MPI for a third year running, this adds to the</p>

		evidence that these codes are not adequate for protecting animals, therefore we feel that the only way to ensure these breaches do not continue is for an outright ban.
30	Exotic animals	Used in circuses
		I do not support the use of exotic animals in circuses and propose that their use be banned. Given that there are currently no circuses in NZ using exotic animals the banning of the practice now will cause no industry disruption. Popular opinion both here and overseas is moving away from the use of exotic animals in circus and if this practice was to occur again in NZ it is likely that there would be a public outcry against it.
31	Cattle	Milk stimulation
		I support the proposal to prohibit the stimulation of milk let down by inserting water or air into a cow's vagina. I propose the prohibition is extended to include the insertion of any object into a cow's vagina to stimulate milk let down. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
32	Cattle and Sheep	Vehicular traction in calving or lambing
		I support the proposal to prohibit the use of a moving vehicle to provide traction in lambing or calving. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
33	Cattle and Sheep	Ingrown horns
		I support the proposal to require treatment for horns that are touching the skin or eye. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
34	Stock transport	Cuts and abrasions
		I support the proposal that transport should not result in cuts or abrasions. I propose the regulation is extended to all animals' not just cattle, sheep, deer, goats, and pigs. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
35	Stock transport	Animals with ingrown horns
		I support the proposal that animals with ingrown horns must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
36	Stock transport	Animals with bleeding horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with bleeding horns or antler must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
37	Stock transport	Animals with long horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with long horn or antler must not cause injury to themselves or others during transport. I could not find any rationale for the use of 110mm as a cut off value for long antler either in the code of welfare, or the report on the code. I propose that MPI publish the rationale behind the cut off value of 110mm or perform analysis of the injuries sustained from transport of animals with horns to determine if this measurement is an appropriate guide. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
38	Stock transport	Lame cattle, deer, pigs and goats

		I support the proposal that cattle, sheep, pigs and goats with lameness scores of 2 must be certified for transport by a veterinarian and that animals with a lameness score of 3 must not be transported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
39	Stock transport	Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury
		I support the proposal that animals who cannot bear weight evenly due to injury require certification from a veterinarian for transport. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
40	Stock transport	Pregnant animals
		I support the proposal that animals who are in late stages of pregnancy should not be transported. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
41	Stock transport	Animals with injured or diseased udders
		I support the proposal that animals who have diseased udders should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
42	Stock transport	Cattle or sheep with cancer eye
		I support the proposal that animals who have cancer eye which is large, not confined to the eyelid or discharging/bleeding should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
Young calf management regulatory proposals		
43	Young Calves	Loading and unloading facilities
		I support the proposal that facilities must be provided which enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. Given the potential for severe injury and pain I propose that the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
Proposed	Young Calves	Calves must not be thrown, if they need to be manually lifted they must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick calves).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed 2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Minimum training standard for people handling/loading calves

		<p>I propose a minimum training standard is put in place for people loading calves on to transportation. Footage from 2015 clearly shows inappropriate handling of calves at the time of loading¹. A regulation for minimum training standards for those loading calves will not just improve calf welfare but will also demonstrate the transport industry's commitment to improving their part of the calf management chain. In contrast failure for the transport industry to demonstrate willingness to improve welfare outcomes for calves could reflect badly in the media. I propose infringement penalty is prosecution due to the lack of provision of appropriate training being a corporation level infringement and therefore an appropriate penalty needs to be significant enough to deter corporations from flouting the law.</p> <p>1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Same day slaughter
		<p>I propose that all young calves received at a slaughter premises must be slaughtered that day and cannot be held overnight. It has been recognised by MPI that time off feed is a significant welfare concern in young calves therefore reducing the time spent at a slaughter premises aims to reduce the risk of calves spending an extended period of time off feed. Although an alternative proposal could be for feeding at arrival at slaughter premises given the other welfare issues of housing young calves I consider reducing holding time to a minimum as the least bad of the options. I propose an infringement penalty set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Use of nearest slaughterhouse
		<p>Increased time spent at transport has been shown to be one of the determinants of poorer outcomes for calves¹. For this reason I propose that calves are required to be slaughtered at the closest slaughter premises. I propose the infringement penalty to be set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p> <p>1) Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
44	Young Calves	Shelter on farm, before and during transportation and at processing plants
		<p>I support the proposal for minimum standards of shelter on farm, before transportation, and at slaughter premises. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p>
45	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – age
		<p>I propose that the minimum age of transport is increased to 10 days to bring us in line with what is considered an acceptable standard of welfare in other developed countries. MPI have stated that the 4 day standard suggested in the proposed regulation has been suggested as this reflects current industry practice. However the transport code of welfare only cites research performed in calves 5-10 days of age¹ therefore I propose that the absolute minimum age of transport be set at 5 days of age. I support the most conservative determination of age – that it is determined from the time the calf is separated from the dam. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>1) Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p>
46	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – Physical characteristics
		<p>I support the proposal that the list of physical characteristics provided with regulation 46 should be met prior to transport of young calves. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p>

47	Young Calves	Maximum time off feed
		<p>I support the proposal for regulating the maximum time off feed for young calves, however we propose this is reduced to 12 hours. The lack of physiological indicators in the 2000 Todd paper does not demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) this is in fact the case in calves <5 days of age or b) that these calves are not experiencing significant hunger or c) that these calves have the physiological capacity to respond to transport in a measurable way with the tools used in the study <p>I propose that calves undergoing transport are kept to the same feeding schedule they would have if they remained on farm. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134. 2) Knowles, T.G., Warriss, P.D., Brown, S.N., Edwards, J.E., Watkins, P.E. and Phillips, A.J. 1997. Effects on calves less than one month old of feeding or not feeding them during road transport of up to 24 hours. Veterinary Record 140, 116-124.
48	Young Calves	Duration of transport
		<p>I support limiting the duration of transport of young calves to 8 hours or less. As length of transport has been shown to be associated with poorer outcomes for calves we propose an increase in the infringement penalty to \$1000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84
49	Young Calves	Blunt force trauma
		<p>I support the prohibition of the use of blunt force trauma for killing calves. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to receive appropriate penalties to deter this behaviour.</p>
50	Young Calves	Transport by sea across Cook Strait prohibited
		<p>I support the prohibition of transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to be held accountable.</p>
Surgical and painful procedures regulatory proposals		
51	All animals	Hot branding
		<p>I support the prohibition of hot branding and the penalty of prosecution.</p>
52	All animals	Embryo collection via exteriorised uterus (surgical embryo transfer)
		<p>I do not support the collection of embryos via exteriorised uterus and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).</p>
53	All animals	Laparoscopic artificial insemination (laparoscopic AI)
		<p>I do not support the use of laparoscopic AI and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians</p>

		and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
54	All animals	Liver biopsy
		I support the proposal for liver biopsy to be restricted to being performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students and the requirement for the use of pain relief. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
55	All animals	Dental work
		I support the proposal that any power tool used for dental work must be designed for the purpose of dentistry. I propose the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
56	Cats	Declawing
		I support the restriction of cat declawing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
57	Companion animals	Desexing (including stray/feral cats, dogs and other species)
		I support the restriction of desexing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence. I propose that all cats and dogs sold in pet shops be desexed and vaccinated before being released to the purchaser. This would work as a preventative step in helping reduce the number of stray/feral cats and dogs over time.
58	Dogs	Freeze branding
		I propose that freeze branding of dogs is banned. With better technology now available we can microchip dogs rather than freeze branding them. In the case that freeze branding is not prohibited I support the restriction of freeze branding to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
59	Dogs	Dog debarking (and devoicing of other species)
		I support the restriction of dog debarking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
60	Dogs	Cropping the ears
		I support the proposal to prohibit ear cropping of dogs. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
61	Dogs	Dew claws

		I support the restriction of removal of articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose restriction of removal of non-articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution.
62	Dogs	Tail docking
		I support the docking of tails in dogs for therapeutic reasons only. The procedure must be performed by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Pain relief must be used at the time of this procedure.
63	Cattle	Teats
		<p>I support the proposal for supernumerary teat removal of animals >6 weeks of age to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the removal of supernumerary teats in animals <6 weeks of age without pain relief, however the procedure could be undertaken by a skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie a vet tech). I propose that:</p> <p>a) the maximum of age of animals on whom supernumerary teat removal can be performed by a lay person is reduced to 4 weeks of age</p> <p>i) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>b) pain relief is required for any supernumerary teat removal procedure regardless of age</p> <p>ii) infringement penalty of prosecution</p> <p>c) procedure is performed using sterilised equipment</p> <p>iii) infringement penalty of \$500</p> <p>d) any person performing the procedure who is not a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student is signed off by a veterinarian</p> <p>iv) infringement penalty of prosecution</p>
64	Cattle	Claw removal
		I support the proposal that claw removal is restricted to being performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief is required at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) pain relief is also administered. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
65	Cattle	Teat occlusion
		I support the proposal that teat sealing can only be performed with a product registered for that specific purpose. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution.
66	Cattle	Tail docking
		I support the restriction of tail docking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons only, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
67	Cattle and sheep	Castration and shortening of the scrotum (cryptorchid)
		I support the proposal for surgical castration at any age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I support the proposal that non-surgical castration in cattle and sheep over 6 months of age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the age of 6 months as an appropriate age at which lay people can no longer perform non-surgical castration and propose that this age limit is lowered to 2 months, I support limiting the manner of non-surgical castration to only the

		use of conventional rubber rings. I does not support performing non-surgical castration without pain relief at any age and propose that pain relief is required for any castration procedure at any age. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also required. I propose that the penalty for all infringements other than lack of NSAID use is prosecution and that the penalty for not using an NSAID is an infringement of \$300.
68	Cattle, sheep and goats	Disbudding
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian, veterinary student under direct supervision, or skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie vet tech/appropriately trained farm worker). I propose that appropriate maximum ages are determined for disbudding to be performed by a lay person. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
69	Cattle, sheep and goats	Dehorning
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision. Given the much greater risk of pain, bleeding, and infection from dehorning rather than disbudding I propose that farmers are given 12 months warning after which dehorning can only be performed by veterinarians. This will give a strong message that disbudding is much preferred and much more economically viable. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
70	Sheep	Tail docking
		I support the limiting of tail docking in sheep who are greater than 6 months of age to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support restricting the techniques for tail docking in younger animals to rubber ring and hot iron only. I propose that pain relief at the time of procedure and NSAID should also be required, regardless of age at the time of tail docking. Furthermore I propose that the maximum age at which a lay person is able to perform a tail docking procedure is reduced to 2 months. I support the proposal that tails are not to be cut flush and are to be able to cover the vulva in a female and of a similar length in a male. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for infringements in sheep > 2 months of age and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use. I support the proposed penalties of \$500 for use of non-listed methods and not cutting tails flush in sheep < 2 months of age. I propose a penalty of prosecution for not using pain relief in sheep <2 months of age and a penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
71	Sheep	Mulesing
		I support the proposal to prohibit mulesing. I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
72	Deer	Develveting
		I support the proposal for develveting to be only performed by veterinarians, directly supervised veterinary students or a person with veterinary approval. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
73	Horses	Blistering, firing, or nicking

		I support the proposal to prohibit blistering, firing or nicking, and support the proposed infringement penalty.
74	Horses	Tail docking
		I support the proposal for tail docking to only be performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students, only for therapeutic reasons, only with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
75	Horses	Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal pregnancy diagnosis in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
76	Horses	Rectal examination of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal examination in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
77	Horses	Caslick's procedure
		I support the proposal for creation, opening and repair of caslick's procedure to only be performed by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and the use of pain relief for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty. I propose that a caslick's procedure may only be performed for therapeutic purposes and not for a perceived performance benefit and that the proposed infringement penalty for this breach is the same as that proposed above.
78	Horses	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
79	Llama and alpaca	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in llama and alpaca to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure, and the minimum age for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalties for these infringements.
80	Pigs	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration to only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision and the required use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution. I propose that a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) is also required and that the penalty for not administering an NSAID is \$300.
81	Pigs	Tail docking
		I propose that pain relief should be used for this procedure regardless of the animal's age. I support limiting the procedure to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students in animals > 7 days of age. I propose that a NSAID should also be administered at the time of the procedure. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and for a lay person performing the procedure in an animal > 7 days of age. I propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID administration.
82	Birds	Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird
		I support the restriction of pinioning/deflighting a bird to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only being performed in the best

		interests of the animal, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
83	Poultry	Dubbing
		I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence to perform dubbing on breeds not usually dubbed and to not use pain relief at the time of the procedure. I oppose the surgical modification of an animal if the modification is not in the interests of the animal, therefore I propose that dubbing is prohibited with the penalty of a prosecutable offence.
84	Ostriches and emus	Declawing
		I support the prohibition of radical declawing of emu chicks. However the use of the term radical implies that some declawing is allowed and opens the regulation to subjective interpretation. I propose that the regulation prohibit all declawing of emu or ostrich unless performed by a vet for therapeutic reasons. I support the penalty of prosecutable offence.
85	Roosters	Caponising (rooster castration)
		I support the restriction of caponising to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

From: Laura Twomey § 9(2)(a)
Sent: Monday, 16 May 2016 8:32 p.m.
To: Animal Welfare Policy
Subject: Submission on Animal Welfare

Categories: Blue Category

Hello,

As I am reading through many of the new proposed regulations some of which I agree with and others I am furious about. Many of the regulations do not need changing and some indeed do, but by taking away the rights and choices of the public, the small animal breeders and other farming community more and more are getting angry and will refuse to follow the rules of the new laws.

Most of the New Zealand public who have animals treat them with respect and take care of them, some do not and things in regards to their offences need to be harsher.

On the website it is stated that

"Dogs travelling on the back of vehicles on public roads must be secured so they don't fall off."

This should have been brought into action many years ago but in the cases of hunters many have cages attached to the vehicle which is safer than a rope or chain in the case of an accident I would rather bruising than decapitation for any animal traveling on the back of a vehicle.

"If you are dehorning cattle, sheep or goats, you would be required to administer pain relief." No, the pain does not last that long and they are farming animals, you do not give pain relief to a child having an injection to protect them from a disease so why give animals pain relief for a quick sting that is ultimately to protect them from fights and injuring other animals in the heard and causing more injury.

"If a dog shows signs of heat distress from being left in a hot vehicle, the person in charge of the dog will be liable for a fine."

What about those that have fans and people sitting in the car also, are you going to fine them if all is okay but the dog is panting??? If the animal is in serious danger yes, do something about it. If the dog is fine leave it alone. Even if it is raining and 10 degrees and the dog is in distress its not from the heat its because they are scared. Are we going to be given a fine for that too?

"De-clawing cats and de-barking dogs will be prohibited except for therapeutic purposes." Therapeutic purposes are you meaning so that they don't damage your \$5000 leather lounge suit with their kitty claws, so that you can relax after a long hard days work twiddling your thumb. Or getting complaints from your neighbors ears with your dogs barking on a far, oh wait, better yet. lets just put them all down and we wont have to deal with any damage to a lounge suite or noise complaints about dogs barking and disrupting their down time when music and loud vehicles are any nicer to listen to.

"If you want to transport injured stock – a veterinary certificate would be required."

My cow hurt its leg I can either take it to the vet or spend how many hundred for a vet certificate to move the animal. I think many would just shoot the cow don't you.

"Hot branding any animal would be prohibited."

So are you saying that tattooing or ice branding is any kinder on the animal? if you notice hot or cold branding is faster than tattooing and easier on the animal.

"Adequate shelter for young calves would be required."

How is this going to be monitored, by council checking every farm in New Zealand, I think not.

"Transportation across the Cook Strait would be banned."

For what reason would it be banned, next the government is going to say "you, yes you reading this are not allowed to drive from A to B because its illegal and there is not a need in this current moment that is affecting them or bringing money into the governments hand.

"Handlers of young calves will be required to handle them properly."

By whos opinion that it is "properly handled" Same as saying to give injections to children or not, all the matter of opinions.

To those of us out in the community that have animals we only do what is best for them such as what most parents do for their human children.

Many laws do need clarification but taking away all options and saying no you can not get you dog de-barked is quite frankly stupid. I can either get my dog de-barked, re-homed (not likely), try a barking collar (yay bark bark!!! S*** I am getting an electric shock I will try to get it off and hurt myself and cause my owner hundreds in a vet bill) or just go with euthanasia. Which is cheaper, easier but emotionally damaging.

Ask Breeders and Farm owners. Many take care of their stock and only want what's best. Just because one opinion is different from another does not mean that the government is always right and us little people are wrong. WE don't want a gun at our heads saying do this or here's a fine.

s 9(2)(a)

Laura Twomey

✓ 147

From: Lisa Noonan s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, 18 May 2016 8:41 p.m.
To: Animal Welfare Submissions
Subject: Submission on Animal Welfare Regulations

MPI Animal Welfare Codes Submission

Nathan Guy
Minister for Primary Industries

In response to MPI's request for feedback on proposed animal welfare regulations I submit the following for your careful consideration.

The given consultation period (14th April to 10 May 2016) for public involvement is woefully inadequate. Five weeks is unrealistic and makes a mockery of the consultation process. The volume of proposals we are being asked to consider in this time frame isn't feasible and I ask that a more realistic time frame be given for the public to have our say.

I suggest a period of five weeks be given to each section of the proposed welfare regulations.

While the proposed regulations relating to live animal exports, the care and conduct towards animals, and surgical and painful procedures is a start, I ask that there be a full review into intensive farming practices across the agricultural industry.

The last two decades have seen the intensification of animal agriculture to levels that are unprecedented in recent history. The current welfare codes and proposed welfare regulations don't go nearly far enough in protecting animal welfare under increasingly intensive farming practices.

Society's moral values are constantly shifting yet these regulations have remained largely static and are vastly out of step with changing attitudes to animal welfare. I want to see a total ban on all cages for layer hens, farrowing crates for sows and a reduction in intensive dairy resulting in the slaughter of over 2m calves annually.

These farming practices can no longer be deemed humane by today's standards and cannot be incorporated as such in any welfare code. The new rules are not keeping pace with changing scientific knowledge and cannot be accepted as good practice.

- 1) From 5.3m dairy cows in 2007 to 6.4m in 2012 (23% increase in just 5 years) Statistics NZ
- 2) Switzerland banned cages for hens in 1992

Care and conduct regulatory proposals		
1	All animals	Electric prodders
		<p>I propose that the use of electric prodders be banned under all circumstances except when they are "necessary for protection, preservation or maintenance of human life"</p> <p>I do not support exemptions on the use of prodders based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the species and size of an animal b. the manner of use of an animal (circus) c. the location of the animal (slaughter premises) <p>I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p>
2	All animals	Use of goads

		I support the proposal to ban the use of goads on sensitive areas of an animal's body under any circumstances. Given the deliberate cruelty involved in using goads on sensitive areas I propose an increased infringement penalty of \$500.
3	All animals	Twisting an animal's tail
		I support the proposal to prohibit painful twisting of an animal's tail. Given the potential for significant pain and damage from this behaviour, and the deliberate nature of the act I propose the infringement penalty is set at the higher level of \$500.
Proposed	All animals	Any animal requiring manual lifting must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick animals).
		Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading ¹ , only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage ² , presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour. 1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed 2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/
4	Dogs	Pinch and Prong collars
		I support the prohibition of pinch and prong collars under any circumstances; no exemption for dogs used for special purposes (guarding, military) is supported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300. I also support the banning of the sale of these collars and associated penalties under the law.
5	Dogs	Injuries from collars or tethers
		I support the proposal to only use collars or tethers in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. Given the potential for severe injury from collars I propose the penalty is increased to a prosecutable offence.
6	Dogs	Muzzling a dog
		I support the proposal for regulating the use of muzzles so they do not cause injury or distress. I support the inclusion in the proposal that muzzles should allow for a dog to be able to drink. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
7	Dogs	Dry and shaded shelter
		I support the proposal for dogs to have access to dry and shaded shelter at all times. I propose the inclusion in the proposal that dogs also have access to fresh, palatable drinking water at all times. Given that shelter and water are basic needs of life neglecting these items has the potential to cause significant harm and even death therefore I propose the infringement penalty to be increased to a prosecutable offence. I also propose that there be a maximum time imposed that a dog is allowed to be chained for at any one time and that an infringement fee be set for exceeding that time.
8	Dogs	Dogs left in vehicles
		I support the proposal for people leaving dogs in vehicles to ensure their safety. I propose increasing the penalty to a prosecutable offence both to reflect the potential fatal nature of the injury and also to act as a suitable penalty to prevent this behaviour. Additionally increasing the penalty allows for effective prosecution of corporations who use dogs who have a responsibility to ensure dogs in their care are cared for appropriately.
9	Dogs	Secured on moving vehicles

		I support the proposal to secure dogs on moving vehicles. I propose including dogs on vehicles on private property in the regulation, and propose a speed limit of 40kph for vehicles carrying unsecured working dogs. I propose increasing the penalty for infringement to \$1000 due to the potential for severe injury, suffering, and death resulting from falling from a moving vehicle.
Proposed	Dogs	Ban export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Macau or China
		The Macau and China greyhound racing industries do not have the same standards of animal welfare as NZ. The export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Hong Kong (for further transport to Macau/China) is minimal at present. However if the export of greyhounds from other countries (Australia, Ireland) is banned or more heavily regulated then NZ could become a transport hub for dogs in this industry. This has the potential for poor welfare outcomes for dogs and very poor public perception in New Zealand. It is far better to ban an activity like this before it has the potential to become established. MPI have demonstrated their willingness to put in place infringements for uncommon industry activities which have the potential to become welfare issues in the future with proposal 50 in this document banning transport of young calves across cook strait. I propose the above regulation and propose the infringement penalty is set at a prosecutable offence.
10	Dogs and Cats	Drowning dogs and cats
		I support the prohibition of the killing of a dog or cat of any age by drowning. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
11	Eels	Insensible for desliming
		I support the proposal that eels must be insensible for desliming or killed before they are deslimed. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
12	Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish	Insensible before being killed
		I support the proposal that crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish must be insensible before they are killed. I dispute the NAWAC statement that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible and propose that either: a. the only legally acceptable method of rendering crabs and crayfish insensible is by electrical stunning (for which specific equipment is available for use in small restaurant premises). OR b. NAWAC conduct a review of the recent (since 2000) scientific literature on humane slaughter of crustaceans and present good quality, recent evidence to support the claim that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for failing to render a crustacean insensible prior to slaughter.
13	Goats	Tethering requirements
		I do not support the tethering of goats, on the basis that it stops goats expressing normal social behaviours, and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$500. Furthermore I share concerns with previous submissions around tethering of goats that tourists witnessing tethered goats on the road side could easily get a negative impression of animal welfare in NZ. I propose that all goats, regardless of housing system, have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$500. I also propose that as goats are social animals' all goats should be provided with a companion such as another goat, camelid, horse, donkey or sheep. I propose that failure to house a goat with a companion should attract an infringement penalty of \$300. 1. Miranda-de la Lama, G.C. and Mattiello, S. (2010). The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming. Small Ruminant Research 90, (1-3), 1-10
14	Horses	Use of a whip, lead, or any other object

		I support the prohibition of using a whip, lead or other object to strike around the head. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
15	Horses	Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
16	Horses and Donkeys	Tethering requirements
		I do not support the tethering of horses and donkeys and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$300. I propose that all horses and donkeys have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times regardless of housing system and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$300.
17	Layer Hens	Opportunity to express normal behaviours in housing systems
		I believe that colony cages do not adequately consider the welfare of layer hens because they prohibit the ability of the hen to express a range of normal behaviours. In addition, colony cages are not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 as they do not allow owners or persons in charge of animals to take all reasonable steps to ensure that their physical, health and behavioural needs are met. 1) Sections 9, 68 Animal Welfare Act 1999
18	Layer Hens	Stocking densities
		Colony cages do not allow hens to engage in a range of normal behaviours and therefore they are in clear breach of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. With a stocking density of 13 hens per square metre or 750 square centimetres, clearly the stocking density is too high.
19	Layer Hens	Housing and equipment design
		<p>Colony cages are only slightly bigger than traditional battery cages. While they provide token welfare gestures like nest boxes, scratch pads and perches, these gestures do not ensure the physical, health and behavioural needs of hens are met. With only 750 sq cm per hen, there are a number of behaviours hens are not able to functionally perform in colony cages; this includes spreading her wings fully¹. It's also questionable whether a hen in a colony cage can properly nest, perch, peck or scratch. A hen in a colony cage cannot dust bathe.</p> <p>Research has shown that some hens in colony cages can be prevented from using the nest provided due to competition from other hens². Also, the limited space in colony cages is insufficient to allow hens sufficient time (on average 45 minutes³) if they want to lay at the same time.</p> <p>In order to satisfy a hen's need for perching, the housing system must be able to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient length of perching space to allow all birds to perch at the same time; and • Sufficient elevation of the perches to satisfy the hens' requirements for a perceived safe perching place at night. <p>Colony cages fulfil neither of these requirements. The standard of approximately 15cm of space per hen is an average and does not allow consideration for larger birds. Perches in colony systems are situated on average just a few centimetres from the floor of the cage. <i>'A perch positioned 5cm above floor level is 'not considered as a perch (by a hen) and has no attractive or repulsive value'</i>.</p> <p>Litter is not provided in colony cage systems. Litter is imperative for hen welfare. Hens will make great efforts to access litter for pecking, scratching and dustbathing – three normal behaviours of hens⁴. When hens are unable to forage in litter, they can redirect their pecking towards other hens resulting in harmful feather pecking and even cannibalism. When hens are unable to dustbathe in litter, they can develop the dysfunctional behaviour of sham dustbathing.</p>

		<p>1) A hen's wingspan is approximately 75-80 centimetres which is twice the size of a traditional battery cage</p> <p>2) Guedson, V. and Faure, J. M. (2004) <i>Laying performance and egg quality in hens kept in standard or furnished cages</i>. <i>Animal Research</i>, 53: 45-57.</p> <p>3) Appleby, M.C. (1998) Modification of laying hen cages to improve behaviour. <i>Poultry Science</i>, 77: 1828-1832.</p> <p>4) Cooper, J.J. and Ablettosa, M. J. (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. <i>Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews</i>, 14: 127-149.</p>
20	Layer Hens	Induced moulting
		I support the proposal to prohibit induced moulting of layer hens.
21	Llama and Alpaca	Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes, and packs
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
22	Llama and Alpaca	Companion animals
		I support the proposal that camelids must be provided with a companion animal. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
23	Llama and Alpaca	Offspring (Cria) camelid companions
		I support the proposal to prohibit raising Cria without the company of other camelids. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
24	Pigs	Dry sleeping area
		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal that all pigs have access to a dry sleeping area.</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.</p>
25	Pigs	Lying space for grower pigs
		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal for minimum space requirements for grower pigs.</p> <p>1. Error in formula</p> <p>The proposed formula used to calculate the minimum space has a type error; specifically the exponent notation has not been applied. I believe the formula intended by MPI should read "live weight^{0.67} (kg)" but instead it reads "live weight 0.67(kg)" which translates to an Area = 0.03 * liveweight * 0.67(kg) and results in a much higher space requirement.</p> <p>Therefore I contend that proposal 25 must be rewritten and resubmitted for public consultation, with the correct formula included so that the intended space requirement can be properly considered.</p> <p>2. Minimum requirement</p> <p>Recent research suggests that a k-value of 0.3 is too low. In 2006, Gonyou et al. (2006) which ADFI is reduced. More recently, a 2015 study has found that a k-value of 0.0336 might underestimate the impact of increased stocking density on ADG and ADFI. A k-value of 0.3 is too low to provide grower pigs with this environment and is sufficient as a minimum requirement for static space only.</p> <p>Does the proposal adequately define the appropriate systems?</p> <p>The proposal is based on a minimum standard, which is expected to occur (if at all) only where growers have reached the capacity of their pen and are shortly to be moved to a bigger pen; not a minimum standard which is considered acceptable at all times and this should be clarified in the regulation itself.</p> <p>I consider the minimum standards of housing for pigs to be provide "sufficient space to enable them to perform natural behaviours such as lying on their side without touching another pig, standing up, turning around and performing exercise, space for separate areas for dunging and feeding, with a dunging areas situated a sufficient distance from</p>

		<p>sleeping and feeding areas as well as materials to enable them to root and forage" 4. If these standards cannot be met by the current farming systems then we are concerned that the current farming systems are not compatible with the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour and breach the animal welfare act.</p> <p>The current regulation has no limit on the length of time during which a grower pig may be submitted to the proposed minimum standard. Overstocking is a known problem. I am concerned that grower pigs may be submitted to spaces which do not meet minimum requirement if their transfer to a new pen is delayed. I would like the regulations to be clear that it is unacceptable for growers to be kept for prolonged periods in spaces at or close to the minimum requirement. In its 2010 review, NAWAC submitted that space enough to allow for pigs to lie fully recumbent (k-value of 0.047) was recommended best practice.</p> <p>For the sake of clarity and to give effect to the intention of NAWAC, I suggest that a minimum period of time for growers kept in the lower end of the scale be added.</p> <p>Due to the above considerations, I propose that the minimum standard is amended to:</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must have lying space of at least: Area (m2) per pig = 0.040 x live weight 0.67(kg)</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must not have lying space of less than: Area (m2) per pig = 0.047 x live weight 0.67(kg) for longer than one week.</p> <p>Penalty: I support penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p> <p>Gonyou, H. W., M. C. Brumm, E. Bush, J. Deen, S. A. Edwards, T. Fangman, J. J. McGlone, M. Meunier-Salaun, R. B. Morrison, H. Spooler, P. L. Sundberg, and A. K. Johnson. 2006. Application of broken-line analysis to assess floor space requirements of nursery and grower-finisher pigs expressed on an allometric basis. J. Anim. Sci. 84: 229-235.</p> <p>Thomas, LL. "The Effects of Increasing Stocking Density on Finishing Pig Growth ..." 2015. http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=kaesrr ibid. Page 9</p> <p>"ANIMAL WELFARE (Pigs) CODE OF WELFARE 2010 REPORT." 2015. 15 May. 2016 <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/1446></p>
26	Pigs	Dry sow stalls
		<p>Proposal: I support the prohibition of dry sow stalls</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p>
27	Pigs	Size of farrowing crates
		<p>Proposal: I do not support the use of farrowing crates.</p> <p>Production systems using farrowing crates are not the only financially viable forms of pork production. It is widely accepted that sow welfare in farrowing crates is sub-optimal. Continuing a production system which is contrary to good practice and scientific knowledge is in direct violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.</p> <p>In 2016, a review of Farrowing Crates for Pigs in NZ was submitted by NAWAC. In that report, NAWAC stated that "no significant change in science, technology or good practice from 2010 when the pigs code of welfare was issued". It submitted that the levels of piglet mortality in farrowing pens is higher than in farrowing crates and used this as justification for retaining farrowing crates in New Zealand. However, there is abundant research which supports the conclusion that total piglet mortality on farms with loose farrowing systems does not differ from that of farms with crates²³.</p> <p>I submit that farrowing crates are unacceptable in modern day pork production systems and must be banned outright.</p> <p>"National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee - NZPork." 2016. 15 May. 2016 http://www.nzpork.co.nz/images/custom/farrowing-crate-advice-14-march-2016.pdf</p> <p>Weber, R. "Piglet mortality on farms using farrowing systems ... - IngentaConnect." 2007. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ufaw/aw/2007/00000016/00000002/art00042</p> <p>KilBride, AL. "A cohort study of preweaning piglet mortality and ... - ScienceDirect." 2012. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167587711003564</p>
28	Pigs	Provision of nesting material

		<p>Proposal: I support the provision of nesting material that can be manipulated to sows. However, it is clear that sows in farrowing crates will be unable to exhibit natural nesting behaviours in the confined space of a farrowing crate. To give effect to the intention of providing nesting material, the sow must be given more space in which to move. I agree that the definition of manipulable material should be made more apparent. "Material at ground level which mimics that of natural nesting material and encourages the sow to exhibit rooting behaviour" would be appropriate. However, for clarity, I recommend that examples are provided for guidance. Appropriate examples would include straw and sawdust.</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Chaloupková, H. "The effect of nesting material on the nest-building and maternal ... - NCBI." 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20889685</p>
29	Rodeos	Fireworks
		<p>I support the ban of fireworks at rodeo's, The loud noise of fireworks is well established as a stressor in companion animals (Bolster 2012; Dale et al., 2010) And Unexpected noise and movement will cause the fight or flight response in both horses and cattle (Lanier, 2000; Christensen, 2005).</p> <p>I would like to see a total ban on rodeo, rodeo is of no advantage to the economy. A petition recently submitted to parliament has 62,000 members of the public in support of such a ban. Rodeo is in breach of the animal welfare act which states that animals should be 'physically handled in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress.' The rodeo is a form of entertainment therefore making it an unnecessary activity for animals to be involved in. The likelihood of animals feeling distress while performing in rodeos could only be successfully minimised if rodeos were entirely stopped; goading animals into states of distress is fundamental to getting them to perform in rodeo events.</p> <p>As there have been many breaches of the rodeo code brought before MPI in 2014 and 2015 we strongly urge MPI to carefully consider if the codes are adequate in helping to minimise the likelihood of unreasonable and unnecessary pain or distress. We are aware of new breaches that will be brought before MPI for a third year running, this adds to the evidence that these codes are not adequate for protecting animals, therefore we feel that the only way to ensure these breaches do not continue is for an outright ban.</p>
30	Exotic animals	Used in circuses
		<p>I do not support the use of exotic animals in circuses and propose that their use be banned. Given that there are currently no circuses in NZ using exotic animals the banning of the practice now will cause no industry disruption. Popular opinion both here and overseas is moving away from the use of exotic animals in circus and if this practice was to occur again in NZ it is likely that there would be a public outcry against it.</p>
31	Cattle	Milk stimulation
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit the stimulation of milk let down by inserting water or air into a cow's vagina. I propose the prohibition is extended to include the insertion of any object into a cow's vagina to stimulate milk let down. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.</p>
32	Cattle and Sheep	Vehicular traction in calving or lambing
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit the use of a moving vehicle to provide traction in lambing or calving. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
33	Cattle and Sheep	Ingrown horns
		<p>I support the proposal to require treatment for horns that are touching the skin or eye. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
34	Stock transport	Cuts and abrasions

		I support the proposal that transport should not result in cuts or abrasions. I propose the regulation is extended to all animals' not just cattle, sheep, deer, goats, and pigs. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
35	Stock transport	Animals with ingrown horns
		I support the proposal that animals with ingrown horns must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
36	Stock transport	Animals with bleeding horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with bleeding horns or antler must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
37	Stock transport	Animals with long horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with long horn or antler must not cause injury to themselves or others during transport. I could not find any rationale for the use of 110mm as a cut off value for long antler either in the code of welfare, or the report on the code. I propose that MPI publish the rationale behind the cut off value of 110mm or perform analysis of the injuries sustained from transport of animals with horns to determine if this measurement is an appropriate guide. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
38	Stock transport	Lame cattle, deer, pigs and goats
		I support the proposal that cattle, sheep, pigs and goats with lameness scores of 2 must be certified for transport by a veterinarian and that animals with a lameness score of 3 must not be transported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
39	Stock transport	Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury
		I support the proposal that animals who cannot bear weight evenly due to injury require certification from a veterinarian for transport. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
40	Stock transport	Pregnant animals
		I support the proposal that animals who are in late stages of pregnancy should not be transported. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
41	Stock transport	Animals with injured or diseased udders
		I support the proposal that animals who have diseased udders should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
42	Stock transport	Cattle or sheep with cancer eye
		I support the proposal that animals who have cancer eye which is large, not confined to the eyelid or discharging/bleeding should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.

Young calf management regulatory proposals		
43	Young Calves	Loading and unloading facilities
		I support the proposal that facilities must be provided which enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. Given the potential for severe injury and pain I propose that the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
Proposed	Young Calves	Calves must not be thrown, if they need to be manually lifted they must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick calves).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage, presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Minimum training standard for people handling/loading calves
		<p>I propose a minimum training standard is put in place for people loading calves on to transportation. Footage from 2015 clearly shows inappropriate handling of calves at the time of loading. A regulation for minimum training standards for those loading calves will not just improve calf welfare but will also demonstrate the transport industry's commitment to improving their part of the calf management chain. In contrast failure for the transport industry to demonstrate willingness to improve welfare outcomes for calves could reflect badly in the media. I propose infringement penalty is prosecution due to the lack of provision of appropriate training being a corporation level infringement and therefore an appropriate penalty needs to be significant enough to deter corporations from flouting the law.</p> <p>http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Same day slaughter
		<p>I propose that all young calves received at a slaughter premises must be slaughtered that day and cannot be held overnight. It has been recognised by MPI that time off feed is a significant welfare concern in young calves therefore reducing the time spent at a slaughter premises aims to reduce the risk of calves spending an extended period of time off feed. Although an alternative proposal could be for feeding at arrival at slaughter premises given the other welfare issues of housing young calves I consider reducing holding time to a minimum as the least bad of the options. I propose an infringement penalty set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Use of nearest slaughterhouse
		<p>Increased time spent at transport has been shown to be one of the determinants of poorer outcomes for calves. For this reason I propose that calves are required to be slaughtered at the closest slaughter premises. I propose the infringement penalty to be set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>

44	Young Calves	Shelter on farm, before and during transportation and at processing plants
		I support the proposal for minimum standards of shelter on farm, before transportation, and at slaughter premises. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
45	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – age
		<p>I propose that the minimum age of transport is increased to 10 days to bring us in line with what is considered an acceptable standard of welfare in other developed countries. MPI have stated that the 4 day standard suggested in the proposed regulation has been suggested as this reflects current industry practice. However the transport code of welfare only cites research performed in calves 5-10 days of age therefore I propose that the absolute minimum age of transport be set at 5 days of age. I support the most conservative determination of age – that it is determined from the time the calf is separated from the dam. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p>
46	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – Physical characteristics
		I support the proposal that the list of physical characteristics provided with regulation 46 should be met prior to transport of young calves. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
47	Young Calves	Maximum time off feed
		<p>I support the proposal for regulating the maximum time off feed for young calves, however we propose this is reduced to 12 hours. The lack of physiological indicators in the 2000 Todd paper does not demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this is in fact the case in calves <5 days of age or that these calves are not experiencing significant hunger or that these calves have the physiological capacity to respond to transport in a measurable way with the tools used in the study <p>I propose that calves undergoing transport are kept to the same feeding schedule they would have if they remained on farm. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p> <p>Knowles, T.G., Warriss, P.D., Brown, S.N., Edwards, J.E., Watkins, P.E. and Phillips, A.J. 1997. Effects on calves less than one month old of feeding or not feeding them during road transport of up to 24 hours. Veterinary Record 140, 116-124.</p>
48	Young Calves	Duration of transport
		<p>I support limiting the duration of transport of young calves to 8 hours or less. As length of transport has been shown to be associated with poorer outcomes for calves we propose an increase in the infringement penalty to \$1000.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
49	Young Calves	Blunt force trauma
		I support the prohibition of the use of blunt force trauma for killing calves. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to receive appropriate penalties to deter this behaviour.

50	Young Calves	Transport by sea across Cook Strait prohibited
		I support the prohibition of transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to be held accountable.
Surgical and painful procedures regulatory proposals		
51	All animals	Hot branding
		I support the prohibition of hot branding and the penalty of prosecution.
52	All animals	Embryo collection via exteriorised uterus (surgical embryo transfer)
		I do not support the collection of embryos via exteriorised uterus and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
53	All animals	Laparoscopic artificial insemination (laparoscopic AI)
		I do not support the use of laparoscopic AI and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
54	All animals	Liver biopsy
		I support the proposal for liver biopsy to be restricted to being performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students and the requirement for the use of pain relief. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
55	All animals	Dental work
		I support the proposal that any power tool used for dental work must be designed for the purpose of dentistry. I propose the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
56	Cats	Declawing
		I support the restriction of cat declawing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
57	Companion animals	Desexing (including stray/feral cats, dogs and other species)
		I support the restriction of desexing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence. I propose that all cats and dogs sold in pet shops be desexed and vaccinated before being released to the purchaser.

		This would work as a preventative step in helping reduce the number of stray/feral cats and dogs over time.
58	Dogs	Freeze branding
		I propose that freeze branding of dogs is banned. With better technology now available we can microchip dogs rather than freeze branding them. In the case that freeze branding is not prohibited I support the restriction of freeze branding to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
59	Dogs	Dog debarking (and devoicing of other species)
		I support the restriction of dog debarking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
60	Dogs	Cropping the ears
		I support the proposal to prohibit ear cropping of dogs. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
61	Dogs	Dew claws
		I support the restriction of removal of articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose restriction of removal of non-articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution.
62	Dogs	Tail docking
		I support the docking of tails in dogs for therapeutic reasons only. The procedure must be performed by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Pain relief must be used at the time of this procedure.
63	Cattle	Teats
		<p>I support the proposal for supernumerary teat removal of animals >6 weeks of age to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the removal of supernumerary teats in animals <6 weeks of age without pain relief, however the procedure could be undertaken by a skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie a vet tech). I propose that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the maximum of age of animals on whom supernumerary teat removal can be performed by a lay person is reduced to 4 weeks of age i) infringement penalty of prosecution pain relief is required for any supernumerary teat removal procedure regardless of age ii) infringement penalty of prosecution procedure is performed using sterilised equipment iii) infringement penalty of \$500 any person performing the procedure who is not a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student is signed off by a veterinarian iv) infringement penalty of prosecution
64	Cattle	Claw removal
		I support the proposal that claw removal is restricted to being performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief is required at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) pain relief is also administered. I

		support the infringement penalty of prosecution for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
65	Cattle	Teat occlusion
		I support the proposal that teat sealing can only be performed with a product registered for that specific purpose. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution.
66	Cattle	Tail docking
		I support the restriction of tail docking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons only, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
67	Cattle and sheep	Castration and shortening of the scrotum (cryptorchid)
		I support the proposal for surgical castration at any age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I support the proposal that non-surgical castration in cattle and sheep over 6 months of age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the age of 6 months as an appropriate age at which lay people can no longer perform non-surgical castration and propose that this age limit is lowered to 2 months, I support limiting the manner of non-surgical castration to only the use of conventional rubber rings. I does not support performing non-surgical castration without pain relief at any age and propose that pain relief is required for any castration procedure at any age. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also required. I propose that the penalty for all infringements other than lack of NSAID use is prosecution and that the penalty for not using an NSAID is an infringement of \$300.
68	Cattle, sheep and goats	Disbudding
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian, veterinary student under direct supervision, or skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie vet tech/appropriately trained farm worker). I propose that appropriate maximum ages are determined for disbudding to be performed by a lay person. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
69	Cattle, sheep and goats	Dehorning
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision. Given the much greater risk of pain, bleeding, and infection from dehorning rather than disbudding I propose that farmers are given 12 months warning after which dehorning can only be performed by veterinarians. This will give a strong message that disbudding is much preferred and much more economically viable. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
70	Sheep	Tail docking
		I support the limiting of tail docking in sheep who are greater than 6 months of age to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered.

		<p>I support restricting the techniques for tail docking in younger animals to rubber ring and hot iron only. I propose that pain relief at the time of procedure and NSAID should also be required, regardless of age at the time of tail docking.</p> <p>Furthermore I propose that the maximum age at which a lay person is able to perform a tail docking procedure is reduced to 2 months.</p> <p>I support the proposal that tails are not to be cut flush and are to be able to cover the vulva in a female and of a similar length in a male.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for infringements in sheep > 2 months of age and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalties of \$500 for use of non-listed methods and not cutting tails flush in sheep < 2 months of age. I propose a penalty of prosecution for not using pain relief in sheep <2 months of age and a penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p>
71	Sheep	Mulesing
		I support the proposal to prohibit mulesing. I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
72	Deer	Develveting
		I support the proposal for develveting to be only performed by veterinarians, directly supervised veterinary students or a person with veterinary approval. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
73	Horses	Blistering, firing, or nicking
		I support the proposal to prohibit blistering, firing or nicking, and support the proposed infringement penalty.
74	Horses	Tail docking
		I support the proposal for tail docking to only be performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students, only for therapeutic reasons, only with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
75	Horses	Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal pregnancy diagnosis in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
76	Horses	Rectal examination of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal examination in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
77	Horses	Caslick's procedure
		<p>I support the proposal for creation, opening and repair of caslick's procedure to only be performed by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and the use of pain relief for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p> <p>I propose that a caslick's procedure may only be performed for therapeutic purposes and not for a perceived performance benefit and that the proposed infringement penalty for this breach is the same as that proposed above.</p>
78	Horses	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
79	Llama and alpaca	Castration

		I support the proposal for castration in llama and alpaca to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure, and the minimum age for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalties for these infringements.
80	Pigs	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration to only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision and the required use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution. I propose that a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) is also required and that the penalty for not administering an NSAID is \$300.
81	Pigs	Tail docking
		I propose that pain relief should be used for this procedure regardless of the animal's age. I support limiting the procedure to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students in animals > 7 days of age. I propose that a NSAID should also be administered at the time of the procedure. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and for a lay person performing the procedure in an animal > 7 days of age. I propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID administration.
82	Birds	Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird
		I support the restriction of pinioning/deflighting a bird to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only being performed in the best interests of the animal, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
83	Poultry	Dubbing
		I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence to perform dubbing on breeds not usually dubbed and to not use pain relief at the time of the procedure. I oppose the surgical modification of an animal if the modification is not in the interests of the animal, therefore I propose that dubbing is prohibited with the penalty of a prosecutable offence.
84	Ostriches and emus	Declawing
		I support the prohibition of radical declawing of emu chicks. However the use of the term radical implies that some declawing is allowed and opens the regulation to subjective interpretation. I propose that the regulation prohibit all declawing of emu or ostrich unless performed by a vet for therapeutic reasons. I support the penalty of prosecutable offence.
85	Roosters	Caponising (rooster castration)
		I support the restriction of caponising to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.

Submitted by:

Lisa Noonan

s 9(2)(a)

From: lindy § 9(2)(a)
Sent: Sunday, 15 May 2016 10:19 p.m.
To: Animal Welfare Submissions
Subject: Submission on Animal Welfare Regulations

Categories: Blue Category

I am writing a submission with regards to the changes to animal welfare policies in NZ. Im pleased to see that there is an attempt to punish people in the care and conduct to animals section. Pain relief surely is the minimum that animals deserve if these unnecessary procedures go ahead. In the matter of Live Exports I think NZ needs to ban these altogether - instead of this ridiculous "no live export for slaughter" that it seems think is ok. This practise is disgustingly cruel - cramming 1000's of land animals onto the sea for weeks to deal with bad weather....turbulent seas and sickness....what difference does it make if the poor creatures are for breeding or slaughter. It is the shipment of live animals which is abhorrent and unnatural. NZ must show the world that we are a compassionate people and refuse to play the game doing what is expected. Bobby calves....also a dispicable practise. Surely the basic needs of the animals must be met after their short life and bad treatment by humans. Once again - it is the miminum that should be afforded these poor creatures whose only "crime" is being born a male - for once seen as a useless life by humans so shipped off to their death.

And of course all this is well and good if the punishment for any of these and many more cruelties committed are not heavy. We all know that people being cruel...some cruelties you cant imagine....is the precursor of abusing people...children in particular because they are vulnerable...just like animals. NZ needs to make a stand and get tough with such behaviour..have some courage and treat these abuses as a crime! Use this opportunity to make a change for all these animals who give so much.....usually ending in their death....or worse.

Lindy Herrick

§ 9(2)(a)

Submitted by:
Kathleen Lafferty
s 9(2)(a)

MPI Animal Welfare Codes Submission

Nathan Guy
Minister for Primary Industries

In response to MPI's request for feedback on proposed animal welfare regulations I submit the following for your careful consideration.

The given consultation period (14th April to 10 May 2016) for public involvement is woefully inadequate. Five weeks is unrealistic and makes a mockery of the consultation process. The volume of proposals we are being asked to consider in this time frame isn't feasible and I ask that a more realistic time frame be given for the public to have our say.

I suggest a period of five weeks be given to each section of the proposed welfare regulations. While the proposed regulations relating to live animal exports, the care and conduct towards animals, and surgical and painful procedures is a start, I ask that there be a full review into intensive farming practices across the agricultural industry.

The last two decades have seen the intensification of animal agriculture to levels that are unprecedented in recent history. The current welfare codes and proposed welfare regulations don't go nearly far enough in protecting animal welfare under increasingly intensive farming practices. Society's moral values are constantly shifting yet these regulations have remained largely static and are vastly out of step with changing attitudes to animal welfare. I want to see a total ban on all cages for layer hens, farrowing crates for sows and a reduction in intensive dairy resulting in the slaughter of over 2m calves annually.

These farming practices can no longer be deemed humane by today's standards and cannot be incorporated as such in any welfare code. The new rules are not keeping pace with changing scientific knowledge and cannot be accepted as good practice.

- 1) From 5.3m dairy cows in 2007 to 6.4m in 2012 (23% increase in just 5 years) Statistics NZ
- 2) Switzerland banned cages for hens in 1992

Care and conduct regulatory proposals		
1	All animals	Electric prodders
		<p>I propose that the use of electric prodders be banned under all circumstances except when they are "necessary for protection, preservation or maintenance of human life"</p> <p>I do not support exemptions on the use of prodders based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">a. the species and size of an animalb. the manner of use of an animal (circus)c. the location of the animal (slaughter premises) <p>I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p>
2	All animals	Use of goads
		<p>I support the proposal to ban the use of goads on sensitive areas of an animal's body under any circumstances. Given the deliberate cruelty involved in using goads on sensitive areas I propose an increased infringement penalty of \$500.</p>

3	All animals	Twisting an animal's tail
		I support the proposal to prohibit painful twisting of an animal's tail. Given the potential for significant pain and damage from this behaviour, and the deliberate nature of the act I propose the infringement penalty is set at the higher level of \$500.
Proposed	All animals	Any animal requiring manual lifting must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick animals).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed 2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
4	Dogs	Pinch and Prong collars
		I support the prohibition of pinch and prong collars under any circumstances; no exemption for dogs used for special purposes (guarding, military) is supported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300. I also support the banning of the sale of these collars and associated penalties under the law.
5	Dogs	Injuries from collars or tethers
		I support the proposal to only use collars or tethers in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. Given the potential for severe injury from collars I propose the penalty is increased to a prosecutable offence.
6	Dogs	Muzzling a dog
		I support the proposal for regulating the use of muzzles so they do not cause injury or distress. I support the inclusion in the proposal that muzzles should allow for a dog to be able to drink. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
7	Dogs	Dry and shaded shelter
		I support the proposal for dogs to have access to dry and shaded shelter at all times. I propose the inclusion in the proposal that dogs also have access to fresh, palatable drinking water at all times. Given that shelter and water are basic needs of life neglecting these items has the potential to cause significant harm and even death therefore I propose the infringement penalty to be increased to a prosecutable offence. I also propose that there be a maximum time imposed that a dog is allowed to be chained for at any one time and that an infringement fee be set for exceeding that time.
8	Dogs	Dogs left in vehicles

		I support the proposal for people leaving dogs in vehicles to ensure their safety. I propose increasing the penalty to a prosecutable offence both to reflect the potential fatal nature of the injury and also to act as a suitable penalty to prevent this behaviour. Additionally increasing the penalty allows for effective prosecution of corporations who use dogs who have a responsibility to ensure dogs in their care are cared for appropriately.
9	Dogs	Secured on moving vehicles
		I support the proposal to secure dogs on moving vehicles. I propose including dogs on vehicles on private property in the regulation, and propose a speed limit of 40kph for vehicles carrying unsecured working dogs. I propose increasing the penalty for infringement to \$1000 due to the potential for severe injury, suffering, and death resulting from falling from a moving vehicle.
Proposed	Dogs	Ban export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Macau or China
		The Macau and China greyhound racing industries do not have the same standards of animal welfare as NZ. The export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Hong Kong (for further transport to Macau/China) is minimal at present. However if the export of greyhounds from other countries (Australia, Ireland) is banned or more heavily regulated then NZ could become a transport hub for dogs in this industry. This has the potential for poor welfare outcomes for dogs and very poor public perception in New Zealand. It is far better to ban an activity like this before it has the potential to become established. MPI have demonstrated their willingness to put in place infringements for uncommon industry activities which have the potential to become welfare issues in the future with proposal 50 in this document banning transport of young calves across cook strait. I propose the above regulation and propose the infringement penalty is set at a prosecutable offence.
10	Dogs and Cats	Drowning dogs and cats
		I support the prohibition of the killing of a dog or cat of any age by drowning. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
11	Eels	Insensible for desliming
		I support the proposal that eels must be insensible for desliming or killed before they are deslimed. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
12	Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish	Insensible before being killed
		I support the proposal that crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish must be insensible before they are killed. I dispute the NAWAC statement that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible and propose that either: a. the only legally acceptable method of rendering crabs and crayfish insensible is by electrical stunning (for which specific equipment is available for use in small restaurant premises). OR

		<p>b. NAWAC conduct a review of the recent (since 2000) scientific literature on humane slaughter of crustaceans and present good quality, recent evidence to support the claim that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for failing to render a crustacean insensible prior to slaughter.</p>
13	Goats	Tethering requirements
		<p>I do not support the tethering of goats, on the basis that it stops goats expressing normal social behaviours, and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$500. Furthermore I share concerns with previous submissions around tethering of goats that tourists witnessing tethered goats on the road side could easily get a negative impression of animal welfare in NZ.</p> <p>I propose that all goats, regardless of housing system, have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$500.</p> <p>I also propose that as goats are social animals, all goats should be provided with a companion such as another goat, camelid, horse, donkey or sheep. I propose that failure to house a goat with a companion should attract an infringement penalty of \$300.</p> <p>1. Miranda-de la Lama, G.C. and Mattiello, S. (2010). The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming. Small Ruminant Research 90, (1-3), 1-10</p>
14	Horses	Use of a whip, lead, or any other object
		I support the prohibition of using a whip, lead or other object to strike around the head. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
15	Horses	Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
16	Horses and Donkeys	Tethering requirements
		I do not support the tethering of horses and donkeys and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$300. I propose that all horses and donkeys have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times regardless of housing system and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$300.
17	Layer Hens	Opportunity to express normal behaviours in housing systems
		<p>I believe that colony cages do not adequately consider the welfare of layer hens because they prohibit the ability of the hen to express a range of normal behaviours. In addition, colony cages are not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 as they do not allow owners or persons in charge of animals to take all reasonable steps to ensure that their physical, health and behavioural needs are met.</p> <p>1) Sections 9, 68 Animal Welfare Act 1999</p>

18	Layer Hens	Stocking densities
		Colony cages do not allow hens to engage in a range of normal behaviours and therefore they are in clear breach of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. With a stocking density of 13 hens per square metre or 750 square centimetres, clearly the stocking density is too high.
19	Layer Hens	Housing and equipment design
		<p>Colony cages are only slightly bigger than traditional battery cages. While they provide token welfare gestures like nest boxes, scratch pads and perches, these gestures do not ensure the physical, health and behavioural needs of hens are met. With only 750 sq cm per hen, there are a number of behaviours hens are not able to functionally perform in colony cages; this includes spreading her wings fully¹. It's also questionable whether a hen in a colony cage can properly nest, perch, peck or scratch. A hen in a colony cage cannot dust bathe.</p> <p>Research has shown that some hens in colony cages can be prevented from using the nest provided due to competition from other hens². Also, the limited space in colony cages is insufficient to allow hens sufficient time (on average 45 minutes³) if they want to lay at the same time.</p> <p>In order to satisfy a hen's need for perching, the housing system must be able to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient length of perching space to allow all birds to perch at the same time; and • Sufficient elevation of the perches to satisfy the hens' requirements for a perceived safe perching place at night. <p>Colony cages fulfil neither of these requirements. The standard of approximately 15cm of space per hen is an average and does not allow consideration for larger birds. Perches in colony systems are situated on average just a few centimetres from the floor of the cage. 'A perch positioned 5cm above floor level is 'not considered as a perch (by a hen) and has no attractive or repulsive value'⁴.</p> <p>Litter is not provided in colony cage systems. Litter is imperative for hen welfare. Hens will make great efforts to access litter for pecking, scratching and dustbathing – three normal behaviours of hens⁴. When hens are unable to forage in litter, they can redirect their pecking towards other hens resulting in harmful feather pecking and even cannibalism. When hens are unable to dustbathe in litter, they can develop the dysfunctional behaviour of sham dustbathing.</p> <p>1) A hen's wingspan is approximately 75-80 centimetres which is twice the size of a traditional battery cage</p> <p>2) Guedson, V. and Faure, J. M. (2004) <i>Laying performance and egg quality in hens kept in standard or furnished cages</i>. Animal Research, 53: 45-57.</p> <p>3) Appleby, M.C. (1998) Modification of laying hen cages to improve behaviour. Poultry Science, 77: 1828-1832.</p> <p>4) Cooper, J.J. and Ablentosa, M. J. (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews, 14: 127-149.</p>
20	Layer Hens	Induced moulting
		I support the proposal to prohibit induced moulting of layer hens.

21	Llama and Alpaca	Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes, and packs
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
22	Llama and Alpaca	Companion animals
		I support the proposal that camelids must be provided with a companion animal. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
23	Llama and Alpaca	Offspring (Cria) camelid companions
		I support the proposal to prohibit raising Cria without the company of other camelids. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
24	Pigs	Dry sleeping area
		Proposal: I support the proposal that all pigs have access to a dry sleeping area. Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
25	Pigs	Lying space for grower pigs
		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal for minimum space requirements for grower pigs.</p> <p>1. Error in formula</p> <p>The proposed formula used to calculate the minimum space has a type error; specifically the exponent notation has not been applied. I believe the formula intended by MPI should read "live weight^{0.67} (kg)" but instead it reads "live weight 0.67(kg)" which translates to an Area = 0.03 * liveweight * 0.67(kg) and results in a much higher space requirement. Therefore I contend that proposal 25 must be rewritten and resubmitted for public consultation, with the correct formula included so that the intended space requirement can be properly considered.</p> <p>2. Minimum requirement</p> <p>Recent research suggests that a k-value of 0.3 is too low. In 2006, Gonyou et al. (2006) which ADFI is reduced. More recently, a 2015 study has found that a k-value of 0.0336 might underestimate the impact of increased stocking density on ADG and ADFI.</p> <p>A k-value of 0.3 is too low to provide grower pigs with this environment and is sufficient as a minimum requirement for static space only.</p> <p>Does the proposal adequately define the appropriate systems?</p> <p>The proposal is based on a minimum standard, which is expected to occur (if at all) only where growers have reached the capacity of their pen and are shortly to be moved to a bigger pen, not a minimum standard which is considered acceptable at all times and this should be clarified in the regulation itself.</p> <p>I consider the minimum standards of housing for pigs to be provide "sufficient space to enable them to perform natural behaviours such as lying on their side without touching another pig, standing up, turning around and performing exercise, space for separate areas for dunging and feeding, with</p>

		<p>a dunging areas situated a sufficient distance from sleeping and feeding areas as well as materials to enable them to root and forage" 4. If these standards cannot be met by the current farming systems then we are concerned that the current farming systems are not compatible with the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour and breach the animal welfare act. The current regulation has no limit on the length of time during which a grower pig may be submitted to the proposed minimum standard. Overstocking is a known problem. I am concerned that grower pigs may be submitted to spaces which do not meet minimum requirement if their transfer to a new pen is delayed. I would like the regulations to be clear that it is unacceptable for growers to be kept for prolonged periods in spaces at or close to the minimum requirement. In its 2010 review, NAWAC submitted that space enough to allow for pigs to lie fully recumbent (k-value of 0.047) was recommended best practice. For the sake of clarity and to give effect to the intention of NAWAC, I suggest that a minimum period of time for growers kept in the lower end of the scale be added. Due to the above considerations, I propose that the minimum standard is amended to:</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must have lying space of at least: Area (m2) per pig = 0.040 x live weight 0.67(kg)</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must not have lying space of less than: Area (m2) per pig = 0.047 x live weight 0.67(kg) for longer than one week.</p> <p>Penalty: I support penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p> <p>Gonyou, H. W., M. C. Brumm, E. Bush, J. Deen, S. A. Edwards, T. Fangman, J. J. McGlone, M. Meunier-Salaun, R. B. Morrison, H. Spooler, P. L. Sundberg, and A. K. Johnson. 2006. Application of broken-line analysis to assess floor space requirements of nursery and grower-finisher pigs expressed on an allometric basis. J. Anim. Sci. 84: 229-235.</p> <p>Thomas, LL. "The Effects of Increasing Stocking Density on Finishing Pig Growth ..." 2015.</p> <p>http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=kaesrr</p> <p>ibid. Page 9</p> <p>"ANIMAL WELFARE (Pigs) CODE OF WELFARE 2010 REPORT." 2015. 15 May. 2016 <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/1446></p>
26	Pigs	Dry sow stalls
		<p>Proposal: I support the prohibition of dry sow stalls</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p>
27	Pigs	Size of farrowing crates
		<p>Proposal: I do not support the use of farrowing crates.</p> <p>Production systems using farrowing crates are not the only financially viable forms of pork production. It is widely accepted that sow welfare in farrowing crates is sub-optimal. Continuing a production system which is contrary to good practice and scientific knowledge is in direct violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.</p> <p>In 2016, a review of Farrowing Crates for Pigs in NZ was submitted by NAWAC. In that report, NAWAC stated that "no significant change in science, technology or good practice from 2010 when the pigs code of welfare was issued". It submitted that the levels of piglet mortality in farrowing pens is higher than in farrowing crates and used this as justification for retaining farrowing crates in New Zealand. However, there is abundant research which supports the conclusion that total piglet mortality</p>

		<p>on farms with loose farrowing systems does not differ from that of farms with crates²³.</p> <p>I submit that farrowing crates are unacceptable in modern day pork production systems and must be banned outright.</p> <p>"National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee - NZPork." 2016. 15 May. 2016 http://www.nzpork.co.nz/images/custom/farrowing-crate-advice-14-march-2016.pdf</p> <p>Weber, R. "Piglet mortality on farms using farrowing systems ... - IngentaConnect." 2007. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ufaw/aw/2007/00000016/00000002/art00042</p> <p>KilBride, AL. "A cohort study of preweaning piglet mortality and ... - ScienceDirect." 2012. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167587711003564</p>
28	Pigs	Provision of nesting material
		<p>Proposal: I support the provision of nesting material that can be manipulated to sows. However, it is clear that sows in farrowing crates will be unable to exhibit natural nesting behaviours in the confined space of a farrowing crate. To give effect to the intention of providing nesting material, the sow must be given more space in which to move.</p> <p>I agree that the definition of manipulable material should be made more apparent. "Material at ground level which mimics that of natural nesting material and encourages the sow to exhibit rooting behaviour" would be appropriate. However, for clarity, I recommend that examples are provided for guidance. Appropriate examples would include straw and sawdust.</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Chaloupková, H. "The effect of nesting material on the nest-building and maternal ... - NCBI." 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20889685</p>
29	Rodeos	Fireworks
		<p>I support the ban of fireworks at rodeo's, The loud noise of fireworks is well established as a stressor in companion animals (Bolster 2012; Dale et al., 2010) And Unexpected noise and movement will cause the fight or flight response in both horses and cattle (Lanier, 2000; Christensen, 2005).</p> <p>I would like to see a total ban on rodeo, rodeo is of no advantage to the economy. A petition recently submitted to parliament has 42,000 members of the public in support of such a ban. Rodeo is in breach of the animal welfare act which states that animals should be 'physically handled in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress.' The rodeo is a form of entertainment therefore making it an unnecessary activity for animals to be involved in. The likelihood of animals feeling distress while performing in rodeos could only be successfully minimised if rodeos were entirely stopped; goading animals into states of distress is fundamental to getting them to perform in rodeo events.</p> <p>As there have been many breaches of the rodeo code brought before MPI in 2014 and 2015 we strongly urge MPI to carefully consider if the codes are adequate in helping to minimise the likelihood of unreasonable and unnecessary pain or distress. We are aware of new breaches that will be brought before MPI for a third year running, this adds to the evidence that these codes are not adequate for protecting animals, therefore we feel that the only way to ensure these breaches do not continue is for an outright ban.</p>
30	Exotic animals	Used in circuses

		I do not support the use of exotic animals in circuses and propose that their use be banned. Given that there are currently no circuses in NZ using exotic animals the banning of the practice now will cause no industry disruption. Popular opinion both here and overseas is moving away from the use of exotic animals in circus and if this practice was to occur again in NZ it is likely that there would be a public outcry against it.
31	Cattle	Milk stimulation
		I support the proposal to prohibit the stimulation of milk let down by inserting water or air into a cow's vagina. I propose the prohibition is extended to include the insertion of any object into a cow's vagina to stimulate milk let down. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
32	Cattle and Sheep	Vehicular traction in calving or lambing
		I support the proposal to prohibit the use of a moving vehicle to provide traction in lambing or calving. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
33	Cattle and Sheep	Ingrown horns
		I support the proposal to require treatment for horns that are touching the skin or eye. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
34	Stock transport	Cuts and abrasions
		I support the proposal that transport should not result in cuts or abrasions. I propose the regulation is extended to all animals' not just cattle, sheep, deer, goats, and pigs. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
35	Stock transport	Animals with ingrown horns
		I support the proposal that animals with ingrown horns must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
36	Stock transport	Animals with bleeding horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with bleeding horns or antler must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
37	Stock transport	Animals with long horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with long horn or antler must not cause injury to themselves or others during transport. I could not find any rationale for the use of 110mm as a cut off value for long antler either in the code of welfare, or the report on the code. I propose that MPI publish the rationale behind the cut off value of 110mm or perform analysis of the injuries sustained from transport of animals with horns to determine if this

		measurement is an appropriate guide. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
38	Stock transport	Lame cattle, deer, pigs and goats
		I support the proposal that cattle, sheep, pigs and goats with lameness scores of 2 must be certified for transport by a veterinarian and that animals with a lameness score of 3 must not be transported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
39	Stock transport	Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury
		I support the proposal that animals who cannot bear weight evenly due to injury require certification from a veterinarian for transport. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
40	Stock transport	Pregnant animals
		I support the proposal that animals who are in late stages of pregnancy should not be transported. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
41	Stock transport	Animals with injured or diseased udders
		I support the proposal that animals who have diseased udders should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
42	Stock transport	Cattle or sheep with cancer eye
		I support the proposal that animals who have cancer eye which is large, not confined to the eyelid or discharging/bleeding should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
Young calf management regulatory proposals		
43	Young Calves	Loading and unloading facilities
		I support the proposal that facilities must be provided which enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. Given the potential for severe injury and pain I propose that the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
Proposed	Young Calves	Calves must not be thrown, if they need to be manually lifted they must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick calves).

		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Minimum training standard for people handling/loading calves
		<p>I propose a minimum training standard is put in place for people loading calves on to transportation. Footage from 2015 clearly shows inappropriate handling of calves at the time of loading¹. A regulation for minimum training standards for those loading calves will not just improve calf welfare but will also demonstrate the transport industry's commitment to improving their part of the calf management chain. In contrast failure for the transport industry to demonstrate willingness to improve welfare outcomes for calves could reflect badly in the media. I propose infringement penalty is prosecution due to the lack of provision of appropriate training being a corporation level infringement and therefore an appropriate penalty needs to be significant enough to deter corporations from flouting the law.</p> <p>http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Same day slaughter
		<p>I propose that all young calves received at a slaughter premises must be slaughtered that day and cannot be held overnight. It has been recognised by MPI that time off feed is a significant welfare concern in young calves therefore reducing the time spent at a slaughter premises aims to reduce the risk of calves spending an extended period of time off feed. Although an alternative proposal could be for feeding at arrival at slaughter premises given the other welfare issues of housing young calves I consider reducing holding time to a minimum as the least bad of the options. I propose an infringement penalty set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Use of nearest slaughterhouse
		<p>Increased time spent at transport has been shown to be one of the determinants of poorer outcomes for calves¹. For this reason I propose that calves are required to be slaughtered at the closest slaughter premises. I propose the infringement penalty to be set at prosecution level so that penalties are severe enough to prevent corporations flouting the law.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>
44	Young Calves	Shelter on farm, before and during transportation and at processing plants

		I support the proposal for minimum standards of shelter on farm, before transportation, and at slaughter premises. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
45	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – age
		<p>I propose that the minimum age of transport is increased to 10 days to bring us in line with what is considered an acceptable standard of welfare in other developed countries. MPI have stated that the 4 day standard suggested in the proposed regulation has been suggested as this reflects current industry practice. However the transport code of welfare only cites research performed in calves 5-10 days of age; therefore I propose that the absolute minimum age of transport be set at 5 days of age. I support the most conservative determination of age – that it is determined from the time the calf is separated from the dam. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p>
46	Young Calves	Fitness for transport – Physical characteristics
		I support the proposal that the list of physical characteristics provided with regulation 46 should be met prior to transport of young calves. I support the higher proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
47	Young Calves	Maximum time off feed
		<p>I support the proposal for regulating the maximum time off feed for young calves, however we propose this is reduced to 12 hours. The lack of physiological indicators in the 2000 Todd paper does not demonstrate that: this is in fact the case in calves <5 days of age or that these calves are not experiencing significant hunger or that these calves have the physiological capacity to respond to transport in a measurable way with the tools used in the study.</p> <p>I propose that calves undergoing transport are kept to the same feeding schedule they would have if they remained on farm. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Todd, S.E., Mellor, D.J., Stafford, K.J., Gregory, N.G., Bruce, R.A. and Ward, R.N. 2000. Effects of food withdrawal and transport on 5- to 10-day-old calves. Research in Veterinary Science 68, 125-134.</p> <p>Knowles, T.G., Warriss, P.D., Brown, S.N., Edwards, J.E., Watkins, P.E. and Phillips, A.J. 1997. Effects on calves less than one month old of feeding or not feeding them during road transport of up to 24 hours. Veterinary Record 140, 116-124.</p>
48	Young Calves	Duration of transport
		<p>I support limiting the duration of transport of young calves to 8 hours or less. As length of transport has been shown to be associated with poorer outcomes for calves we propose an increase in the infringement penalty to \$1000.</p> <p>Cave J, G. Callinan A, P, L. Woonton W, K. Mortalities in bobby calves associated with long distance transport. AVJ 2005; 83: 82-84</p>

49	Young Calves	Blunt force trauma
		I support the prohibition of the use of blunt force trauma for killing calves. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to receive appropriate penalties to deter this behaviour.
50	Young Calves	Transport by sea across Cook Strait prohibited
		I support the prohibition of transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I support the more severe penalty of prosecution as this allows corporations to be held accountable.
Surgical and painful procedures regulatory proposals		
51	All animals	Hot branding
		I support the prohibition of hot branding and the penalty of prosecution.
52	All animals	Embryo collection via exteriorised uterus (surgical embryo transfer)
		I do not support the collection of embryos via exteriorised uterus and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
53	All animals	Laparoscopic artificial insemination (laparoscopic AI)
		I do not support the use of laparoscopic AI and propose to prohibit the practice. In the event that it is not prohibited then I propose that the procedure is limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. If the procedure is not banned outright then I support the proposal for pain relief to be mandatory and for a penalty of prosecution if pain relief is not used. Furthermore if the practice is not prohibited outright I propose that it is regulated separately under each species to ensure the law is clear in this regard (ie it is not currently appropriate for a lay person to perform this procedure on a pet cat or dog).
54	All animals	Liver biopsy
		I support the proposal for liver biopsy to be restricted to being performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students and the requirement for the use of pain relief. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
55	All animals	Dental work

		I support the proposal that any power tool used for dental work must be designed for the purpose of dentistry. I propose the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
56	Cats	Declawing
		I support the restriction of cat declawing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
57	Compani on animals	Desexing (including stray/feral cats, dogs and other species)
		I support the restriction of desexing to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence. I purpose that all cats and dogs sold in pet shops be desexed and vaccinated before being released to the purchaser. This would work as a preventative step in helping reduce the number of stray/feral cats and dogs over time.
58	Dogs	Freeze branding
		I propose that freeze branding of dogs is banned. With better technology now available we can microchip dogs rather than freeze branding them. In the case that freeze branding is not prohibited I support the restriction of freeze branding to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
59	Dogs	Dog debarking (and devoicing of other species)
		I support the restriction of dog debarking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only in the animal's best interest, and the use of pain relief. I propose that to ensure the procedure is always performed in the animal's best interest a consultation with a veterinary behaviourist is required prior to the procedure being performed, to ensure all non-surgical options for managing the behaviour have been fully explored. However I recognise this aspect of the proposal may be best administrated through the NZ veterinary council rather than MPI. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
60	Dogs	Cropping the ears
		I support the proposal to prohibit ear cropping of dogs. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
61	Dogs	Dew claws
		I support the restriction of removal of articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I

		propose restriction of removal of non-articulated dew claws to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution.
62	Dogs	Tail docking
		I support the docking of tails in dogs for therapeutic reasons only. The procedure must be performed by a veterinarian or a veterinary student under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Pain relief must be used at the time of this procedure.
63	Cattle	Teats
		<p>I support the proposal for supernumerary teat removal of animals >6 weeks of age to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the removal of supernumerary teats in animals <6 weeks of age without pain relief, however the procedure could be undertaken by a skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie a vet tech). I propose that:</p> <p>the maximum of age of animals on whom supernumerary teat removal can be performed by a lay person is reduced to 4 weeks of age</p> <p>i) infringement penalty of prosecution pain relief is required for any supernumerary teat removal procedure regardless of age</p> <p>ii) infringement penalty of prosecution procedure is performed using sterilised equipment</p> <p>iii) infringement penalty of \$500 any person performing the procedure who is not a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student is signed off by a veterinarian</p> <p>iv) infringement penalty of prosecution</p>
64	Cattle	Claw removal
		I support the proposal that claw removal is restricted to being performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student and that pain relief is required at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) pain relief is also administered. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.
65	Cattle	Teat occlusion
		I support the proposal that teat sealing can only be performed with a product registered for that specific purpose. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution.
66	Cattle	Tail docking
		I support the restriction of tail docking to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student for therapeutic reasons only, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for all offences other than not using NSAID for which the infringement penalty should be \$300.

67	Cattle and sheep	Castration and shortening of the scrotum (cryptorchid)
		I support the proposal for surgical castration at any age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I support the proposal that non-surgical castration in cattle and sheep over 6 months of age to be limited to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students and that pain relief must be used. I does not support the age of 6 months as an appropriate age at which lay people can no longer perform non-surgical castration and propose that this age limit is lowered to 2 months, I support limiting the manner of non-surgical castration to only the use of conventional rubber rings. I does not support performing non-surgical castration without pain relief at any age and propose that pain relief is required for any castration procedure at any age. I propose that in addition to the pain relief at the time of the procedure additional NSAID pain relief is also required. I propose that the penalty for all infringements other than lack of NSAID use is prosecution and that the penalty for not using an NSAID is an infringement of \$300.
68	Cattle, sheep and goats	Disbudding
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian, veterinary student under direct supervision, or skilled lay person signed off by a veterinarian (ie vet tech/appropriately trained farm worker). I propose that appropriate maximum ages are determined for disbudding to be performed by a lay person. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
69	Cattle, sheep and goats	Dehorning
		I propose that disbudding is limited to being performed only by only a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision. Given the much greater risk of pain, bleeding, and infection from dehorning rather than disbudding I propose that farmers are given 12 months warning after which dehorning can only be performed by veterinarians. This will give a strong message that disbudding is much preferred and much more economically viable. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.
70	Sheep	Tail docking
		I support the limiting of tail docking in sheep who are greater than 6 months of age to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students. I support the use of pain relief during the procedure and propose that additional NSAID pain relief is also administered. I support restricting the techniques for tail docking in younger animals to rubber ring and hot iron only. I propose that pain relief at the time of procedure and NSAID should also be required, regardless of age at the time of tail docking.

		<p>Furthermore I propose that the maximum age at which a lay person is able to perform a tail docking procedure is reduced to 2 months.</p> <p>I support the proposal that tails are not to be cut flush and are to be able to cover the vulva in a female and of a similar length in a male.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalty of prosecution for infringements in sheep > 2 months of age and propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p> <p>I support the proposed penalties of \$500 for use of non-listed methods and not cutting tails flush in sheep < 2 months of age. I propose a penalty of prosecution for not using pain relief in sheep <2 months of age and a penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID use.</p>
71	Sheep	Mulesing
		I support the proposal to prohibit mulesing. I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.
72	Deer	Develveting
		I support the proposal for develveting to be only performed by veterinarians, directly supervised veterinary students or a person with veterinary approval. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
73	Horses	Blistering, firing, or nicking
		I support the proposal to prohibit blistering, firing or nicking, and support the proposed infringement penalty.
74	Horses	Tail docking
		I support the proposal for tail docking to only be performed by veterinarians or directly supervised veterinary students, only for therapeutic reasons, only with the use of pain relief. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
75	Horses	Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal pregnancy diagnosis in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
76	Horses	Rectal examination of horses
		I support the proposal for rectal examination in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
77	Horses	Caslick's procedure
		<p>I support the proposal for creation, opening and repair of caslick's procedure to only be performed by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and the use of pain relief for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p> <p>I propose that a caslick's procedure may only be performed for therapeutic purposes and not for a perceived performance benefit and that the proposed infringement penalty for this breach is the same as that proposed above.</p>
78	Horses	Castration

		I support the proposal for castration in horses to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalty.
79	Llama and alpaca	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration in llama and alpaca to be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student and for the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure, and the minimum age for the procedure. I support the proposed infringement penalties for these infringements.
80	Pigs	Castration
		I support the proposal for castration to only be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student under direct supervision and the required use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the infringement penalty of prosecution. I propose that a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) is also required and that the penalty for not administering an NSAID is \$300.
81	Pigs	Tail docking
		I propose that pain relief should be used for this procedure regardless of the animal's age. I support limiting the procedure to veterinarians and directly supervised veterinary students in animals > 7 days of age. I propose that a NSAID should also be administered at the time of the procedure. I propose an infringement penalty of prosecution for lack of use of pain relief and for a lay person performing the procedure in an animal > 7 days of age. I propose an infringement penalty of \$300 for lack of NSAID administration.
82	Birds	Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird
		I support the restriction of pinioning/deflighting a bird to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, only being performed in the best interests of the animal, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
83	Poultry	Dubbing
		I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence to perform dubbing on breeds not usually dubbed and to not use pain relief at the time of the procedure. I oppose the surgical modification of an animal if the modification is not in the interests of the animal, therefore I propose that dubbing is prohibited with the penalty of a prosecutable offence.
84	Ostriches and emus	Declawing
		I support the prohibition of radical declawing of emu chicks. However the use of the term radical implies that some declawing is allowed and opens the regulation to subjective interpretation. I propose that the regulation prohibit all declawing of emu or ostrich unless performed by a vet for therapeutic reasons. I support the penalty of prosecutable offence.
85	Roosters	Caponising (rooster castration)

		I support the restriction of caponising to being performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student, and the use of pain relief at the time of the procedure. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence.
--	--	---

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

From: Woeber-Read <59(2)(a)>
Sent: Sunday, 15 May 2016 1:50 p.m.
To: Animal Welfare Submissions
Subject: Submission on Animal Welfare Regulations
Categories: Blue Category

To the Ministry of Primary Industries

This is my submission on the Animal Welfare regulations released for consultation in April 2016. I write in my personal capacity.

I have read carefully through the documents for consultation, and the minutes of the workshops and meetings in 2015/16, and **I would like to endorse fully every regulation proposed** by the Ministry of Primary Industries to bring our animal welfare regulations, particularly those relating to farm animals, in line with best humane practice, exemplified by the European Union. If all the regulations came into effect undiluted, New Zealand would have a solid foundation for future improvements to make us world leaders in animal welfare. These regulations are only the first step, but very welcome among those who are deeply concerned about the rights of animals unable to protest against cruel treatment. I appreciate the chance to make my submission in support of all animals who cannot.

I am completely against factory farming, and would like to see a return to small-scale organic farming across New Zealand. However, this is unlikely to happen soon, so the compromise regulations which have been proposed are a welcome initiative. I would like to see even more stringent animal welfare measures, such as a mandatory 10-day period before a bobby calf is removed from its mother, which the European Union requires. I would also like a measure in place to ensure bobby calves are worth more than the \$5 they currently fetch, which would contribute to their not being treated as waste products. I urge MPI not to water down any of the proposals if there is pressure from farming groups to do so, such as dairy farmers already struggling in the current unfavourable climate. The proposed regulations are long-term measures, and the dairy industry is likely to recover in time, so a regimen of strong animal welfare practices needs to be in place for good and bad times alike. I believe the current proposals are quite visionary, make beneficial use of technology, like text communication between farmer and truck driver, and deserve the full support of New Zealanders.

I would ask that the regulations pertaining to bobby calves come into force by the 2016 calving season. I do not think it is too much to ask that adequate shelter be set up over winter 2016, nor that a wooden ramp be constructed (either by the farmer or the transport company used) for loading on to the truck. Certainly those proposals which do not require construction of any kind, such as reduced time between last feed and slaughter, maximum truck journey times, and humane care of bobby calves each step of the way, must be in place by then to signal that MPI is in earnest.

Once these proposed regulations have come into law, I would like to see MPI conduct a full review of factory farming in New Zealand, with a focus on pig and hen factory farming, to speed up the removal of all forms of inhumane confinement. I also ask that, building on the momentum of the current animal welfare proposals, future consideration be given to banning circus animals and rodeos, in which animals only "perform" under duress (like through the flank strap), often

suffer unbearable pain (such as when a leg shatters), and, in the case of circus animals, are also kept in unnatural confinement.

I ask that none of the proposed regulations is watered down, as they are the minimum required for sustainable and humane animal farming expected by New Zealand society in the 21st century.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Dr Catherine Woeber

s 9(2)(a)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



1..

SUBMISSION TO THE MINISTRY FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES ON THE PROPOSED ANIMAL WELFARE REGULATIONS (CARE & CONDUCT AND SURGICAL & PAINFUL PROCEDURES)

MAY 2016
CATRIONA MACLENNAN
BARRISTER
ANIMAL AGENDA AOTEAROA

s 9(2)(a)



..1

INTRODUCTION

This submission is divided into two parts, based on the two parts in the Ministry for Primary Industries' Discussion Paper *Proposed Animal Welfare Regulations (Care & Conduct and Surgical & Painful Procedures)*. These two parts are Part A - Overview of the proposed regulatory package, and Part B – Specific Regulatory Proposals.

BACKGROUND

I became involved in advocacy on animal issues in the 1980s, when I campaigned against testing on animals and live sheep exports. In the late 1990s, I was a founding member of the Animal Rights Legal Advocacy Network, a group of lawyers and law students which lobbied and campaigned on animal issues. ARLAN made a complaint to Parliament's Regulations Review Committee about the caging of hens.

In the early 2000s, I helped establish The Link in New Zealand. Originally named First Strike, The Link is an umbrella group of organisations working in the fields of domestic violence, child abuse and animal cruelty. It was created in the United States and educates the public about the links between animal cruelty and other forms of violence, and works to reduce violence, primarily by closer co-operation and information exchanges between agencies working in different spheres. I was later the lawyer for the New Zealand Companion Animal Council.

In 2013 and 2014 I presented a 13-part television series called *Paws for Thought*, about animal issues.

In 2013, I created Animal Agenda Aotearoa in co-operation with the SPCA Auckland. Animal Agenda Aotearoa is a campaign to lobby politicians about animal issues. In the run-up to the 2014 general election, Animal Agenda Aotearoa contacted the 10 main political parties and asked them to answer questions about their animal welfare policies. The parties' responses were collated to give each party a mark out of 10 for its animal policy. I interviewed politicians from all major political parties apart from ACT and the Conservatives about their animal policies on *Paws for Thought* in 2014. 2014 was the first year in which almost all of the major political parties had animal welfare spokespersons and animal welfare policies.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

PART A – OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED REGULATORY PACKAGE

Part A of this submission first discusses the principles on which the proposed Animal Welfare Regulations (Care & Conduct and Surgical & Painful Procedures) should be based. The latter section of Part A addresses the questions posed in MPI Discussion Paper No: 2016/12.

1 A principled approach to regulation making

Animal Agenda Aotearoa submits that the regulations made under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 should be based on principle. It is accordingly submitted that the approach to regulation-making outlined in MPI Discussion Paper No: 2016/12 *Proposed Animal Welfare Regulations (Care & Conduct and Surgical & Painful Procedures)* is flawed. The discussion paper does not discuss core principles. Rather, it identifies enforceability and clarity as two key problems with the primary legislation. The paper then goes on to state on page 11 that “the overarching objective of the regulatory proposals in this document is to make regulations that will deal effectively with these problems.”

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support this approach. Instead, it advocates that the overarching objective of the regulations should be to promote the core purposes and principles of the Animal Welfare Act. The Act is –

“An Act—

(a) to reform the law relating to the welfare of animals and the prevention of their ill-treatment; and, in particular,—

(i) to recognise that animals are sentient:

(ia) to require owners of animals, and persons in charge of animals, to attend properly to the welfare of those animals:

(ii) to specify conduct that is or is not permissible in relation to any animal or class of animals:

(iii) to provide a process for approving the use of animals in research, testing, and teaching:

(iv) to establish a National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee and a National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee;

(v) to provide for the development and issue of codes of welfare and the approval of codes of ethical conduct:

(b) to repeal the Animals Protection Act 1960.”

Section 4 of the act provides that –

“4 Definition of physical, health, and behavioural needs

In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the term **physical, health, and behavioural needs**, in relation to an animal, includes—

- (a) proper and sufficient food:
 - (ab) proper and sufficient water:
 - (b) adequate shelter:
 - (c) opportunity to display normal patterns of behaviour:
 - (d) physical handling in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress:
 - (e) protection from, and rapid diagnosis of, any significant injury or disease,—
- being a need which, in each case, is appropriate to the species, environment, and circumstances of the animal.”

Section 9 of the act states that -

“ 9 Purpose

- (1) The purpose of this Part is to ensure that owners of animals and persons in charge of animals attend properly to the welfare of those animals.
- (2) This Part accordingly—
 - (a) requires owners of animals, and persons in charge of animals, to take all reasonable steps to ensure that the physical, health, and behavioural needs of the animals are met in accordance with both—
 - (i) good practice; and
 - (ii) scientific knowledge; and
 - (b) requires owners of ill or injured animals, and persons in charge of such animals, to ensure that the animals receive treatment that alleviates any unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress from which the animals are suffering; and
 - (c) imposes restrictions on the carrying out of surgical procedures on animals; and
 - (d) provides for the classification of the types of surgical procedures that may be performed on animals; and
 - (e) specifies the persons or classes of persons who may perform each class of such surgical procedures; and
 - (f) specifies certain minimum conditions that must be observed in relation to the transportation of animals.”

Section 10 provides that –

“10 Obligation in relation to physical, health, and behavioural needs of animals

The owner of an animal, and every person in charge of an animal, must ensure that the physical, health, and behavioural needs of the animal are met in a manner that is in accordance with both—

- (a) good practice; and

(b) scientific knowledge.”

Animal Agenda Aotearoa submits that the above provisions should provide the core foundation for the regulations. Each proposed regulation should be measured against these provisions, and should be discarded if it does not comply with them.

If such an approach is not adopted, the purposes and most fundamental protections of the Animal Welfare Act are in practice rendered worthless. This has been plainly apparent since the 1999 act came into force. The Codes of Welfare and the way in which the act has been interpreted have meant that millions of New Zealand animals have continued to suffer physical pain and psychological deprivation and distress because they do not receive the basic protections of the act.

If the act was applied so as to give effect to its core aim of reforming the law relating to the welfare of animals and their ill-treatment, and to implement sections 4, 9 and 10, the Government would immediately be required to ban farrowing crates, colony cages for hens, rodeos, goat tethering, testing on animals and other cruel practices.

However, this has not occurred. Instead, since the act came into force, it has been interpreted to give priority to the economic welfare of farmers over the physical and psychological welfare of animals, and to ignore the core protections and basic principles of the act. The so-called “Codes of Welfare” have been one of the key causes of animal cruelty in New Zealand. The way in which the codes have been written and interpreted has given legal sanction to practices such as farrowing crates and colony cages, which do not comply with the Five Freedoms conferred on animals by section 4 of the act. In particular, intensive farming practices utterly fail to allow animals to display normal patterns of behaviour, as provided for in section 4(c). The codes, combined with the interpretation of exceptions in the act, have provided defences to the continuation of cruel and outdated practices.

Animal Agenda Aotearoa advocates the abolition of the Codes of Welfare and a simple requirement that all animals be afforded the protections of sections 4, 9 and 10 of the act. Similarly, in relation to the proposed regulations, it is submitted that, rather than the regulations proposed in the Ministry’s Discussion Paper, it would be better simply to measure all treatment of animals against the core provisions of the act and not permit it if it did not comply with these. However, if there are to be regulations, then, as submitted

above, each proposed regulation must be measured against the fundamental provisions of the act and be discarded if it does not comply with these. If this is not done, there is little purpose in having an Animal Welfare Act, as most farmed animals in New Zealand will continue to be treated in ways that are unacceptable.

2 Proper funding and enforcement for animal welfare

At present in New Zealand, as noted in the Ministry's Discussion Paper, animal welfare responsibilities are primarily split between the Ministry and the SPCA. The Ministry is charged primarily with focusing on farmed animals, while the SPCA focuses on companion animals. The police are also involved from time to time.

It is a clear indication of the very low priority given to animal welfare in this country that it is considered that a charity which has to raise its own funds (apart from a small contribution by the Government) should bear such a large part of the burden of enforcing animal welfare.

Animal Agenda Aotearoa submits that an independent Commissioner for Animal Welfare should be created and responsibility for animal welfare should be removed from the Ministry for Primary Industries.

The Ministry's responsibility for enforcement of animal welfare in relation to farm animals places it in a position of conflict vis-à-vis its primary purpose, which is to support and increase exports.

The homepage of MPI's website demonstrates this: it does not mention animal welfare -

"Our vision is to grow and protect New Zealand. We do this by maximising export opportunities for the primary industries, improving sector productivity, increasing sustainable resource use, and protecting New Zealand from biological risk. MPI is the ministry formed from the merger of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, the Ministry of Fisheries and the New Zealand Food Safety Authority. MPI is positioned to deliver high-quality services and support to the whole of the primary sector."

The Ministry's primary role is accordingly in conflict with its animal welfare responsibilities as, in the short term, it is beneficial to exports to disregard animal welfare and produce farm products at the cheapest-possible price. It

places MPI in a difficult position to be investigating and prosecuting farmers when it is also working with them to increase exports. An independent Commissioner for Animal Welfare whose sole focus was animal welfare would not have this conflict and would be able to focus exclusively on animal welfare.

The resources devoted by the Ministry to animal welfare are totally inadequate. In the 2010/2011 financial year, Animal Welfare Education and Enforcement and Animal Welfare Policy Advice were in total appropriated \$5.132 million. The figure for the 2011/2012 financial years was \$6.569 in total. The total for 2012/2013 was \$6.012 million. This means that the amount of funding was actually falling. In Budget 2015, the Government allocated \$10 million over four years to boost MPI's animal welfare compliance and capability and to develop more transparent and enforceable animal welfare regulations. This is an increase of only \$2.5 million per annum, and is still far from adequate to deal with the number of farmed animals in New Zealand. New Zealand has up to 60 million animals being commercially farmed at a time. However, the Ministry until recently employed only 11 animal welfare inspectors to deal with all animal welfare complaints on farms around the country. This is completely inadequate resourcing and means that the Ministry can respond only to the most serious allegations of animal neglect and abuse. There is no regular monitoring or inspection of New Zealand farms. The public would be shocked by the extent of cruelty and neglect on New Zealand farms if such monitoring were to be undertaken.

There is a huge, unacknowledged problem with cruelty on New Zealand farms – both deliberate cruelty and cruelty as a result of neglect or ignorance. There have been recent examples of covert filming on pig, hen and dairy farms. The footage has shown deliberate cruelty as well as horrific conditions. Animal group SAFE took out ads in the United Kingdom last December following the broadcast of the Sunday programme footage of cruelty to calves. Such pictures are immensely damaging to New Zealand's international brand and reputation as a whole – they are not only damaging for the specific industry in which cruelty is revealed. The footage of cruelty to calves was filmed on numerous farms in only one New Zealand province. It appears clearly apparent that, were other farms to be investigated, the same types of cruelty would be found.

The Government should take a pro-active approach and acknowledge and work towards ending such cruelty. If it did that, it would be able to say it had taken the high road and was being proactive the next time horrific pictures

were released. At present, the Government is always caught on the back foot over such revelations and says the cruelty is isolated.

The Ministry very rarely prosecutes for animal cruelty. In the year to December 2015, MPI prosecuted approximately five percent of the 698 animal welfare complaints it received. This is a tiny fraction and utterly inadequate to send a message to farmers that cruelty and neglect of animals are unacceptable. In 2014, farm workers who stomped on and killed piglets were not prosecuted and a farmer who deliberately rammed cows with a quad bike was not prosecuted. MPI has been very slow to act on the deliberate cruelty to calves revealed in the Sunday programme. MPI has also not prosecuted in relation to the specific cases of evidence of cruelty at rodeos provided to it.

A comprehensive report on the ministry's failure to enforce animal welfare was prepared in 2011. MPI has not acted on the clear recommendations in the report. When a journalist from Seven Sharp sought the report under the OIA, MPI refused to release it, stating that doing so would damage the New Zealand economy. This is an incredible statement and a clear acknowledgement by MPI itself of its failure to fulfil its animal welfare responsibilities. Here is a link to the Seven Sharp item in which a former MPI employee talks about MPI's failure to enforce animal welfare - <http://tvnz.co.nz/seven-sharp/special-mpi-fronts-up-over-damning-bobby-calves-report-video-6451915>. There will continue to be further revelations and embarrassment for the Government and the country until action is taken.

On 1 April 2016, there was a fire in a Waikato piggery – Brien Farms in Hopuhopu. At least 50 pigs burned to death. This is either the third or fourth fire on this pig farm. In August 2015, 400 mother and baby pigs were burned to death in a blaze at the same farm. In 2005, up to 300 animals were burned to death. Burning to death is one of the most horrific and painful ways of dying. The pigs who died suffered fear and agony. The fact that this is either the third or fourth time this has happened at this farm demonstrates that something is seriously wrong.

The television story about this event said that the Ministry for Primary Industries would visit the site next week to check whether there were any animal welfare issues. The fact that hundreds of pigs have repeatedly burned to death clearly demonstrates that there are animal welfare issues. It seems incomprehensible that MPI staff did not travel to the farm on Friday so that they could inspect the site as soon as the Fire Service advised that it was safe

to do so. Giving a number of days of advance notice to farmers of an inspection simply gives them an opportunity to temporarily remedy animal welfare issues so that MPI does not obtain an accurate picture of normal practices on the farm.

In other countries, pro-active steps are being taken to improve animal welfare. In Israel, for example, this year cameras are being installed in all slaughterhouses to try and prevent the repeated animal abuse revealed by covert filming in Israel. New Zealand should do this too. This country's lack of action means it is slipping further and further behind other countries in relation to animal welfare, which will increasingly jeopardise New Zealand's export earnings from agriculture as consumers in other countries become increasingly conscious and concerned about animal welfare.

New Zealand's aim should be to brand itself internationally as Number One in the world in terms of animal welfare. New Zealand could sell its exports at a premium if it could certify that animals were not cruelly treated during production. This would also complement the country's clean, green image, with environmental purity adding value to the animal friendly brand, and vice versa. That is not what happens at present. Instead, each minor concession on animal welfare occurs very slowly and often a long time after other countries have already acted.

New Zealand would be following in the footsteps of European nations in appointing a Commissioner for Animal Welfare.

Animal welfare has been included in the Swiss constitution since 1973 and the "dignity of animals" was written into the Swiss constitution in 1999. Germany, Austria and Slovenia have similar provisions. New Zealand's recent move to include a Declaration of Sentience in the Animal Welfare Act has accordingly been slow.

The position of Commissioner for Animal Welfare would be written into the Animal Welfare Act, as is the case in Malta (see s 44A) -

<https://www.animallaw.info/sites/default/files/stmtanimalwelfarelaw.pdf>.

The Commissioner should be a person with a scientific background in relation to animals. The Commissioner should not be a current or retired farmer, as this would damage the credibility of the office and give the appearance that it was not truly independent or focused primarily on animal welfare.

At the time the Commissioner role was established, responsibility for animal welfare would be removed from the Ministry for Primary Industries. This would enable the ministry to focus solely on supporting and increasing New Zealand's exports.

It is important that the Commissioner be independent.

The Commissioner would require adequate resources to pro-actively monitor animal welfare, investigate cruelty, prosecute offences, carry out education programmes relating to the proper treatment of animals (both within the farming community and among the general public), keep abreast of scientific knowledge relating to the treatment of animals, and carry out other specific functions.

As noted above, the neglect and cruelty which come to public attention are a tiny fraction of the neglect or cruelty which actually occurs. Most of it takes place far from the public eye. It would be much better for the Government and the farming industry to front-foot this problem and take steps to bring an end to it. It is simply not credible for ministers and farming lobby groups to repeatedly claim that publicised examples of animal cruelty are isolated incidents. They plainly are not and the Government would win credit if it was proactive in dealing with this.

A large increase in animal welfare funding should be provided to ensure that the Commissioner for Animal Welfare can properly enforce animal welfare. New Zealand can well afford this funding for proper enforcement of animal welfare. The following are a few examples of where money could be found for proper enforcement of animal welfare –

- In the 2015 Budget, the Government announced it would write off up to \$1.7 billion in unpaid Child Support penalties.
- It is calculated that tax avoidance and evasion cost the economy between \$1 billion and \$6 billion a year.
- Since 2008, Inland Revenue has written off \$5 billion in tax debt.
- \$591 million in unpaid fines and reparation was clocked up in three years.
- \$68 million was clawed back from property speculators when Inland Revenue began taking proper enforcement action.
- The Government spent over \$300 million on the 2011 Rugby World Cup.

- The Government gave \$36 million to the 2013 America's Cup.

3 Legal personality for animals

The 2015 amendments to the Animal Welfare Act included the insertion into the legislation of a Declaration of Sentience to recognise that animals are living creatures, rather than inanimate objects. It is a measure of how backward New Zealand's animal law is that it was not until 2015 that it was recognised in law that animals are living beings. The Declaration of Sentience is included in the preamble to the act.

Animal Agenda Aotearoa submits that a Declaration of Sentience is a basic starting point, but that what is required to bring significant improvements in animal welfare is legal personality for animals.

New Zealand has legal personality for companies and other inanimate entities, but not for animals, who are living beings. New Zealand should lead the world in granting legal personality to animals.

4 Regulations based on minimum standards in Codes of Welfare

The Ministry's Discussion Paper repeatedly states that the draft regulations are based on current Codes of Welfare. This submission has made it plain under heading 1 above that Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not consider this is the correct approach to the drafting of the regulations.

In addition to such an approach lacking a principled basis, it also means that the inadequate protections in the current codes would be carried forward into the regulations.

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support the approach of simply drafting regulations based on the current codes. Instead, each proposed regulation should be drafted based on a completely fresh evaluation of current best scientific practice and legal protection.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS IN PART A OF THE DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

Question 1: Is there any reason why changes to the Act not yet in force, should not be brought into force at the same time as the regulations (rather than waiting for them to automatically commence in 2020) ?

No, there is no reason why this should not occur.

Question 2: Are the infringement fees proposed for sections 156I and 36(3) appropriate ?

The infringement fees proposed are too low. Animal Agenda Aotearoa understands the Ministry's rationale about the need for infringement fees to be proportionate with infringement fees for totally unrelated matters. However, very low infringement fees reinforce that animal welfare is not regarded as an important matter and that it is acceptable to provide animals with a very low level of care. This is the opposite of the message we should be sending.

In addition, as noted on page 8 of the Discussion Paper, by the time an infringement fee for non-compliance with a Compliance Notice is issued, the person in charge of the animal has already been informed that the practice does not comply with the act or a regulation; been provided with time to rectify the situation; and failed to do so. Accordingly, people levied infringements have already had ample opportunity to comply and chosen not to comply. It is therefore submitted that higher infringement fees are required to ensure that people realise they must comply. If people believe there will be no real sanctions for non-compliance, it is submitted that this could lead to a prolonged continuation of the unacceptable conduct, with major adverse outcomes for the welfare of the animals involved.

Page 9 of the Discussion Paper suggests that the infringement fee for failing to inspect a set trap should be \$300. This is utterly inadequate. There is widespread non-compliance with the requirement to inspect set traps but this is rarely detected, due to the lack of pro-active monitoring and enforcement of animal welfare in New Zealand. Animals in traps suffer agony. A \$300 penalty is insufficient.

The act provides for infringement fees of up to \$1000 and it is submitted that this should be the level of infringement fees.

Question 3: Are there any minimum standards or additional matters you think should become regulations immediately, which are not included in the regulatory proposals in Part B ?

The oversight of exported live animals is completely inadequate. When a shipment of New Zealand animals was sent from Timaru to Mexico in 2015, there was no independent vet or any MPI officials on board. New Zealand was completely reliant for information about the condition and fate of the animals on data provided by the exporter. The current requirements for stock handlers and vets on board live export vessels are completely inadequate to ensure the welfare of the animals – though Animal Agenda Aotearoa is of the view that it is actually impossible to safeguard animal welfare during live export as the entire process is so contrary to the welfare of the animals.

In addition, there is no monitoring or reporting on the condition of the animals once they arrive in the other country and are transported to their destination. Honorary Professor of Agri-Food Systems at Lincoln University, Keith Woodford said in 2015 that his information was that the sheep from the last major shipment of sheep to Mexico in 2007 were slaughtered at barbecues and village festivals within a short time of arriving in Mexico. New Zealand has a ban on the live export of animals for slaughter, but allowing live export of animals supposedly for breeding provides ample opportunity for the ban on export for slaughter to be circumvented.

Animal Agenda Aotearoa supports a ban on all live exports of animals. If there is to be live export, New Zealand vets and other officials should be required to travel with the animals and there should be monitoring and reporting on the welfare of the animals once they reach their destinations.

Question 4: Are there any minimum standards or additional matters that you think should be considered for regulation in the future, once the implications of regulating these areas are better understood ?

See submission on Question 3.

Question 5: Are there any proposed regulations, set out in Part B, that should not be regulated ?

No.

Question 6: If so, how should these matters be managed ?

Not applicable.

Question 7: Do you think there should be a wider use of non-regulatory mechanisms ? If so, in what situation ?

Animal Agenda Aotearoa is concerned that non-regulatory options such as education and voluntary agreements are a soft option for the farming industry and can lead to the continuation of cruel practices for extended periods.

Question 8: Will the proposed regulations, set out in Part B, change the way you or others operate, if so, in what ways ? What implications would these have for you ?

The proposed penalties for non-compliance are very low and the risks of being detected in non-compliant conduct are low because so few resources in New Zealand are devoted to animal welfare.

Animal Agenda Aotearoa would like to believe that the regulations will result in improvements to the treatment of animals in New Zealand, but if these eventuate they are likely to be small-scale.

Question 9: Are the infringement offences and respective fees proposed for breaches of the proposed regulations, outlined in Part B, appropriate ? Should any of the proposals attract higher or lower fees or penalties ?

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support fees or penalties set at a lower rate than those which currently already apply.

Question 10: Are the prosecutable offences proposed in the regulations appropriate ? If not, why not ?

Question 11: Should any of the proposed regulations, set out in Part B, include a mental element (eg intention, knowledge or recklessness) ? If so, are

the penalties for a prosecutable offence under regulation appropriate for the regulated activity ?

No, Animal Agenda Aotearoa believes that strict liability should apply.

Question 12: What defences do you think should be available if the proposed regulations are breached and why ?

Animal Agenda Aotearoa is concerned about the provision of the defences proposed on page 19 of the Discussion Paper. In the case of Lourens Erasmus, the District Court Judge initially imposed an extremely lenient – and inappropriate – penalty on the grounds that Mr Erasmus was suffering from stress and that banning him from working with animals would impose too severe a restriction on his ability to earn a living. Rather than focusing on Mr Erasmus' situation, the judge should have focused on protecting animal welfare.

The facts of the case involved an extremely high degree of animal suffering, inflicted deliberately. Subsequently, a deliberate decision was made not to seek veterinary assistance for the animals.

On 7 February 2013, Mr Erasmus was sentenced to two years and one month's jail in the High Court after pleading guilty to three offences under section 28(1)(c) and (d) of the *Animal Welfare Act*. The first charge alleged that Mr Erasmus wilfully ill-treated 25 cows, with the result that their pain or distress was so great that it was necessary to destroy the animals to end their suffering. The second charge alleged that Mr Erasmus wilfully ill-treated 22 cows seriously injuring them and leading to them suffering prolonged pain. Thirdly, it was alleged that 115 cows were wilfully ill-treated, resulting in serious injury and prolonged pain.

The Summary of Facts provided to the District Court in which he appeared said that Mr Erasmus had begun farming at Princes Street, Waikino in June 2011. From early February 2012, he began hitting his cows during milking. Initially, he used stainless steel milking cups to strike the cows on the bony hock areas of their hind legs. He either swung the cups against the cows' legs while holding the hose attached to the cups, or else used the cup as a "club" held in the palm of his hand to bash the animals' legs.

Mr Erasmus struck the cows with the milking cups repeatedly to bruise their legs. Once the animals' legs were bruised, Mr Erasmus used his fist to strike

the bruised areas forcefully. That abuse continued during each milking period for approximately three to four weeks.

In early February 2012, a three feet long steel bar made of heavy steel tubing became dislodged from the railings in the milking shed. Mr Erasmus during three to four milkings used the bar to strike a number of cows in the hock areas of their hind legs with as much force as he could muster while the animals were contained in the milking sheds. Each animal was hit approximately three to four times with the heavy steel bar.

As a result of the assaults on the animals, a number of the cows developed large haematomas, resulting in large, swollen, infected abscesses on their hind legs. Such injuries require veterinary treatment but no attempt was made to seek veterinary treatment for the animals. Mr Erasmus sought to treat some of the abscesses himself by cutting through skin and tissue with either a large pair of tailing scissors or a craft knife to let out the pus and fluid. This was done without anaesthetic or pain relief.

A Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Animal Welfare Inspector entered the property on 22 February 2012 to inspect the animals. The inspection revealed serious animal welfare issues, with a majority of the cows on the property showing obvious signs of physical injuries, including suspected broken legs, lameness, severe swelling and abscesses oozing pus and blood. 115 of the 135 cows exhibited signs of broken tails.

One cow was euthanased within 10 minutes of the first inspection due to her injuries. 25 animals in total were euthanased as they were in such severe pain and distress. A further 22 animals had severe injuries requiring veterinary treatment.

The Summary of Facts contained graphic details of the injuries and pain suffered by four of the cows who were later put down. The summary also said that 115 of the 135 cows had broken tails, with 47 of the tails being broken in more than one place.

The Ministry said in the summary that the defendant was not a suitable person to be an owner of, or exercising authority over, dairy cows and it sought permanent disqualification under section 169 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. A judge in the Waihi District Court sentenced Mr Erasmus to 10 months' home detention with judicial monitoring at three month intervals. He was not

disqualified from owning or exercising authority over animals under section 169.

The Ministry for Primary Industries described the case as the worst case of wilful ill-treatment of animals ever to be brought before a New Zealand court. Despite that, the District Court judge sentenced Mr Erasmus only to home detention and failed to make an order banning him from owning or having control over animals. The Ministry for Primary Industries is to be commended for successfully appealing to the High Court against this grossly inadequate sentence. The tougher sentence imposed by the High Court following the appeal was at the time the longest prison sentence ever imposed in New Zealand for animal cruelty.

Question 13: Would it be appropriate to expand the second defence above to include “necessary for the preservation, protection or maintenance of human or animal life” ? If so, in what circumstances, and which regulatory proposals would this apply to ?

It would have been helpful for the Discussion Paper to have provided an example of the types of situations it was envisaged this would cover.

Question 14 Do any of the proposed regulations, set out in Part B, require a lead-in period ? If so, what period is reasonable ? Are there any other challenges relating to the timing of regulations coming into force ?

No, they should come into force as soon as possible. This is particularly the case since – to the detriment of animals – the regulations are closely based on the existing and inadequate minimum standards.

Question 15: How should the codes of welfare be amended by the proposed regulations to ensure the codes continue to work effectively within the legislative scheme

As outlined earlier in this submission, Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support the Codes of Welfare. It is submitted they legalise cruelty and practices which would not be condoned if the basic purposes and protections of the act were given proper effect.

Question 16: Which of the approaches as outlined above, or combination of approaches, do you support ?

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support the Codes of Welfare continuing to be able to be used as defences to cruel behaviour which does not comply with the basic principles and protections of the act.

Question 17: What other options to amend the codes are there ?

Question 18: How should MPI best engage with stakeholders to monitor and and review the impact of proposed regulations ?

There needs to be far more consultation with animal welfare groups, and far more weight should be placed on their submissions. Industry groups have a vested, economic interest in continuing cruel practices and little incentive to change them when there is such weak monitoring and enforcement of animal welfare in New Zealand. Their influence on policy and law-making relating to animal welfare means that New Zealand's animal welfare continues to be very poor.

Animal Agenda Aotearoa is happy to be consulted and to provide feedback in future.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

PART B – SPECIFIC REGULATORY PROPOSALS

1 All animals – Electric prodders

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support the use of electric prodders in any circumstances. They should be banned. The use of electric prodders is contrary to the welfare of animals.

2 All animals – Use of goads

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support the use of goads. They should be banned.

3 All animals – Twisting an animal's tail

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support permitting the twisting of animals' tails. Tail twisting should be clearly prohibited by law. Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support the proposed regulation which provides a prohibition only when the twisting is done "in a manner that causes the animal pain." At present, tail twisting is used to control animals and Animal Agenda Aotearoa has heard a vet speak of this practice as acceptable and widespread. If any form of tail twisting is permitted, cruel and excessive tail twisting will continue, as those working on farms will not know the exact point at which the twisting becomes unacceptable. A total ban is accordingly the only way to provide clarity and to end this cruelty.

New Zealand has a major problem with the deliberate twisting and breaking of cows' tails on dairy farms. This is used as a means of punishing animals. There have been a number of horrendous cases which have come to light in recent years, involving the breaking of the tails of dozens or hundreds of cows. Some of these cases have resulted in prosecutions and convictions. However, only a fraction of this type of abuse ever comes to the attention of the Ministry or the public. Most of it occurs out of sight on farms and is never detected.

The following are some recent examples of tail twisting and tail breaking –

- In February 2013, West Coast dairy farmer Michael Jackson was sentenced after pleading guilty to failing to alleviate pain or distress in 230 injured dairy cows. A veterinarian discovered that 46 per cent of 500 cows had fractured or dislocated tail bones or soft tissue damage to the tail as a result of twisting or lifting of the tail. Canterbury/Westland District Compliance Manager Peter Hyde said that this was the largest

percentage of animals in a single herd that the Ministry for Primary Industries had seen with deliberate physical injuries. **Mr Jackson claimed that the practice of tail twisting was widespread in the dairy industry. (emphasis added).**

- In August 2013, Ashburton dairy herd manager Kevin Smith was convicted after pleading guilty to the wilful ill-treatment of 154 dairy cows by breaking their tails and failing to provide treatment for the broken tails. Mr Smith also admitted striking the animals with a plastic pipe.
- In September 2013, former farmer Saul Beaumont pleaded guilty to breaking the tails of 46 cows. He was working on a Taranaki farm when he broke the tails of numerous cows on multiple occasions, continuing to do so after verbal and written warnings from his employer.

In order, to end this abuse, the law must be clear that no twisting of animals' tails is acceptable. As mentioned earlier in this submission, more unannounced farm inspections and far greater monitoring and enforcement of animal welfare are also required.

4 Dogs – Pinch and prong collars

Animal Agenda Aotearoa agrees that the use of pinch and prong collars should be prohibited. It is submitted that the use of electric shock collars should also be prohibited by regulation.

Dog electric shock collars are used primarily by unqualified dog owners to prevent barking. This is both cruel and ineffective.

Shock collars, also known as electric pulse training aids, are used to train animals by applying an electric current to their skin. There are three types –

- handler-operated devices delivering an electrical discharge
- containment systems delineating the boundaries of an area and normally combined with an audible or vibrational stimulus warning the animal that if he or she does not retreat, an electrical stimulus will be applied
- noise-activated systems emitting an electrical stimulus in response to vocalisation by the wearer.

Veterinarian Dr Elsa Flint advises that the shock delivered by the devices is extremely painful. How much pain the dog suffers depends on the maximum joules provided by the collar, the intensity-setting, the duration of the shock and whether the electrodes are tightly against the skin. The jolt administered may also be more or less severe depending on the length of the dog's coat, the animal's hydration and how the dog holds his or her head. The rationale of the devices, though, is that they supply a painful jolt to the animal.

Untrained people buying dog electric shock collars for personal use are in no position to assess properly how the device should be used to minimise the pain to the animal.

It is Dr Flint's view that there is no situation in which the use of dog electric shock collars is acceptable and that they should be banned completely.

An American man who had bought one of the collars for his dog decided to trial it on himself before using it on the dog. He was so upset by the strength of the shock administered by the device, that he decided not to use it on his dog.

West Harbour Vet Clinic small animal vet and executive committee member of the Companion Animal Society of the New Zealand Veterinary Association, Ee-Heng Lim, says that positive reward is the best way to train dogs. He does not support the use of shock collars and says that they are open to abuse and cause more harm than good.

Shock collars are already illegal in Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany and Wales, as well as in four Australian states. There are legal restrictions on the use of the devices in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Italy.

Dr Flint in 2012 completed a doctoral thesis titled *The Social Significance of Barking in New Zealand Dogs (Canis familiaris)*. The 198-page document confirms that barking is often viewed as a problem by humans and that "quick fix" solutions to silence the dog are sought, with little consideration being given to the causes of the barking or the negative consequences for dogs of some solutions used. Dr Flint found that 40 per cent of "problem barker" dogs presenting at the Animals with Attitude Behaviour Clinic in Auckland were suffering from separation anxiety. Using electric collars to punish such dogs for vocalising to express their anxiety only increases their anxiety. Separation anxiety needs to be diagnosed and treated properly if it is to be cured.

Dr Flint says that use of dog electric shock collars is painful and traumatic for the animal. In addition, they are ineffective as the dog does not understand why the shock is being administered. The harmful impacts of the collars include burns at contact points.

If the collars are used repeatedly, they can induce in dogs anxiety leading to a state of learned helplessness.

The United Kingdom Companion Animal Welfare Council in September 2012 published a 92-page report on shock collars, titled *The Use of Electric Pulse Training Aids (EPTAs) in Companion Animals*. The study concluded that the widespread use of EPTAs as manual training aids was not “compatible with the moral climate underpinning the spirit of the animal welfare legislation.” The paper said it was clear that the lack of a close link between electrical stimuli and the behaviour to be modified could give rise to both behavioural and welfare problems.

Learned helplessness is a state of extreme anxiety that occurs when an animal is exposed to what is, or is perceived to be, an uncontrollable situation. In the case of electric collars, the affected animal eventually fears making any moves in case movement triggers further pain. The dog is unable to work out specifically what is causing the pain and how that can be avoided, so makes no movements at all.

Another article which details the impact of shock collars on dogs is: *The use of shock collars and their impact on the welfare of dogs* – Emily Blackwell and Rachel Casey, 2006; and *Clinical signs caused by the use of electric training collars on dogs in everyday life situations* – E Schalke and others, 2006.

In addition, the Australian Veterinary Association has produced a reward-based training guide which confirms that reward-based training is the humane and effective way to modify dogs’ behaviour - Australian Veterinary Association’s reward-based training guide - http://www.ava.com.au/sites/default/files/AVA_website/pdfs/Reward-based-training-brochure-WEB.pdf.

Clause 8.1.2 of the Code of Welfare for Dogs states the electronic training devices are punishment systems that work by supplying an instant noxious stimulus for unwanted behaviour.

"This is contrary to the philosophy of most animal behaviourists, who recommend reward-based training methods. Electronic training devices can be harmful if misused, but used carefully they can be very effective against unwanted behaviours."

The New Zealand Companion Animal Council in 2013 lobbied Trade Me to ban the sale of electric shock collars through its site.

In June 2013, there were 352 listings on Trade Me offering dog electric shock collars for sale. The feedback on the website in relation to the collars was extremely disturbing, as it made it plain that the collars were causing severe harm to the welfare of dogs. The comments from purchasers also made it plain that the devices were ineffective.

Feedback included comments such as "very cruel," "dangerous product – caused our dog to have shaking fit" and "Dog barked, got shocked, squealed in pain, shocked again etc. Was just plain awful."

When the distressed and traumatised animals stop barking, the humans think the shock collars have worked. That is not the case. Dogs don't understand why they are receiving the shocks – if the barking ceases, it is because the animals are suffering from physical pain and trauma.

Electric shock collars are used to "train" dogs by applying an electric current to their skins. The devices most readily available to the public are noise-activated systems which deliver a sharp jolt to a barking animal, aimed at stopping the barking. The collars are designed to hurt – and they do. Dogs feel the same sort of shock as comes from touching a stock fence. As owners using the devices are not trained, they have no idea of how strong the shock might be. Some dogs receive burns on their skins at the contact points of the collars.

Following lobbying and the information provided about the harmful impact of electric shock collars, Trade Me agreed to stop allowing them to be sold on its website.

Animal Agenda Aotearoa submits that the importation, sale and use of electric shock collars should be prohibited in New Zealand.

5 Dogs – Injuries from collars or tethers

Animal Agenda Aotearoa agrees that the use of a collar and/or a tether must not cause cuts, abrasions or swelling, or restrict breathing or panting. Some of the issues raised above in relation to electric shock collars are accordingly also

relevant to this proposed regulation, and the intent of this regulation also supports the submission that electric shock collars should be banned.

Animal Agenda Aotearoa submits that the draft regulation should also include a ban on chaining dogs. Many dogs in New Zealand are chained either permanently or for the majority both of each day and of their lives. This is incredibly cruel and the animals suffer both physically and psychologically. In the worst cases, the chain becomes embedded into the animal's neck if it is never removed.

More information about the chaining of dogs in New Zealand can be found on the website of Chained Dog Awareness - <http://cdanz.org/email-an-mp/>.

Animal Agenda Aotearoa submits that, in order to end the permanent or near-permanent chaining of dogs in New Zealand, there must be a ban on all chaining of dogs. If the law were to allow chaining for specified periods of time, enforcement would be extremely difficult as it would be almost impossible to prove whether the dog had been chained for a period allowed by law. An outright ban would mean this problem would not arise.

Chaining of dogs is contrary to their welfare and does not allow them to display normal patterns of behaviour, as referred to in section 4 (c) of the act.

6 Dogs – Muzzling a dog

Animal Agenda Aotearoa supports this draft regulation.

7 Dogs – Dry and shaded shelter

Animal Agenda Aotearoa supports this draft regulation. The current provision in the Dogs Code of Welfare 2010 is inadequate as it provides that ventilation and shade must be provided "in situations where dogs are likely to experience heat distress." Ventilation and shade should be available at all times. The qualification in the code should be removed.

8 Dogs – Dogs left in vehicles

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support this proposed regulation. Instead, it is submitted that leaving a dog unattended in a vehicle should be prohibited. There are numerous cases, both in New Zealand and overseas, of dogs dying – essentially by cooking to death - after being left unattended in hot vehicles. It is impossible for people to guess accurately how long it is safe to leave a dog in a hot vehicle for – this varies according to the temperature and other factors. People who return to vehicles to find their dogs dead or close to death almost

invariably assert that they thought it would be all right to leave their dogs in the car for a certain period.

The only way to protect the welfare of dogs is to ban leaving them unattended in cars.

9 Dogs – Secured on moving vehicles

Animal Agenda Aotearoa submits that it would be preferable to require dogs to be transported inside the body of the vehicle. The Discussion Paper notes that dogs who fall from moving vehicles are likely to suffer serious injuries, if not death. Dogs who fall from the top of the vehicle but cannot free themselves from the vehicle because they are tethered or otherwise restrained can likewise suffer severe injuries.

10 Dogs & Cats – Drowning dogs & cats

This proposed regulation is supported.

11 Eels – Insensible for desliming

Eels must be insensible or killed before they are deslimed.

12 Crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish – Insensible before being killed

This regulation is supported, though it would be preferable for crabs, rock lobsters and crayfish to be killed as soon as they are captured. There is no animal welfare benefit to them in being kept alive – quite the contrary. They are captured to be eaten by humans, but they do not need to be kept alive until immediately before they are cooked and eaten.

13 Tethering requirements

This draft regulation is not supported. The tethering of goats should be prohibited. Many goats in New Zealand spend their entire lives on chains or ropes, able to move only a short distance and with no company. Their diets are very restricted and they may either have inadequate shelter, or no protection at all from the elements.

As noted earlier in this submission, the act requires people in charge of animals to ensure their physical, health and behavioural needs are met, in accordance with good practice and scientific knowledge. Physical, health and behavioural needs are defined as –

- Proper and sufficient food
- Proper and sufficient water

- Adequate shelter
- Opportunity to display normal patterns of behaviour
- Physical handling in a manner that minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress
- Protection from, and rapid diagnosis of, any significant injury or disease.

People who tether goats are not complying with a single one of these needs. Goats require a wide variety of vegetation in their diets and will not be properly nourished if they eat only grass. Ruminants need bulky feed for their digestive systems to work properly, and should have hay and salt every day. Goats have thin skins, with very little fat below the skin, meaning they do not like getting wet and are highly susceptible to chills. Often they are not adequately sheltered in the basic, metal structures provided for them. The situation is even worse for those animals provided with no shelter at all. Goats are intelligent herd animals who need companionship. Lone, tethered goats cannot display normal patterns of behaviour as they lack company and their movement is restricted.

Animals living on the roadside are vulnerable to attack by dogs or people, as well as to being run over by cars. Some goats die of neglect or strangle in their tethers. Other freeze to death or, in summer, may die of heat exhaustion. If goats are permanently chained, the chain can grow into their neck and embed itself in their flesh.

New Zealand had the chance in 2012 to improve the lives of goats by banning tethering, but chose not to do so. The Animal Welfare (Goats) Code of Welfare 2012 instead provided that goats restrained by tethering must be placid and trained to the conditions; have constant access to palatable water, sufficient food and effective shelter; be able to move without undue hindrance; and be inspected at least once every 12 hours.

The code also said kids, sick goats and pregnant or nursing does must not be tethered. Tethers used on goats on roadside verges must prevent goats from getting into the path of vehicles. However, the reality is that many goats are placed on chains or ropes and forgotten.

The code itself states that best practice is for goats to be kept in herds or at least with one social companion and that "Goats should not be tethered as they are social animals." If best practice is for goats not to be tethered, why is there a minimum standard permitting tethering ?

Last year, a petition was presented to Parliament calling for a ban on goat tethering. Some MPs smirked or laughed openly as the petition was read in the House. The petition was referred to the Primary Production Committee, which sought input from the Ministry. The Ministry advised that it had investigated 38 complaints about goat welfare between 2013 and 2015, but had not considered any matter sufficiently serious to warrant a prosecution. This was despite the fact that the complaints repeatedly recorded that animals were skinny, dead, or unable to bear weight on both forelegs. The committee decided to take no action on the petition.

MPI's Discussion Paper on the draft Animal Welfare Act regulations proposes that "Tethered goats much have constant access to food, water, and shelter." The draft goes on to say that tethering is an "identified area of frequent non-compliance" and that "Current responses appear ineffective at deterring frequent offending."

In addition, the draft records that "On average 50 complaints a year are identified relating to tethered goats, making up 25% of all goat complaints." This is a far higher complaints investigation figure than the statistic provided to the Primary Production Committee.

It is clear that goat tethering is not best practice and that intended safeguards are flouted. Accordingly, an outright ban on tethering is required. This would send a clear message about how goat welfare can best be protected.

14 Horses – use of a whip, lead or any other object

Animal Agenda Aotearoa supports a prohibition on striking a horse around the head with a whip, lead or any other object. However, the proposed infringement fee of \$300 is too low. Striking a human with an object is a criminal assault in law. The Ministry's Discussion Paper notes that striking a horse's head "can cause unreasonable pain and distress. It is an outdated practice that is no longer acceptable." It is submitted that the penalty needs to be higher than \$300 to reinforce the unacceptability of this behaviour.

Further, it is submitted that there should be an outright prohibition on striking horses anywhere on their bodies.

15 Horses – Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles

This is supported but it should also be made explicit that such equipment should be removed from the animal's body when it is not being used.

16 Horses & donkeys – Tethering requirements

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support this proposal, for the reasons outlined in relation to draft regulation 13 relating to goat tethering. Like goat tethering, the tethering of donkeys and horses should be prohibited.

17 Layer hens – Opportunity to express normal behaviours

Colony cages do not allow hens to display normal patterns of behaviour. The appalling conditions in which colony hens are kept were publicised in footage released by Farmwatch earlier this year. This revealed that colony cages effectively provide no better welfare for hens than do battery cages.

The cost to the industry of moving from battery to colony cages has been estimated at \$150 million. This is a waste of money. It is inevitable that New Zealand will eventually abolish the caging of hens and require all hens to be kept in free range conditions. The industry will rightly feel aggrieved at being required to spend millions of dollars to move from battery to colony cages, only to find that this expenditure is wasted when, in future, all caging is banned.

The Government should immediately ban all caging of hens.

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not agree with the statement on page 38 of the Discussion Paper that “Colony cages are considered a housing system that meets the requirements [for animals to have the opportunity to express a range of normal behaviours].”

18 Layer hens – Stocking densities

It is submitted that caging of hens should be prohibited. When hens are not caged, there should also be limits on the number of hens to be kept in one space. The welfare of hens cannot be protected when too many hens are kept together.

19 Layer hens – Housing and equipment design

This draft regulation is opposed. All caging of hens should be banned.

20 Layer hens – Induced moulting

This draft regulation is supported. Debeaking should also be prohibited.

21 Llama & Alpaca – Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes and packs

Animal Agenda Aotearoa supports this proposal.

22 Llama & Alpaca – Companion animals

This draft regulation is supported. Animal Agenda Aotearoa would like this requirement to be extended to goats as well.

23 Llama & Alpaca – Offspring (Cria) camelid companions

Animal Agenda Aotearoa supports this proposal being made a requirement.

24 Pigs – Dry sleeping area

This is supported.

25 Pigs – Lying space for grower pigs

Pigs must always have access to the outdoors and must never be confined. They should be provided with adequate shelter from heat, cold and rain, but should at all times have access to the outdoors as well. There is ample evidence that the welfare of all pigs is always severely compromised when they are confined.

Monitoring and enforcement of pig welfare in New Zealand is utterly inadequate and it is shameful and a reflection of the country's low concern for animal welfare that most examples of appalling practices are brought to light by the voluntary group Farmwatch, rather than by the agency charged with and funded to enforce animal welfare in New Zealand.

26 Dry sow stalls

All use of dry sow stalls is severely detrimental to pigs and the stalls should never be used in any circumstances. The Ministry should inspect all pig farms in New Zealand to check that dry sow stalls are not being used and to monitor the welfare of farmed pigs. All pigs should be kept in free range conditions.

27 Pigs – size of farrowing crates

Farrowing crates are detrimental to pig welfare and should be banned. This draft regulation is accordingly not supported.

28 Provision of nesting material

As noted above, Animal Agenda Aotearoa considers that farrowing crates should be banned immediately. Pigs should always be provided with nesting

material, but this should not be done in the context of the use of farrowing systems.

29 Rodeos – Fireworks

Animal Agenda Aotearoa agrees that fireworks, pyrotechnics and gas-fired explosions should not be used at rodeos. However, in addition to prohibiting the use of these devices at rodeos, the sale and use of all fireworks should be banned to the public. There are injuries to animals every year from the use of fireworks and these cannot be justified.

Further, Animal Agenda Aotearoa supports an immediate ban on all rodeos in New Zealand. Rodeos are immensely cruel to animals and completely contrary to the spirit and protections of the Animal Welfare Act. Footage filmed at rodeos in recent years has provided ample evidence of injuries and cruelty to animals. This footage has been provided to the Ministry and the Ministry's ongoing refusal to take enforcement action in relation to it is extremely disappointing and provides yet another reason why an independent Commissioner for Animal Welfare is needed.

30 Exotic animals – Used in circuses

The use of exotic animals in circuses should be prohibited. The conditions in which the animals are kept are entirely unnatural and Animal Agenda Aotearoa agrees with the views outlined on page 47 of the Discussion Paper, where it is stated that it is unlikely that the needs of exotic animals can be adequately met by circuses. The document states that it is unlikely that the needs of "some exotic animals can be adequately met." It is submitted that no animal's needs can be met by when the animal is subjected to such an artificial existence.

Further, Animal Agenda Aotearoa submits that the import of exotic animals to New Zealand should be banned. Sending animals long distances to other countries to live in zoos and similar confinement is never in the interests of the animals. The only situation in which this can be justified is when circus, zoo or other similarly captive animals are to be rehomed to an animal sanctuary. Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support importing elephants or pandas to New Zealand.

31 Cattle – Milk stimulation

This proposal is supported.

32 Cattle and sheep – Vehicular traction in calving or lambing

Animal Agenda Aotearoa supports this draft regulation.

33 Cattle and sheep – Ingrown horns

Agreed.

34 Stock transport – Cuts and abrasions

Agreed. Animal Agenda Aotearoa has been told it is common for stock trucks to be overloaded so farmers do not have to pay for an extra truck. Animals are transported in crowded conditions and sometimes suffer severe injuries.

35 Stock transport – Animals with ingrown horns

Animal Agenda Aotearoa supports a ban and accordingly submits that the exception should be deleted.

36 Stock transport – Animals with bleeding horns or antlers

The same submission is made as for proposed regulation 35.

37 Stock transport – Animals with long horns or antlers

Agreed.

38 Stock transport – Lamé cattle, deer, pigs and goats

The same submission is made as for proposed regulation 35.

39 Stock transport – Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury

The same submission is made as for proposed regulation 35.

40 Stock transport – pregnant animals

The same submission is made as for proposed regulation 35.

41 Stock transport – Animals with injured or diseased udders

The same submission is made as for proposed regulation 35.

42 Stock transport – Cattle or sheep with cancer eye

The same submission is made as for proposed regulation 35.

43 Young Calves – Loading and Unloading Facilities

The Farmwatch footage which screened on TVNZ's *Sunday* programme in December 2015 revealed appalling treatment of calves. It is disappointing that MPI's response was not speedier and more vigorous.

2.2 million young calves are transported for slaughter in New Zealand every year within a few days of being born. This is an appalling way to treat animals and an indictment of this country's farming practices. Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support a farming system which regards 2.2 million young animals as objects to be discarded within a few days of birth. Animal Agenda Aotearoa's submissions in relation to young calves are made against that background.

Animal Agenda Aotearoa agrees that facilities must be provided to enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. The Farmwatch footage showed young calves being thrown around like inanimate objects.

44 Young Calves – Shelter on-farm, before and during transportation and at processing

Animal Agenda Aotearoa believes that young calves should be kept with their mothers while they are still on-farm. Video cameras should be installed in all slaughterhouses in New Zealand so that the treatment of animals can be monitored.

45 Young Calves – Fitness for Transport – Age

It is submitted that young calves should not be able to be transported until they are at least 10 days old. As noted in the Discussion Paper, the European Union does not permit transport until at least 10 days of age.

46 Young Calves – Fitness for Transport – Physical Characteristics

The proposal in this regulation that calves should be able to stand illustrates the essential barbarity of a system which sends 2.2 million calves a year, within a few days of birth, on terrifying and physically uncomfortable road journeys in order to slaughter them. It is difficult to express any support at all for such a system. Animal Agenda Aotearoa agrees that animals should be fit before being loaded onto trucks.

47 Young Calves – Maximum time off feed

This draft regulation is not supported. Very young animals – just like human animals – require feeding at short intervals. 24 hours without food is far too long and extremely cruel. Four hours should be the limit.

48 Young Calves – Duration of Transport

A journey of eight hours is far too long for young calves. It would be better for their welfare for them to be slaughtered on the farm.

49 Young Calves – Blunt force trauma

This proposal is supported.

50 Young Calves – Transport by sea across Cook Strait prohibited

Agreed.

51 All animals – Hot branding

Agreed.

52 All animals – embryo collection via exteriorised uterus

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support this procedure but supports the use of pain relief at all times for painful and surgical procedures. Training, supervision and experience are also essential for all surgical and painful procedures.

53 All animals – Laparoscopic artificial insemination

Animal Agenda Aotearoa supports the use of pain relief, but queries what monitoring and enforcement there would be in practice.

54 All animals – Liver biopsy

Animal Agenda Aotearoa supports the requirement for a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student to do the procedure and for pain relief to be provided.

55 All animals – Dental work

The necessity for animals to be able to display normal patterns of behaviour should be borne in mind at all times. Animals require claws and teeth to protect themselves as well as for eating.

56 Cats – Declawing

The declawing of cats should be completely banned. Cats need their claws for climbing and balance, as well as for defending themselves. It is never in the interests of the cat for him or her to be declawed. People who cannot cope with cats' claws or cat scratching should not bring cats into their families. The proposal to permit cat declawing is not supported.

57 Companion animals – Desexing (including stray/feral cats, dogs, and other species)

Agreed.

58 Dogs – Freeze branding

This procedure should be banned. Dogs can be microchipped and collared to identify them.

59 Dogs – Dog debarking (and devoicing of other species)

Like cat declawing, dog debarking is a barbaric practice and people who would contemplate it are not fit to have ownership or care of dogs or other animals. Debarking and devoicing should be prohibited.

60 Dogs – Cropping the ears

Animal Agenda Aotearoa agrees with the statement in the Discussion paper that cropping dogs' ears is unnecessary – it is utterly unjustifiable and done purely for human vanity reasons of trying to make the dog's appearance conform to the human's idea of what is desirable. Cropping dogs' ears should continue to be totally prohibited.

61 Dogs – Dew claws

The removal of dew claws should be prohibited.

62 Dogs – Tail docking

Like cat declawing and dog debarking, dog tail docking is done for reasons some humans consider justifiable but which are contrary to the animal's welfare and not justifiable on any objective view. Dog tail docking, as noted on page 88 of the Discussion Paper, is done primarily for so-called aesthetic reasons. Tail docking should be prohibited.

63 Cattle – Teats

Animal Agenda Aotearoa is very sceptical about whether this procedure could be performed without compromising the welfare of the animal.

64 Cattle – claw removal

Agreed.

65 Teat occlusion

This should be prohibited. The Discussion Paper clearly outlines the pain and harmful consequences to the animal.

66 Cattle – Tail docking

Tail docking of cattle should be prohibited. Cattle require their tails for flicking away flies and other purposes. Animal Agenda Aotearoa agrees with the research summary on page 92 of the Discussion Paper, stating that a recent study found that tail docking did not improve cow hygiene. Docking is already prohibited in the United Kingdom, Germany, Denmark and California. New Zealand should follow the lead of these jurisdictions.

67 Cattle and sheep - Castration and shortening of the scrotum (Cryptorchid)

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support this practice.

70 Sheep – tail docking

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support this practice.

71 Sheep – Mulesing

Animal Agenda Aotearoa considers that this practice should be prohibited.

72 Deer – Develvetting

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support this practice.

73 Horses – Blistering, firing or nicking

These practices should be prohibited.

74 Horses – Tail docking

The docking of horses' tails should be prohibited. As noted on page 103 of the Discussion Paper, the docking of horses' tails is done for the benefit of humans, leads to chronic pain, and means horses cannot repel insects. Horse tail docking is prohibited in Germany, Ireland, Portugal, Norway, Austria, Sweden, Denmark and the United Kingdom and should be banned in New Zealand as well.

75 Horses – Rectal pregnancy diagnosis of horses

This procedure is dangerous to mares and must be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student.

76 Horses – rectal examination of horses

This procedure is dangerous to horses and must be performed only by a veterinarian or directly supervised veterinary student.

77 Horses – Caslick's procedure

This procedure should be prohibited. Mares should not be repeatedly bred to the point that it is considered necessary.

78 Horses – Castration

Agreed.

79 Llama and alpaca – Castration

Agreed.

80 Pigs – Castration

Agreed.

81 Pigs – Tail docking

Pig tail docking should be prohibited.

82 Birds – Pinioning or otherwise deflighting a bird

Animal Agenda Aotearoa does not support these procedures.

83 Poultry – Dubbing

These procedures should be banned.

84 Ostriches & Emus – Declawing

Animal Agenda Aotearoa supports a prohibition on this practice.

85 Roosters – Caponising (rooster castration)

Agreed.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

154

From: Joanne Williams s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Sunday, 15 May 2016 1:16 p.m.
To: Animal Welfare Submissions
Subject: Factory Farming

To whom it may concern at MPI.

I would like to see our government act on the prevalence of animal cruelty in our country. Although I do believe we are meant to eat meat I don't believe we are meant to artificially breed creatures and separate them from their mothers as newborns, then kill them if they are male and sell their flesh as dogfood, in droves. This practice sickens me and has made me stop eating animal products for almost 2 years.

I'm just one of many citizens who are rejecting food produced in despicable clinical bizarre environments. Who gives us the right to make that judgement on an animal's life? Just imagine for a minute, try hard and envision your family as a the family of a cow or pig or chicken. You are 'aroused'- someone takes your semen with a cold metal or plastic (I'm not sure exactly how that's done) and makes hundreds of sperm sticks out of it.

Imagine your wife is impregnated with another man's semen against her will.

Her baby grows and she develops love for her unborn calf.

Your child.

The child is born. It is a boy. Some guy takes it away while your wife screams and tries to reach him. She is blocked by gates.

Your baby is thrown around a concrete yard unable to properly stand yet and chucked in a truck, put in a cage on the side of the road to be picked up by the dogfood guy. Maybe sitting there for a few hours in the hot sun crying for his Mum with no water or feed, like a piece of trash.

Mum is herded off to the milking shed to have her milk drained away which was meant for her baby which is now abducted, abused and on death row.

Or, it is a girl. I'm sure you know how this goes better than I.

The world needs to change if it is to survive. New Zealand could be a world leaders in chemical-free, cruelty-free farming. If we just ate less meat we would have less pollution and healthier rivers, a richer environment, therefore healthier people, happier and more productive, intelligent, creative, innovative citizens. Tourists would think of our country as Eden and we could be innovators in sustainable practices. We would live with love instead of greed. Don't you want to feel that too?

Stop legalising the behaviours of a sick and demented, out of hand industry.

Yours sincerely,
J Williams.

From: Lisa McEwan <⁸₉>
Sent: Thursday, 19 May 2016 1:27 a.m.
To: Animal Welfare Submissions
Subject: Submission on Animal Welfare Regulations

MPI Animal Welfare Codes Submission

Nathan Guy
Minister for Primary Industries

Dear Mr. Guy

In response to MPI's request for feedback on proposed animal welfare regulations I submit the following for your careful consideration.

The given consultation period (14th April to 10 May 2016) for public involvement is woefully inadequate. Five weeks is unrealistic and makes a mockery of the consultation process. The volume of proposals we are being asked to consider in this time frame isn't feasible and I ask that a more realistic time frame be given for the public to have our say.

I suggest a period of five weeks be given to each section of the proposed welfare regulations.

While the proposed regulations relating to live animal exports, the care and conduct towards animals, and surgical and painful procedures is a start, I ask that there be a full review into intensive farming practices across the agricultural industry.

The last two decades have seen the intensification of animal agriculture to levels that are unprecedented in recent history (from 5.3m dairy cows in 2007 to 6.4m in 2012, a 23% increase in just 5 years according to Statistics NZ). The current welfare codes and proposed welfare regulations don't go nearly far enough in protecting animal welfare under increasingly intensive farming practices.

Society's moral values are constantly shifting yet these regulations have remained largely static and are vastly out of step with changing attitudes to animal welfare (Switzerland banned cages for hens in 1992). I want to see a total ban on all cages for layer hens, farrowing crates for sows and a reduction in intensive dairy resulting in the slaughter of over 2m calves annually.

These farming practices can no longer be deemed humane by today's standards and cannot be incorporated as such in any welfare code. The new rules are not keeping pace with changing scientific knowledge and cannot be accepted as good practice.

1)

Proposed regulations for the transport of live animals from New Zealand.

→ The amendments to the principal Act transfer the de facto ban on transport of animals for slaughter from an Order that could be rescinded at any time to an Act of Parliament. As such, this is an improvement. I also support all the extra requirements that the Director General must take into account before granting a certificate for export.

Animals Australia uncovered horrendous treatment of animals destined for consumption in many middle Eastern countries, so the requirement that the Director General 'may' take into account the welfare of the animals when they have reached the exporting country (section 43(2)) is an improvement.

New Zealand, in line with most civilised nations, does not allow suspected criminals to be extradited to places where they may face the death penalty, because this is against the law of our country. We recognise that our duty to protect our residents from harm extends beyond our own borders. Similarly, animals should not be extradited to places where they may face inhumane slaughter that is prohibited under New Zealand law. Our animal residents also need to be protected from harm.

I consider that this must be a part of any regulation around export of animals, whether for slaughter or any other reason. For this reason, I propose that the conditions described in 4.3.3 of the discussion document must go further, and that animals must only be exported to countries that have equal or better legal protections for their welfare than New Zealand.

Care and conduct regulatory proposals		
1	All animals	Electric prodders
		<p>I propose that the use of electric prodders be banned under all circumstances except when they are "necessary for protection, preservation or maintenance of human life"</p> <p>I do not support exemptions on the use of prodders based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the species and size of an animal b. the manner of use of an animal (circus) c. the location of the animal (slaughter premises) <p>I support the proposed infringement penalty.</p>
2	All animals	Use of goads
		<p>I support the proposal to ban the use of goads on sensitive areas of an animal's body under any circumstances. Given the deliberate cruelty involved in using goads on sensitive areas I propose an increased infringement penalty of \$500.</p>
3	All animals	Twisting an animal's tail
		<p>I support the proposal to prohibit painful twisting of an animal's tail. Given the potential for significant pain and damage from this behaviour, and the deliberate nature of the act I propose the infringement penalty is set at the higher level of \$500.</p>
Proposed	All animals	Any animal requiring manual lifting must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick animals).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage, presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed 2) https://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/
4	Dogs	Pinch and Prong collars
		<p>I support the prohibition of pinch and prong collars under any circumstances; no exemption for dogs used for special purposes (guarding, military) is supported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300. I also support the banning of the sale of these collars and associated penalties under the law.</p>
5	Dogs	Injuries from collars or tethers
		<p>I support the proposal to only use collars or tethers in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. Given the potential for severe injury from collars I propose the penalty is increased to a prosecutable offence.</p>
6	Dogs	Muzzling a dog

		I support the proposal for regulating the use of muzzles so they do not cause injury or distress. I support the inclusion in the proposal that muzzles should allow for a dog to be able to drink. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
7	Dogs	Dry and shaded shelter
		I support the proposal for dogs to have access to dry and shaded shelter at all times. I propose the inclusion in the proposal that dogs also have access to fresh, palatable drinking water at all times. Given that shelter and water are basic needs of life neglecting these items has the potential to cause significant harm and even death therefore I propose the infringement penalty to be increased to a prosecutable offence. I also propose that there be a maximum time imposed that a dog is allowed to be chained for at any one time and that an infringement fee be set for exceeding that time.
8	Dogs	Dogs left in vehicles
		I support the proposal regarding dogs left in vehicles. I propose increasing the penalty to a prosecutable offence both to reflect the potential fatal nature of the injury and also to act as a suitable penalty to prevent this behaviour. Additionally increasing the penalty allows for effective prosecution of corporations who use dogs who have a responsibility to ensure dogs in their care are cared for appropriately.
9	Dogs	Secured on moving vehicles
		I support the proposal to secure dogs on moving vehicles. I propose including dogs on vehicles on private property in the regulation, and propose a speed limit of 40kph for vehicles carrying unsecured working dogs. I propose increasing the penalty for infringement to \$1000 due to the potential for severe injury, suffering, and death resulting from falling from a moving vehicle.
Proposed	Dogs	Ban export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Macau or China
		The Macau and China greyhound racing industries do not have the same standards of animal welfare as NZ. The export of racing greyhounds between NZ and Hong Kong (for further transport to Macau/China) is minimal at present. However if the export of greyhounds from other countries (Australia, Ireland) is banned or more heavily regulated then NZ could become a transport hub for dogs in this industry. This has the potential for poor welfare outcomes for dogs and very poor public perception in New Zealand. It is far better to ban an activity like this before it has the potential to become established. MPI have demonstrated their willingness to put in place infringements for uncommon industry activities which have the potential to become welfare issues in the future with proposal 50 in this document banning transport of young calves across Cook Strait. I propose the above regulation and propose the infringement penalty is set at a prosecutable offence.
10	Dogs and Cats	Drowning dogs and cats
		I support the prohibition of the killing of a dog or cat of any age by drowning. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
11	Eels	Insensible for desliming
		I support the proposal that eels must be insensible for desliming or killed before they are deslimed. I support the infringement penalty of a prosecutable offence.
12	Crabs, rock lobster and crayfish	Insensible before being killed
		I support the proposal that crabs, rock lobster, and crayfish must be insensible before they are killed. I dispute the NAWAC statement that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible and propose that either: a. the only legally acceptable method of rendering crabs and crayfish insensible is by electrical stunning (for which specific equipment is available for use in small restaurant premises). OR

		<p>b. NAWAC conduct a review of the recent (since 2000) scientific literature on humane slaughter of crustaceans and present good quality, recent evidence to support the claim that chilling to <4 degrees Celsius renders crustacean insensible. I support the proposed penalty of a prosecutable offence for failing to render a crustacean insensible prior to slaughter.</p>
13	Goats	Tethering requirements
		<p>I do not support the tethering of goats, on the basis that it stops goats expressing normal social behaviours, and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$500. Furthermore I share concerns with previous submissions around tethering of goats that tourists witnessing tethered goats on the road side could easily get a negative impression of animal welfare in NZ.</p> <p>I propose that all goats, regardless of housing system, have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$500.</p> <p>I also propose that as goats are social animals, all goats should be provided with a companion such as another goat, camelid, horse, donkey or sheep. I propose that failure to house a goat with a companion should attract an infringement penalty of \$300.</p> <p>1. Miranda-de la Lama, G.C. and Mattiello, S. (2010). The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming. Small Ruminant Research 90, (1-3), 1-10</p>
14	Horses	Use of a whip, lead, or any other object
		I support the prohibition of using a whip, lead or other object to strike around the head. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
15	Horses	Injuries from equipment such as halter, head ropes and saddles
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
16	Horses and Donkeys	Tethering requirements
		I do not support the tethering of horses and donkeys and propose that tethering is prohibited with an infringement penalty of \$300. I propose that all horses and donkeys have access to a dry and shaded shelter, appropriate food, and fresh palatable water at all times regardless of housing system and that lack of provision of these requirements is an infringement with a penalty fee of \$300.
17	Layer Hens	Opportunity to express normal behaviours in housing systems
		<p>I believe that colony cages do not adequately consider the welfare of layer hens because they prohibit the ability of the hen to express a range of normal behaviours. In addition, colony cages are not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 as they do not allow owners or persons in charge of animals to take all reasonable steps to ensure that their physical, health and behavioural needs are met.</p> <p>1) Sections 9, 68 Animal Welfare Act 1999</p>
18	Layer Hens	Stocking densities
		Colony cages do not allow hens to engage in a range of normal behaviours and therefore they are in clear breach of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. With a stocking density of 13 hens per square metre or 750 square centimetres, clearly the stocking density is too high.
19	Layer Hens	Housing and equipment design
		Colony cages are only slightly bigger than traditional battery cages. While they provide token welfare gestures like nest boxes, scratch pads and perches, these gestures do not ensure the physical, health and behavioural needs of hens are met. With only 750 sq cm per hen, there are a number of behaviours hens are not able to functionally perform in colony cages; this includes spreading her wings fully. It's also questionable whether a

		<p>hen in a colony cage can properly nest, perch, peck or scratch. A hen in a colony cage cannot dust bathe.</p> <p>Research has shown that some hens in colony cages can be prevented from using the nest provided due to competition from other hens². Also, the limited space in colony cages is insufficient to allow hens sufficient time (on average 45 minutes³) if they want to lay at the same time.</p> <p>In order to satisfy a hen's need for perching, the housing system must be able to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient length of perching space to allow all birds to perch at the same time; and • Sufficient elevation of the perches to satisfy the hens' requirements for a perceived safe perching place at night. <p>Colony cages fulfil neither of these requirements. The standard of approximately 15cm of space per hen is an average and does not allow consideration for larger birds. Perches in colony systems are situated on average just a few centimetres from the floor of the cage. <i>'A perch positioned 5cm above floor level is 'not considered as a perch (by a hen) and has no attractive or repulsive value'.</i></p> <p>Litter is not provided in colony cage systems. Litter is imperative for hen welfare. Hens will make great efforts to access litter for pecking, scratching and dustbathing – three normal behaviours of hens⁴. When hens are unable to forage in litter, they can redirect their pecking towards other hens resulting in harmful feather pecking and even cannibalism. When hens are unable to dustbathe in litter, they can develop the dysfunctional behaviour of sham dustbathing.</p> <p>1) A hen's wingspan is approximately 75-80 centimetres which is twice the size of a traditional battery cage</p> <p>2) Guedson, V. and Faure, J. M. (2004) <i>Laying performance and egg quality in hens kept in standard or furnished cages</i>. Animal Research, 53: 45-57.</p> <p>3) Appleby, M.C. (1998) Modification of laying hen cages to improve behaviour. Poultry Science, 77: 1828-1832.</p> <p>4) Cooper, J.J. and Abletosa, M. J. (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews, 14: 127-149.</p>
20	Layer Hens	Induced moulting
		I support the proposal to prohibit induced moulting of layer hens.
21	Llama and Alpaca	Injuries from equipment such as halters, head ropes, and packs
		I support the proposal to ensure that equipment is used in a manner that does not result in injury or distress. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
22	Llama and Alpaca	Companion animals
		I support the proposal that camelids must be provided with a companion animal. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
23	Llama and Alpaca	Offspring (Cria) camelid companions
		I support the proposal to prohibit raising Cria without the company of other camelids. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
24	Pigs	Dry sleeping area
		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal that all pigs have access to a dry sleeping area.</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.</p>
25	Pigs	Lying space for grower pigs

		<p>Proposal: I support the proposal for minimum space requirements for grower pigs.</p> <p>1. Error in formula</p> <p>The proposed formula used to calculate the minimum space has a type error; specifically the exponent notation has not been applied. I believes the formula intended by MPI should read "live weight^{0.67} (kg)" but instead it reads "live weight 0.67(kg)" which translates to an Area = 0.03 * liveweight * 0.67(kg) and results in a much higher space requirement.</p> <p>Therefore I contend that proposal 25 must be rewritten and resubmitted for public consultation, with the correct formula included so that the intended space requirement can be properly considered.</p> <p>2. Minimum requirement</p> <p>Recent research suggests that a k-value of 0.3 is too low. In 2006, Gonyou et al. (2006) which ADFI is reduced. More recently, a 2015 study has found that a k-value of 0.0336 might underestimate the impact of increased stocking density on ADG and ADFI². A k-value of 0.3 is too low to provide grower pigs with this environment and is sufficient as a minimum requirement for static space only.</p> <p>Does the proposal adequately define the appropriate systems?</p> <p>The proposal is based on a minimum standard, which is expected to occur (if at all) only where growers have reached the capacity of their pen and are shortly to be moved to a bigger pen³ not a minimum standard which is considered acceptable at all times and this should be clarified in the regulation itself.</p> <p>I consider the minimum standards of housing for pigs to be provide "sufficient space to enable them to perform natural behaviours such as lying on their side without touching another pig, standing up, turning around and performing exercise, space for separate areas for dunging and feeding, with a dunging areas situated a sufficient distance from sleeping and feeding areas as well as materials to enable them to root and forage" ⁴. If these standards cannot be met by the current farming systems then we are concerned that the current farming systems are not compatible with the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour and breach the animal welfare act.</p> <p>The current regulation has no limit on the length of time during which a grower pig may be submitted to the proposed minimum standard. Overstocking is a known problem. I am concerned that grower pigs may be submitted to spaces which do not meet minimum requirement if their transfer to a new pen is delayed. I would like the regulations to be clear that it is unacceptable for growers to be kept for prolonged periods in spaces at or close to the minimum requirement. In its 2010 review, NAWAC submitted that space enough to allow for pigs to lie fully recumbent (k-value of 0.047) was recommended best practice.</p> <p>For the sake of clarity and to give effect to the intention of NAWAC, I suggest that a minimum period of time for growers kept in the lower end of the scale be added.</p> <p>Due to the above considerations, I propose that the minimum standard is amended to:</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must have lying space of at least: Area (m2) per pig = 0.040 x live weight 0.67(kg)</p> <p>Grower pigs housed inside on non-litter systems such as slatted or solid floors must not have lying space of less than: Area (m2) per pig = 0.047 x live weight 0.67(kg) for longer than one week.</p> <p>Penalty: I support penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p> <p>Gonyou, H. W., M. C. Brumm, E. Bush, J. Deen, S. A. Edwards, T. Fangman, J. J. McGlone, M. Meunier-Salaun, R. B. Morrison, H. Spoolder, P. L. Sundberg, and A. K. Johnson. 2006. Application of broken-line analysis to assess floor space requirements of nursery and grower-finisher pigs expressed on an allometric basis. J. Anim. Sci. 84: 229-235.</p> <p>Thomas, LL. "The Effects of Increasing Stocking Density on Finishing Pig Growth ..." 2015. http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=kaesrr</p> <p>ibid. Page 9</p> <p>"ANIMAL WELFARE (Pigs) CODE OF WELFARE 2010 REPORT." 2015. 15 May. 2016 <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/1446></p>
26	Pigs	Dry sow stalls
		<p>Proposal: I support the prohibition of dry sow stalls</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of a prosecutable regulation offence.</p>
27	Pigs	Size of farrowing crates

		<p>Proposal: I do not support the use of farrowing crates. Production systems using farrowing crates are not the only financially viable forms of pork production. It is widely accepted that sow welfare in farrowing crates is sub-optimal. Continuing a production system which is contrary to good practice and scientific knowledge is in direct violation of section 10 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. In 2016, a review of Farrowing Crates for Pigs in NZ was submitted by NAWAC. In that report, NAWAC stated that "no significant change in science, technology or good practice from 2010 when the pigs code of welfare was issued". It submitted that the levels of piglet mortality in farrowing pens is higher than in farrowing crates and used this as justification for retaining farrowing crates in New Zealand. However, there is abundant research which supports the conclusion that total piglet mortality on farms with loose farrowing systems does not differ from that of farms with crates^{2,3}. I submit that farrowing crates are unacceptable in modern day pork production systems and must be banned outright.</p> <p>National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee - NZPork." 2016. 15 May. 2016 http://www.nzpork.co.nz/images/custom/farrowing-crate-advice-14-march-2016.pdf</p> <p>ber, R. "Piglet mortality on farms using farrowing systems ... - IngentaConnect." 2007. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ufaw/aw/2007/00000016/00000002/art00042</p> <p>Bride, AL. "A cohort study of preweaning piglet mortality and ... - ScienceDirect." 2012. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167587711003564</p>
28	Pigs	Provision of nesting material
		<p>Proposal: I support the provision of nesting material that can be manipulated to sows. However, it is clear that sows in farrowing crates will be unable to exhibit natural nesting behaviours in the confined space of a farrowing crate. To give effect to the intention of providing nesting material, the sow must be given more space in which to move. I agree that the definition of manipulable material should be made more apparent. "Material at ground level which mimics that of natural nesting material and encourages the sow to exhibit rooting behaviour" would be appropriate. However, for clarity, I recommend that examples are provided for guidance. Appropriate examples would include straw and sawdust.</p> <p>Penalty: I support the proposed infringement penalty of prosecution.</p> <p>Chaloupková, H. "The effect of nesting material on the nest-building and maternal ... - NCBI." 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20889685</p>
29	Rodeos	Fireworks
		<p>I support the ban of fireworks at rodeo's, The loud noise of fireworks is well established as a stressor in companion animals (Bolster 2012; Dale et al., 2010) And Unexpected noise and movement will cause the fight or flight response in both horses and cattle (Lanier, 2000; Christensen, 2005).</p> <p>I would like to see a total ban on rodeo, rodeo is of no advantage to the economy. A petition recently submitted to parliament has 62,000 members of the public in support of such a ban. Rodeo is in breach of the animal welfare act which states that animals should be 'physically handled in a manner which minimises the likelihood of unreasonable or unnecessary pain or distress.' The rodeo is a form of entertainment therefore making it an unnecessary activity for animals to be involved in. The likelihood of animals feeling distress while performing in rodeos could only be successfully minimised if rodeos were entirely stopped; goading animals into states of distress is fundamental to getting them to perform in rodeo events.</p> <p>As there have been many breaches of the rodeo code brought before MPI in 2014 and 2015 we strongly urge MPI to carefully consider if the codes are adequate in helping to minimise the likelihood of unreasonable and unnecessary pain or distress. We are aware of new breaches that will be brought before MPI for a third year running, this adds to the evidence that these codes are not adequate for protecting animals, therefore we feel that the only way to ensure these breaches do not continue is for an outright ban.</p>
30	Exotic animals	Used in circuses

		I do not support the use of exotic animals in circuses and propose that their use be banned. Given that there are currently no circuses in NZ using exotic animals the banning of the practice now will cause no industry disruption. Popular opinion both here and overseas is moving away from the use of exotic animals in circus and if this practice was to occur again in NZ it is likely that there would be a public outcry against it.
31	Cattle	Milk stimulation
		I support the proposal to prohibit the stimulation of milk let down by inserting water or air into a cow's vagina. I propose the prohibition is extended to include the insertion of any object into a cow's vagina to stimulate milk let down. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$300.
32	Cattle and Sheep	Vehicular traction in calving or lambing
		I support the proposal to prohibit the use of a moving vehicle to provide traction in lambing or calving. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
33	Cattle and Sheep	Ingrown horns
		I support the proposal to require treatment for horns that are touching the skin or eye. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
34	Stock transport	Cuts and abrasions
		I support the proposal that transport should not result in cuts or abrasions. I propose the regulation is extended to all animals not just cattle, sheep, deer, goats, and pigs. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
35	Stock transport	Animals with ingrown horns
		I support the proposal that animals with ingrown horns must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
36	Stock transport	Animals with bleeding horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with bleeding horns or antler must not be transported unless certified fit for transport by a veterinarian. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
37	Stock transport	Animals with long horns or antlers
		I support the proposal that animals with long horn or antler must not cause injury to themselves or others during transport. I could not find any rationale for the use of 110mm as a cut off value for long antler either in the code of welfare, or the report on the code. I propose that MPI publish the rationale behind the cut off value of 110mm or perform analysis of the injuries sustained from transport of animals with horns to determine if this measurement is an appropriate guide. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.
38	Stock transport	Lame cattle, deer, pigs and goats
		I support the proposal that cattle, sheep, pigs and goats with lameness scores of 2 must be certified for transport by a veterinarian and that animals with a lameness score of 3 must not be transported. I support the proposed infringement penalty of \$500.

39	Stock transport	Animals that cannot bear weight evenly due to injury
		I support the proposal that animals who cannot bear weight evenly due to injury require certification from a veterinarian for transport. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
40	Stock transport	Pregnant animals
		I support the proposal that animals who are in late stages of pregnancy should not be transported. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
41	Stock transport	Animals with injured or diseased udders
		I support the proposal that animals who have diseased udders should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
42	Stock transport	Cattle or sheep with cancer eye
		I support the proposal that animals who have cancer eye which is large, not confined to the eyelid or discharging/bleeding should not be transported, unless certified by a veterinarian. I propose extending the time frame to not likely to give birth within 48 hours of arrival at slaughter premises. I support the infringement penalty of \$500.
Young calf management regulatory proposals		
43	Young Calves	Loading and unloading facilities
		I support the proposal that facilities must be provided which enable young calves to walk onto and off transportation by their own action. Given the potential for severe injury and pain I propose that the infringement penalty is increased to \$1000.
Proposed	Young Calves	Calves must not be thrown, if they need to be manually lifted they must be placed on the ground so they are able to balance on all four feet or sit in sternal recumbency (or lateral recumbency for sick calves).
		<p>Despite footage from 2015 clearly showing several different people throwing young calves during loading¹, only one individual was prosecuted in relation to the footage², presumably relating to the more severe actions at the slaughterhouse rather than those of the workers loading the trucks. There is clearly a need for simple, easily enforceable, law around wilful mishandling of animals which is not provided for in the current proposals. I propose a regulatory proposal as stated above. I propose the offence to be an infringement with a fine set at \$1000 to reflect both the potential for severe harm from such an act and the need for discouragement from this behaviour.</p> <p>¹http://safe.org.nz/nz-dairy-industry-exposed</p> <p>²http://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/media-releases/mpi-lays-charges-in-bobby-calf-investigation/</p>
Proposed	Young Calves	Minimum training standard for people handling/loading calves
		I propose a minimum training standard is put in place for people loading calves on to transportation. Footage from 2015 clearly shows inappropriate handling of calves at the time of loading ¹ . A regulation for minimum training standards for those loading calves will