BRILL

Society & Animals 19 (2011) 368-382

Society & Animals Journal of Human-Animal Studies
brill.nl/soan

The Use of Animals in New Zealand: Regulation and Practice

Michael C. Morris
Upper Hutt, New Zealand
Michaelcharlesmorris@hotmail.co.nz

Abstract
On the statute books, New Zealand has a strong regulatory system that protects nonhuman animals on farms. Animals are guaranteed the "Five Freedoms," including freedom to express normal patterns of behavior. This theoretically strong protection is weakened considerably, however, through institutional structures and practices. A loophole in the law allowing practices that violate the Five Freedoms in "exceptional circumstances" is used frequently. The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF) is the government agency that administers animal welfare regulation. This agency is also responsible for increasing primary production, and the farming industry has undue influence with MAF. The National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC) is appointed by MAF, and this group is also dominated by industry interests, with a view of animal welfare that excludes behavioral concerns. These factors result in a weakening of welfare requirements. Various solutions to increase protection are proposed, including a requirement that all science and public concerns be taken into account when making decisions on animal welfare and that animal welfare be regulated by an independent government body.

Keywords
factory farming, Five Freedoms, New Zealand, policy

Introduction

The New Zealand regulatory system has been praised by industry advocates, government officials, and animal scientists as being among the best regulated in the world as far as protection of animals is concerned. New Zealand has a reputation for social changes well in advance of its time, with its adoption of universal suffrage and a nuclear-free policy, and the establishment of a cradle-to-grave welfare state. On the statute books, animal welfare legislation appears equally progressive, and it seems reasonable to assume that New Zealand would be one of the most advanced countries in the world when it comes to looking after animals.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2011
DOI: 10.1163/156853011X590024

New Zealand's image as a progressive society suffered serious damage in May 2009, however, after undercover footage revealed the inhumane conditions in a factory piggery.[1] Images of unhappy, scab-marked sows foaming at the mouth, chewing the bars, and generally showing "stereotypical" behavior indicative of extreme stress (Weaver & Morris, 2004) were shown on television over several days, triggering a dip in sales of non-free-range pig products.[2]

The media frenzy over the conditions of pigs was no doubt helped by the fact that a local celebrity, comedian Mike King, was a key player in exposing the conditions on intensive pig farms. But for over 20 years before Mr. King forced the public to come to terms with the reality of animal treatment in New Zealand, activists, lawyers, and animal scientists had been pointing out the failures in a regulatory system that keeps animals in conditions that have been banned or are being phased out in many European countries and US states (Kriek, 2009). The rhetoric of animal protection lauded by government agencies in publications and conferences (e.g., O'Connor & Littin, 2009; Mellor & Bayvel, 2008) contrasts sharply with the reality for many farm animals in New Zealand.

The Regulatory System in New Zealand

Animal welfare in New Zealand is regulated by the Animal Welfare Act (1999). This replaced the Animals Protection Act (1960) and was considered a major step forward in animal welfare legislation (Sankoff, 2005). The Animal Welfare Act changed the emphasis on animal protection so that it adopted a more preventative approach to animal welfare, instead of simply setting out particular crimes against animals (Sankoff, 2005). It also expanded the range of obligations for animal caregivers to correspond to the Five Freedoms of the UK Farm Animal Welfare Council. These are listed in Section 4 of the Animal Welfare Act (1999) as freedom from hunger and thirst, cold and heat, pain and distress, and injury and disease. The fifth freedom is a positive one, and is the "opportunity to display normal patterns of behaviour" (Section 4[c]). The obligation to provide for behavioral needs was not present in the Animals Protection Act, and its inclusion in the Animal Welfare Act has been described as marking a more enlightened view of animal needs (Sankoff, 2005).

The Animal Welfare Act received worldwide attention for its provisions regarding experimentation on nonhuman hominids (e.g., Taylor, 2001). Section 85 allows experiments on nonhuman hominids only if the research is in the best interests of the individual being experimented on, or the individual's species. In fact, the few nonhuman hominids residing in New Zealand are all

in zoos, and there have been no plans to conduct any intrusive experiments on them. The reputation of the Animal Welfare Act therefore appears to be based on protecting a few animals who do not require it. It is far more constructive to look at the way the Act protects the animals who are caused to suffer in New Zealand farms, since this would present a far more realistic indicator of its effectiveness. The flaws in the regulatory system for the use of animals in research, testing, and teaching (covered in Part 6 of the Animal Welfare Act) have already been extensively reviewed (Gerber, 2009; Bourke, 2005; Kedgley, 2004; Morris, 2004), so they will not be covered in detail here.

If the provisions of the Animal Welfare Act were consistently applied to farms, most agricultural practices that are taken for granted would simply not be allowed. This would include intensive farming operations such as battery hen cages, where it is quite apparent that hens cannot "display normal patterns of behaviour." Standard procedures on extensive farms such as tail docking, castration, and dehorning would also be prohibited because of the pain involved (Amey, 2008; Morris & Weaver, 2003).

Codes of Welfare: The Law

In order to continue to allow normal agricultural practices, the Animal Welfare Act contains a provision that those in charge of animals can be protected from prosecution if a Code of Welfare exists for the species of animal or farming type in question (Section 13(2)[c]), even when these practices are inconsistent with the five freedoms stipulated in the Animal Welfare Act.

Codes of Welfare are signed off by the Minister of Agriculture on the advice of the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC), which also supervises the process of formulating Codes of Welfare. Codes of Welfare may allow practices that are inconsistent with the five freedoms stipulated in the Animal Welfare Act and can therefore be used to permit any treatment of animals, no matter how inhumane. Industry advocates and government regulators claim that the Act avoids this by introducing safeguards in the way Codes of Welfare are promulgated (O'Connor & Littin, 2009). These include the requirement that Codes of Welfare must be publicly announced (S.71), and that NAWAC must "have regard to" submissions made by the public on draft codes of welfare before these are amended or signed off by the minister. In addition, NAWAC "may" consult with interested parties before the Code is signed off (S.72). The Code is also supposed to "have regard to good practice and scientific knowledge" (S.73(2)[b]). The Select Committee considering the Animal Welfare Bill in 1999 specifically amended this wording from "current practice" to "good practice" because the committee considered that the older

wording sanctioned existing intensive management practices in poultry and pig production (Roy, 1999).

The most important safeguard is the requirement that Codes of Welfare must comply with the purposes of the Act (S. 71). If applied consistently, this would mean that animals in farms would need to be guaranteed all the Five Freedoms listed in the Animal Welfare Act. However, the Act allows practices that do not meet these freedoms in "exceptional circumstances," which include the "feasibility," "practicality," and "economic effects" of any transition from current to new practices (S.73[4]). This provision could theoretically excuse producers from any obligations to their animals, since it can always be argued that any improvements in animal welfare will result in increasing costs to producers. If this were not so, there would be no need for animal welfare regulation at all, since simple self-interest would ensure that animals are kept in suitable conditions. To prevent a free-for-all, the Select Committee considering the Act made it clear that the Section allowing noncompliance under "exceptional circumstances" could not be used as a general "opt out clause" and they picked out intensive farming of pigs and layer hens for special mention as practices that need to change (Roy, 1999).

Codes of Welfare: The Reality

In theory, the safeguards listed above provide a strong level of protection for farm animals. Animal welfare groups were encouraged by the new provisions for behavioral freedom to launch a campaign when the codes of welfare for pigs and hens were up for review, despite the provisions that allowed otherwise noncomplying activities under "exceptional circumstances." Nine years on, however, there has been little real improvement in the way animals are treated in intensive farms in New Zealand.

One main issue with animal welfare regulation is that the Animal Welfare Act is administered by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF), the government department that is charged with the interests of farmers in increasing productivity and finding overseas markets. MAF officials admit that they see animal welfare primarily as a market access issue (MAF, 2006, 2011). In other words, it seems that for MAF animal welfare is only important when overseas customers are looking (Beatson, 2008). Sankoff (2005) points out that the Animal Welfare Act was actually initiated by farmers, who wanted to protect their image as producers of welfare-friendly animal products, not because of any particular concern over animal welfare.

MAF officials demonstrated their attitude to animal welfare when they commissioned a report (Gregory, 1997) to investigate the possible impact that

the increasing number of vegetarians and demivegetarians in Europe could be having on exports of animal flesh. The author's conclusion makes interesting reading; he warns the industry about the possible damage of the increasing trend toward vegetarianism to export earnings, but rather than recommending that New Zealand diversify its economy to depend less on animal products, or that the country tighten its regulations to ensure higher welfare standards, he simply recommends altering the *image* of the flesh industry.

The Minister of Agriculture, with advice from MAF, appoints all NAWAC members, so it is not surprising to learn that most of them have industry affiliations (MacLennan, 2009). Their industry leanings can be seen in the way they have determined that economic considerations for producers should have an equally important weighting, or even a more important weighting, than the issue of animal suffering. This was evident in a television interview with Peter O'Hara, (then) Chair of NAWAC, shortly after Mike King's exposé of pig farming practices,[3] in which O'Hara's sympathies clearly lay with the producers.

"Consultation"

In spite of the requirement in the Animal Welfare Act that NAWAC take public submissions into account and have the option of consulting with key stakeholders, the reality is that public concerns are generally ignored, and consultation appears to be limited to industry bodies. During the 2002 campaign to change the Codes of Welfare for pigs and layer hens, for example, the Minister of Agriculture received a record 64,000 and 100,000 postcard submissions demanding the abolition of sow stalls and battery hen cages, respectively. A Colmar Brunton poll commissioned by the Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RNZSPCA) at the same time found that 79% and 87% of New Zealanders opposed the use of battery cages and sow stalls, respectively (Dale, 2009). This input from the public was ignored by NAWAC and the Minister of Agriculture, who allowed these practices to continue in the 2004 Codes of Welfare. Peter O'Hara, from NAWAC, later admitted that public desires had no weight with NAWAC, stating that the phrase "have regard to" as described in the Animal Welfare Act (S.73(2)[a]), does not mean "accept" (personal communication, October 19, 2008).

NAWAC did not merely ignore the public in its consultation process but also gave preferential treatment to industry groups. During the consultation for the Layer Hen Code of Welfare for example, the Egg Producers Federation (EPF) obtained extra meetings with both NAWAC and the Minister of Agriculture and made an extra submission. Extra meetings and submissions were denied to groups opposing battery cages (Morris, 2006). Likewise, the

"consultations" for the broiler Code of Welfare were biased strongly in favor of the industry (Morris, 2009; Sankoff, 2005).

"Exceptional circumstances"

Although the Select Committee discussing the bill determined that "exceptional circumstances" should mean just that, Minister Jim Sutton chose to interpret the phrase in a rather novel way. In his evidence to the Regulation Review Committee, which was hearing a challenge to the legality of the Layer Hen Code of Welfare, Sutton defended the use of the "exceptional circumstances" clause because it had been used only rarely. This is an illogical statement and one that has no legal standing in any other context. To use an example from another legal jurisdiction—if I am caught speeding, I may be let off a penalty if I can prove I had to travel to an emergency, and so there are "exceptional circumstances." It would be illogical to assert that I should be allowed to claim "exceptional circumstances" simply because nobody had done so yet.

"Science based"

Animal welfare science is a complex subject, as it involves reducing something that is not readily amenable to scientific study (the personal feelings of an animal) to something that can be measured. Because of this difficulty, the scientific community once considered it somehow "unscientific" to observe animal behavior and make any inferences about how animals are feeling. Although this "behaviorist" view is losing credibility in the face of new evidence for animal consciousness, it still has currency among agricultural scientists (Rollin, 1998, 2009).

Among ethologists and animal welfare specialists it is increasingly being recognized that animal behavior can provide an objective way of determining the presence of self-consciousness and feeling in animals. At its simplest level, the scientific rationale for this connection between behavior and subjective feelings is the argument from analogy. If animals behave in ways similar to a conscious human, then the most parsimonious explanation is to infer consciousness in the animal (Helton, 2009; Dawkins, 1993). From here, some might argue, it is a simple step to infer that observation of animal behavior can allow the same insights into their feelings as corresponding observations of human behavior (e.g., Bekoff, 2009; Balcombe, 2007).

Animal welfare scientists reviewing the welfare of pigs (SVC, 1997), layer hens (SVC, 1996), and broiler chickens (SCAHAW, 2000) for the European Commission acknowledged the appropriateness of behavioral observations

and experiments as indicators of animals' welfare. In their reviews, they cite considered behavioral evidence, along with anatomical and physiological indicators of welfare.

In contrast, NAWAC is still strongly influenced by behaviorism when making its decisions on confinement. In its report on the layer hen Code of Welfare (Mellor, 2004), NAWAC paid undue attention to a behaviorist study reviewing hen welfare strictly on the basis of physiological indicators (Barnett & Hemsworth, 2003) and paid little heed to behavioral indicators indicative of poor welfare such as "vacuum nesting" or "willingness to work" experiments that have shown just how hard hens are prepared to work for enriched living conditions (Morris, 2006).

NAWAC and the Minister of Agriculture have also resorted to using studies whose motivation, competence, and even existence are in question. For example, in a response to a query from members of his own political party, Minister Jim Sutton cited a non-peer-reviewed paper (Krawczyk & Wezyk, 2002) in defense of his position. This paper was later reviewed by three world experts in poultry welfare, who all criticized its sloppy methodology (Morris, 2006). MAF also relied on an alleged study by an industrial veterinarian who supposedly conducted a survey of egg producers in New Zealand. The largest free-range egg producer in the country was not approached, however, and the veterinarian refused to publish his raw results. Later, an Official Information Act request revealed that MAF had not even asked for the results, so the existence of this survey is in doubt (Morris, 2006).

One of the excuses used for continuing with intensive production, even as Europe and the United States are moving away from it, is that no New Zealand research has been conducted in this area. The implication seems to be that standard breeds of animals, kept in standardized conditions, would somehow behave differently simply because they are on New Zealand soil. Research on both broilers and layer hens in New Zealand have now been commissioned, but the studies show bias in selection of data and interpretation of results.

For example, the authors of a recent layer hen report (Black & Christensen, 2009) examined the amount of "stress hormone" (cortisterone) in the feces of hens who had been kept in battery cages and free-range conditions. They also counted mortality and monitored fear responses. Mortality rates were higher in the free-range farms, and they found no significant difference in cortisterone levels or fear response. There were several flaws in the methodology, however, some of which were even identified by a nonscientist who made a blistering attack on the motives of the researchers and their backers from MAF and the EPF (Clifton, 2009). One difficulty was with the technique of fecal

cortisterone measurement, which was measuring the wrong variable. Hens in battery cages are more likely to be suffering from boredom than from stress. The similarity in fear response merely shows that the hens in the battery cages had gotten used to their environment but cannot have any bearing on whether the hens found it enjoyable. The researchers did not measure willingness to work, or the presence of stereotype behaviors, both of which are standard methods for providing indictors for hen welfare (Appleby, Mench, & Hughes, 2004; Duncan, 2002; Dawkins, 1993). Furthermore, cage-layer osteoporosis is a major welfare problem in battery cages but is rare in nonbattery systems (A. Webster, 2004), and the Black and Christensen (2009) study made no attempt to monitor this condition.

The Black and Christensen (2009) study also raises questions about how the farms in the study were selected. Battery farms are largely self-selected, in that the operators have to give permission for the researchers to come into the operation, and it is likely that only the better-run ones would do this (Temple & Foster, 1992). The largest free-range producer was not approached, even though this producer has high welfare standards, including a requirement for low mortality rate and no beak trimming.[4] The free-range farms chosen for the study were run by battery farmers, who would be less experienced at free-range husbandry and who would likely be thinking in the battery mind-set.[5]

A study on broiler production (Bagshaw, Matthews, & Rogers, 2006) was also recently commissioned by MAF, and in this case the methodology was far more rigorous, though the interpretation was suspect. Among other factors, the authors examined lameness in New Zealand broilers, using a scoring system that had already been published. There is no shortage of experimental evidence, based on behavioral indicators, self-medication with painkillers, and the performance of birds in a maze, that birds with a lameness score of 3 or above (visible lameness) are in pain (reviewed by Morris, 2009). Bagshaw et al. (2006) found that over 40% of heavier broilers in New Zealand were visibly lame. This compares with scores of 3-30% in European studies (SCAHAW, 2000). Bagshaw et al. (2006) tried to cover up these unwelcome results by attempting to discredit earlier pain studies on lameness. Remarkably, they made the claim that bird health in New Zealand was better than in Europe (Morris, 2009), and this was echoed in a press release from MAF, summarizing the research:

> These results show that leg health of New Zealand broilers is better than birds in the UK, Denmark and Sweden and that overall the welfare of our commercial birds is world class. (MAF press release, June 19, 2006)

Industry Influence

Government officials and those commissioned to conduct research for them are generally not unintelligent, and a great many of them have had scientific and legal training, so they should be familiar with the standard of evidence required for statements on animal welfare to be plausible. They should also be responsible enough not to base policy on speculative assumptions. It is therefore surprising that peer-reviewed scientific papers by experts in the field are ignored in favor of anecdotal reports, sloppy scientific practices, and nonexistent surveys. It is surprising, that is, until one realizes the immense behind-the-scenes influence that the agricultural industry has on political decision making.

New Zealand scored first on Transparency International's corruption perception index for 2009,[6] so overt corruption is rare in New Zealand. All this means, however, is that manipulation of the government is more subtle. Hager and Burton (1999) made this point in their exposé of corrupt practices by a government-owned timber company, arguing that that manipulation of public opinion through such tactics as disproportionate lobbying, phony grassroots groups, and infiltration of activist organizations is more common in democracies than dictatorships, where more direct forms of persuasion can be employed.

The battery egg, pork, and broiler industries have influenced policy makers through a subtle interplay of diplomacy, threats, and flattery. Perry Spiller (2004), for example, examined the EPF's accounts and estimates that it had spent around NZ$500,000 lobbying the government to keep battery cages, a sum far above the budget of anyone opposing them. The EPF used legal threats to prevent NAWAC from changing the code on layer hens and phasing out battery cages, at a time when it looked as if NAWAC might do so. The threat of a judicial review from a high-powered lawyer quickly caused the committee to change its mind (Morris, 2006). The gist of this threat was that the EPF "owns" the code, and this could not be changed without industry approval. This goes against the intent of the Animal Welfare Act, whereby codes are supposedly signed off by the minister, and it also contradicts an earlier press release by the EPF in which it states that the code was developed by NAWAC.

The Pork Board used more subtle but equally effective ways of influencing the government to change regulations in its favor. This occurred after a group of activists raided a farm belonging to Colin Kay at Kuku Beach Road in Levin (the same operation later exposed by Mike King, in 2009). The activists shot video footage of the piggery, while taking careful measurements of the stalls. They found that many of the stalls were narrower even than the 60 cm allowed

by the Code of Welfare. The stalls were, in effect, illegal. The activists made an official complaint to MAF, and the video footage of the piggery was presented on a television current affairs show (Campbell, 2006).

MAF launched its own investigation and confirmed the activists' findings. This looked like an open-and-shut case. There was a clear violation of a Code of Welfare. The operator was a top member of the Pork Board and could not claim ignorance. However, the Pork Board, concerned that a prosecution could threaten other producers who were also noncompliant, pulled out all the stops in preventing a prosecution. It did this first by casting doubt on the intent behind the pig Code of Welfare. The Pork Board insisted that the requirement for a space of 60 cm × 200 cm in a sow stall did not really mean what anyone of normal intelligence and sanity would think it means. Most people, and certainly everyone making submissions on the code, would have been under the impression that it means the "clear space"—i.e., the amount of space between the bars of the stall, since this is the actual space a sow has to move around in. However, the Pork Board insisted that the allowable space refers to what they call "centre to centre" measurement and that the 60 cm therefore includes the width of one of the bars of the cage. This is quite nonsensical, as it has no biological significance. MAF officials I spoke to in 2006 clearly appeared to have little respect for the "centre to centre" argument at the time. However, after MAF officials accepted a lunch of coffee and sandwiches provided by the Pork Board on July 20, 2006, they changed their opinion and allowed the narrower stalls to be used.[7]

Possible Solutions

Manipulation of government officials in New Zealand may be more subtle than in many overseas countries, but it is nonetheless just as effective. The Wellington luncheon dates, the insistence in job advertisements for public servants that applicants have "established networks," the expensive conferences sponsored by industry groups and to which public servants are invited, and the fostering of relationships between industry and those guarding ministers' diaries are just as effective as the open checkbook. Similarly, threats wrapped up in so much legal verbiage that it takes special training in law even to realize they are threats, are just as effective as masked thugs with coshes, and horses' heads at the foot of beds.

The first step toward resolving such subtle manipulation is a realization that such corruption exists. Education of the public in government processes and encouragement for them to get personally involved in the animal welfare

debate are important first steps. The support of high-profile celebrities like quintessential "kiwi bloke" comedian Mike King has been invaluable in this respect, in raising awareness of the issue.

Other considerations that have been discussed previously (Morris, 2006, 2009) include a need to take all science into account when making policy deliberations, incorporating peer-reviewed systematic reviews. The law also needs redrafting to ensure that public submissions are given fair weighting. NAWAC guideline 07 states that

> shifts do not represent capricious surges in public sentiment; rather, they are well-established changes in thinking adopted both among animal-using stakeholders and generally within our society, with a timescale for change of one to two decades or more.[8]

In other words, the public is believed to be ignorant, emotional, and fickle and to have very little understanding of animal welfare.

Supposed support for this view comes from the history of science, where commonsense beliefs about physics and the sun going round the Earth were found to be wrong (Rollin, 1998). However, unlike physics or astronomy, which require specialized study to master, reading the emotions and feelings of other sentient beings is part of general emotional intelligence, and a necessary evolutionary adaptation in a social species such as *Homo sapiens.* Animal welfare scientist Ian Duncan (2002) comments on how commonsense notions of animal welfare show a strong agreement with "scientific" findings using recognized methodologies. Certainly commonsense views about the inhumane nature of sow stalls, farrowing crates, and battery cages have been backed up by the SVC (1996, 1997) and SCAHAW (2000) reports. The wording of the law therefore needs to be changed so that it must "recognise and provide for" public concerns, and not just "have regard for" them.

Arguably, the most important reform would be to set up a body responsible for animal welfare that is separate from the Ministry of Agriculture, as this ministry is also charged with market access for agricultural produce and with increasing agricultural productivity. There is a clear conflict of interest between these aims, and this is demonstrated in a number of ways, including the weighting of NAWAC toward industry and veterinary interests[9] (MacLennan, 2009); the favorable way industry groups are treated by NAWAC and the Minister and the Ministry of Agriculture; the selective and suspect scientific advice given by ministry officials; and misleading press releases on animal welfare standards. Conflicts of interest are also clearly seen in the regulation of the use of animals for research, science, and teaching (Bourke, 2005; Morris, 2004).

An independent Ministry for Animal Welfare with responsibilities only for animal welfare and that appoints NAWAC would be less likely to show such inherent bias. Alternatively, a truly independent Commissioner for Animal Welfare, reporting to Parliament and not the executive government may be another solution. New Zealanders are used to this kind of government structure, since the Commissioner for the Environment, the Commissioner for Children, and the Families Commission are already set up in this way.

Conclusion

New Zealand's reputation for enlightened social reform exists more as a marketing tool than a reality when it comes to the treatment of animals. This report has focused on intensive "factory" farming systems, because these are arguably the worst examples of inhumane treatment, in terms of both the numbers of animals suffering and the severity of their suffering (J. Webster, 2004). The poor treatment is also inherent in a system that crams animals into small spaces or genetically manipulates them to be top-heavy and prone to lameness, and it is not just an issue of management, as it is in much extensive farming.

New Zealand is a long way behind much of the developed world when it comes to decent treatment of animals. Sow stalls, for example, have been banned in Sweden, Finland, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom (Mellor, 2002). They are currently being phased out in the US states of Florida (amendment to constitution, 2002), Arizona (Humane Treatment of Animals Act, 2006), Oregon (Senate Bill 694, 2007), and California (Ballot Initiative 2008). Hen cages (including enriched cages) have been banned in Switzerland since 1990 and have recently been banned in Austria after an intensive campaign (Balluch, 2009). Battery cages are also banned in Sweden, though enriched cages are allowed. Germany will be banning all cages (including enriched) from 2012 on. The rest of the European Commission will be battery cage-free by 2012, though enriched cages will still be allowed (Council Directive 1999/74/EC). Belgium has announced an intention to ban enriched cages by 2025.[10] In contrast, battery cages and farrowing crates are in use indefinitely in New Zealand, though in December 2010, the new *Code of Welfare* stipulated that sow stalls are to be phased out by 2015.

New Zealand has a reputation for social reform in the area of human welfare, so in a way it is surprising that animals continue to be treated so badly. New Zealanders certainly do not appear to be any more inhumane in general than other Western cultures. Much of the reason why animal welfare has not been a top priority for successive New Zealand governments would have to be the disproportionate power of the agricultural industries in influencing

government policy. Curtailing this influence and allowing other voices to have a say in the democratic process would be an important first step toward decent treatment of animals.

Notes

1. See Owens & Sinclair, 2009a.
2. Summaries and links to media presentations can be found on the SAFE website (www.lovepigs.org.nz). Kriek (2009) also summarizes the recent pig campaign. More recent footage was aired by Television New Zealand's *Close up* on July 23, 2010.
3. See Owens & Sinclair, 2009b. When asked whether pigs are happy in stalls, O'Hara replied, "There is no reason to think they're not."
4. See company profile of FRENZ (Free Range Eggs New Zealand) at www.frenzs.co.nz/.
5. During the tender process that was eventually won by Black and Christensen (2009), all researchers had to have their project approved by the EPF, so a bias in methodology to support conclusions the industry wants to hear is not particularly surprising.
6. http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2009/cpi_2009_table.
7. See questions for written answer from Tariana Turia, MP, to the Minister of Agriculture, November 20, 2006, available at http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/PB/Business/QWA/.
8. See http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/animal-welfare/nawac/policies/guideline07.htm (accessed May 2011).
9. Veterinarians would be expected to have an interest in preventing animal suffering, but veterinary associations often lag behind the general public in supporting an end to such practices as sow stalls and battery cages. Knight (2009) considers that this is due in a large part to the training they receive at veterinary colleges.
10. *World Poultry News*, August 14, 2009. Available at http://www.worldpoultry.net/news/belgium-to-ban-all-cages-for-egg-production-4218.html.

References

Amey, C. (2008). *Clean, green and cruelty free? The true story of animals in New Zealand.* Wellington: Rebel Press.

Appleby, M. C., Mench, J. A., & Hughes, B. O. (2004). *Poultry behaviour and welfare.* Wallingford: CABI Publishing.

Bagshaw, C. S., Matthews, L. R., & Rogers, A. (2006). *Key indicators of poultry welfare in New Zealand*. Wellington: Unpublished client report on MAF policy.

Balcombe, J. (2007). *Pleasurable kingdom: Animals and the nature of feeling good.* London: MacMillan.

Balluch, M. (2009). The ban on battery hen farming in Austria. Paper presented at the National Animal Rights Conference, Auckland, March 28-29, 2009.

Barnett, J. L., & Hemsworth, P. H. (2003). Science and its application in assessing the welfare of laying hens in the egg industry. *Australian Veterinary Journal, 81*(10), 615-624.

Beatson, P. (2008). Falls the shadow: The animal welfare debate in New Zealand. Oral presentation to the New Zealand Law Commission, August 28, 2008.

Bekoff, M. (2009). Minding Animals, a compassionate footprint. Keynote address, Proceedings of the Minding Animals Conference, Newcastle NSW.

Black, H., & Christensen, N. (2009). *CO206/2006. Comparative assessment of layer hen welfare in New Zealand—final report.* Wellington: AsureQuality and Avivet.

Bourke, D. (2005). The regulation of animal use for research, testing and teaching purposes under part 6 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. Unpublished LLM thesis, University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Campbell, J. (Executive Producer). (2006, June 22). *Campbell Live* [Television broadcast]. Auckland: TV3.

Clifton, J. (2009, May 30-June 5). Aporkalypse now. *New Zealand Listener, 3603*, pp. 5-6.

Dale, A. (2009). *Animal Welfare Codes and Regulations*—the devil in disguise? In P. Sankoff and S. White (Eds.), Animal law in Australasia: A new dialogue (pp. 174-211). Anandale, NSW: The Federation Press.

Dawkins, M. (1993). *Through our eyes only? The search for animal consciousness.* Oxford: W. H. Freeman/Spektrum.

Duncan, I. J. H. (2002). Poultry welfare: Science or subjectivity? *British Poultry Science, 43*(5), 643-652.

Gerber, P. (2009). Scientific experimentation on animals: Are Australia and New Zealand implementing the 3Rs? In P. Sankoff & S. White (Eds.), *Animal law in Australasia: A new dialogue* (pp. 225-242). Anandale, NSW: The Federation Press.

Gregory, N. G. (1997). *Meat, meat eating and vegetarianism: A review of the facts.* Wellington: MAF Policy Technical Paper.

Hager, N., & Burton, B. (1999). *Secrets and lies: The anatomy of an anti-environmental campaign*. Nelson: Craig Potton Publishing.

Helton, W. (2009). Evidence of animal consciousness in recent cognitive science research: Automaticity and attention. Proceedings of the Minding Animals Conference, Newcastle NSW.

Kedgley, S. (2004). Lifting the veil of secrecy surrounding animal experimentation. Proceedings of the ANZCCART conference, Christchurch, August 2003. Wellington: ANZCCART.

Knight, A. (2009). Advancing animal welfare standards within the veterinary profession. Proceedings of the Minding Animals Conference, Newcastle NSW.

Krawczyk, J., & Wezyk, S. (2002). Effect of housing system on performance of commercial hybrids of tetra SL and Shaver layers. *Annals of Animal Science, 2*(2), 181-190.

Kriek, H. (2009). *Mainstreaming animal rights: Campaigning for animals rights in an animal welfare world*. Proceedings of the Minding Animals Conference, Newcastle, NSW.

MacLennan, C. (2009, August). The business of cruelty. *Werewolf 3*. Retrieved August 2009, from www.werewolf.co.nz.

MAF (Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry). (2006). *Research in progress: 2005/2006 operational research objectives.* Wellington: MAF Policy Information Paper 06/02.

—— (2011). *Statement of intent 2011/2014.* Wellington: Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Mellor, D. J. (2003). *Animal welfare (broilers chickens: fully housed) code of welfare 2002 report.* Wellington: Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

—— (2004). *Animal welfare (layer hens) code of welfare 2004 report.* Wellington: Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

Mellor, D. J., & Bayvel, A. C. D. (2008). New Zealand's inclusive science-based system for setting animal welfare standards. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 113*(4), 313-329.

Morris, M. C. (2004). Animal experimentation in New Zealand: The three "buts." Paper presented at the ANZCCART conference, Christchurch, August 2003.

—— (2006). The ethics and politics of the layer hen debate in New Zealand. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics, 19*(5), 495-514.

—— (2009). The ethics and politics of animal welfare in New Zealand: Broiler chicken production as a case study. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics, 22*(1), 15-30.

Morris, M. C., & Weaver, S. A. (2003). Minimising harm in agricultural animal experiments in New Zealand. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics, 16*(5), 421-437.

O'Connor, C., & Littin, K. (2009). New Zealand animal welfare standards. Proceedings of the Minding Animals Conference, Newcastle, NSW.

Owens, D. (Producer), & Sinclair, I. (Reporter). (2009a, May 17). Comic tackles pig welfare. *Sunday* [Television broadcast]. Auckland: Television New Zealand.

—— (2009b, May 24). If pigs could talk. *Sunday* [Television broadcast]. Auckland: Television New Zealand.

Rollin, B. E. (1998). *The unheeded cry: Animal consciousness, animal pain and science* (expanded edition). Ames: Iowa State University Press.

—— (2009). Science and ethics: Overcoming ideology. Proceedings of the Minding Animals Conference, Newcastle NSW.

Roy, E. (1999). *House of Representatives Primary Production Committee report on the Animal Welfare Bill.* Wellington: House of Representatives.

Sankoff, P. (2005). Five years of the "new" animal welfare regime: Lessons learned from New Zealand's decision to modernize its animal welfare legislation. *Animal Law, 1*, 7-38.

SCAHAW (Scientific Committee of Animal Health and Animal Welfare). (2000). *The welfare of chickens kept for meat production (broilers).* Brussels: European Commission.

Spiller, P. (2004). RIP—the demise of free range eggs. *Organic New Zealand, 63*(5), 26-28.

SVC (Scientific Veterinary Committee). (1996). *Report on the welfare of laying hens.* Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, Directorate-General for Agriculture.

—— (1997). *The welfare of intensively kept pigs.* Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, Directorate-General for Agriculture.

Taylor, R. (2001). A step at a time: New Zealand's progress towards hominid rights. *Animal Law, 7*, 35-43.

Temple, W., & Foster, T. M. (1992). The welfare status of egg production in New Zealand. *Proceedings of the New Zealand Society of Animal Production, 53*, 215-219.

Weaver, S. A., & Morris, M. C. (2004). Science, pigs and politics: A New Zealand perspective on the banning of sow stalls. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics, 17*(1), 51-66.

Webster, A. B. (2004). Welfare implications of avian osteoporosis. *Poultry Science 83*(2), 184-192.

Webster, J. (2004). *Animal welfare: A cool eye towards Eden.* Oxford: Blackwell.