1 Introduction

‘If a man aspires towards a righteous life, his first act of abstinence is from injury to animals.’

In Australia, there are a number of farming methods used in the production of pigs. One such method is intensive pig farming. It is by far the most popular method for farmers due to its profitability and the low cost of required resources. For sentient, smart animals such as pigs, however, this mode of farming results in a dismal existence filled with pain and suffering. Breeding pigs remain segregated from each other and spend most of their lives pregnant and confined to cramped stalls. Pigs bred for meat are separated from their mothers early in their lives and are subjected to cruel and painful husbandry practices before being prematurely slaughtered. Animal welfare legislation does little to protect pigs from these practices and consumers, for the most part, remain blissfully unaware of how the industry operates. This
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paper will assess the ramifications of intensive farming for pigs, identify the legislative roles the Commonwealth, States and Territories play in the pig industry, and examine how the industry itself supports and condones cruel and inhumane practices.

2 A Pig’s Natural Life

Pigs are known to be highly intelligent, sentient creatures with “feelings that matter”. In their natural environment, pigs are active and like to spend their time wallowing, ‘rooting’ around in soil, smelling and foraging with their snouts. Pigs are extremely sociable animals and are capable of forming strong bonds, not only with each other but also with other species. They communicate with each other continuously and thrive on bodily contact, particularly when resting together. As Ingrid Newkirk from PETA so aptly stated, ‘[i]n their capacity to feel fear, pain, hunger, and thirst, a pig is a dog is a bear is a boy’.

Pregnant sows are known to build nests in preparation for the impending birth. They choose clean, dry sites away from their group, and will gather materials such as grass and straw to line their nests. A sow is very defensive of her young but will encourage them to leave the nest and socialise with other pigs once they are 5-10 days old.

Piglets are energetic, playful and curious animals. They learn to recognise their mother’s voice and she is known to sing to her litter whilst nursing them. Even after weaning occurs at around three months, the young pigs continue to live close to their mother and siblings. They gather natural materials to sleep on and are generally clean animals, preferring to keep their sleeping, eating and dunging areas separate.
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3 History of the Australian Pig Industry

Farming in Australia once consisted of ‘Old MacDonald’ family farms and backyard producers.\(^8\) Following World War II, intensive animal farming was introduced in response to the economic climate and consumer demand for inexpensive meat.\(^9\) The primary aim of factory farming was to produce the maximum amount of animal flesh or products in the most cost-effective way, using as few resources as possible.\(^10\)

Between 1970 and 2003, over 94% of small family pig farmers left the industry, despite production volume increasing 130%.\(^11\) Today, over 90% of farmed pigs in Australia are raised intensively in foreign-owned ‘factory’ facilities.\(^12\) Farmed pigs are either used for breeding purposes or are raised for meat production. In the last financial year, it is estimated that 4.75 million pigs were slaughtered for human consumption, which equates to 355,000 tonnes of pig meat.\(^13\) In addition, 260,000 sows were current kept for breeding purposes.\(^14\)

4 Conditions on Factory Farms

Pigs that are farmed intensively are generally housed in large ventilated, temperature-controlled buildings or barns. These warehouse-like structures are artificially lit and are continually monitored, thereby increasing productivity and purportedly resulting in fewer fatalities.\(^15\)

The majority of pregnant sows in Australia spend most of their reproductive lives in ‘sow stalls’. Sow stalls were introduced into Australia in 1962 to maximise the number of sows that could be housed in one area and to minimise labour and animal management costs.\(^16\) It is
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also believed to lessen the likelihood of fighting amongst sows. The stalls consist of a cage made of steel bars with a concrete and/or slatted floor. The size of a stall is approximately 0.6 metres x 2.2 metres, barely large enough to house the body of a pregnant pig. The space is so confined that there is no opportunity for the sows to turn around or move more than a step forward or back.

In Australia, 95% of sows are transferred to a farrowing crate, a smaller version of a sow stall, within a week prior to giving birth. This is purportedly done in order to prevent piglets from being crushed or trampled by their mother. Whilst confined to these crates, sows are unable to move and can only eat, drink and defecate. They are positioned in such a way that their litter are able to suckle through the steel bars. After three to four weeks, the piglets are prematurely removed from their mother, which is some months prior to when natural weaning ordinarily takes place. The process then begins again, with artificial insemination, or mating, of the sow and a return to the 'sow stall' for the majority of her 16 week pregnancy. Whilst pigs are known to survive up to 15 years of age in a natural setting, female breeding pigs barely live past two or three years, and are generally slaughtered due to injury or when deemed to no longer be productive or profitable.

For the piglets born into factory farms, life begins with their birth on a concrete or slatted floor. Contact with their mother is vastly restricted by steel bars. They are subjected to a rapid weaning process and also undergo tail docking, castration and teeth clipping at an early age, procedures which are generally conducted without veterinary intervention, anaesthesia or pain relief.
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The short lives of young pigs comprises of moving from weaner pens to grower pens, and finally into finisher pens. They are fed a specialised diet of mainly grains, with added hormones or antibiotics. At around 14 to 16 weeks of age, they are then sold for slaughter as ‘porkers’ or ‘baconers’/‘finishers’, depending on their weight.

5 Legal Framework

5.1 Animal Welfare Legislation

Anti-cruelty legislation can be traced back to 1837, when it was first enacted in Van Diemen's Land, with New South Wales following in 1850. Other colonies introduced similar legislation in the 1860s. Historically, the Australian Constitution has not played a major role in animal welfare matters. Currently, Federal laws in relation to animals are limited to the direct regulation of the live export of farmed animals industry and the wildlife trade, and it is the States and Territories that are largely responsible for animal welfare legislation.

Ostensibly, animal welfare legislation protects all animals from ‘unreasonable, unjustifiable or unnecessary suffering’ and provides for criminal offences against cruel treatment. However, farmed animals are generally not shielded under State and Territory Acts. The origin of this anomaly can be traced back to the early 20th century when the Australian economy relied heavily on the rural industry. The States were granted ‘substantial concessions’ and began exempting certain farming practices from animal welfare legislation, including dehorning of cattle, castration, branding etc. In the 1970s and 1980s, this widened
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to include a complete exemption for all farming practices. Today, a considerable number of those exemptions are still applicable.\(^{33}\)

Effective legislative protection is also denied farm animals because they are distinguished from other species and are classified instead as ‘stock’ or ‘livestock’.\(^{34}\) The legislation, therefore, affords animal species (other than farm animals) recognition that they are sentient beings with their own interests, whilst completely disregarding the needs of farmed animals and relegating them to ‘property status’ and a life based solely on their economic profitability.\(^{35}\)

Legislation, such as *Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979* (NSW), further illustrates this point; section 24(1) sanctions cruel practices on a ‘stock animal’, including branding and castrating, which would otherwise be classed as an offence if performed on other animal species.

5.2 Model Codes of Practice

Currently in Australia, the policy framework relating to the farming of animals is found in the Commonwealth Model Codes of Practice (MCOP).\(^{36}\) A MCOP is a set of standards, guidelines and recommended practices which relate to the treatment of farmed animals. The Commonwealth coordinates the development of the codes through the Primary Industries Ministerial Council (PIMC), which comprises Federal, State/Territory and New Zealand primary industry ministers. Their stated objective is ‘[t]o develop and promote sustainable, innovative and profitable agriculture, fisheries/aquaculture, food and forestry industries’.\(^{37}\) Remarkably, the objective is devoid of any animal welfare goal.
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33 Steven White, above n 28, 350.
34 For example, an “animal” is defined in section 4 of *Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979* (NSW) as a member of a vertebrate species which includes amphibians, birds, fish, mammals (other than a human being), reptiles, or crustaceans at an eating place. A “stock animal” includes cattle, horses, sheep, goats, deer, pigs and poultry.
35 Katrina Sharman, above n 7, 75-76.
36 Steven White, above n 28, 350. There are currently 22 MCOP, a list of which can be found at <http://www.publish.csiro.au/nid/22/sid/11.htm>.
Basically, MCOPs set minimum standards for the welfare of agricultural animals, including accommodation, food/water requirements, and husbandry practices. The process for developing and drafting the content of the codes is dominated by industry interests; animal welfare representatives are typically outnumbered. Government officials may not necessarily possess the required expertise and rely on industry representatives when developing the codes. This allows for a perpetuation of practices which are based entirely on economic and profitability grounds, with minimal protection being afforded to farmed animals.

For a MCOP to be legally binding, it must be adopted by the States and Territories into their animal welfare legislation. The PIMC has allowed for modification of the codes, with the outcome being a lack of uniformity in their implementation by the various jurisdictions. Some States have directly adopted MCOPs; others have revised them before incorporating them into regulations. Generally, compliance is voluntary but most jurisdictions provide an exemption from prosecution where there has been compliance with the relevant codes of practice. This allows for a continuation of practices which would otherwise fall within the scope of cruelty offences.

5.2.1 The Pig Code

In 1983, the first Commonwealth Model Code of Practice for the Welfare of Animals - Pigs (the Pig Code), was issued. The code is currently in its third edition, with its latest review in 2006 resulting in a number of key amendments.

As of 2012, the size of sow stalls and farrowing crates has been increased, but this only applies to new housing instalments. From 2017, sows stalls are still permitted for the first six weeks of pregnancy, despite sow crates being banned or phased out in the UK, Sweden, Finland, Holland and six states of the USA. Whilst the use of farrowing crates is also still permitted, confinement is restricted to no longer than a period of six weeks. These changes
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have since passed into law in NSW, South Australia, Queensland, Victoria and Western Australia.\(^{42}\)

Despite declaring that sow stalls would be prohibited in Tasmania, the Government has since reneged on this commitment.\(^{43}\) From July 2013, Tasmania now allows for sows to be confined in stalls for up to 10 days after mating, and up to 42 days in farrowing crates.\(^{44}\)

### 5.3 Australian Animal Welfare Strategy

In 2005, the Australian Animal Welfare Strategy (AAWS) was developed by the Commonwealth Government in order to create ‘a more consistent and effective animal welfare system’.\(^{45}\) Its purpose was to standardise relevant State and Territory animal protection laws and establish a regulatory framework that could be endorsed by all States and Territories and replace the existing codes of practice.\(^{46}\)

However, the AAWS has been criticised for endorsing current codes of practice and for not analysing if the standards were sufficient to protect animals. This is particularly the case with the exemptions or defences created by the codes of practice – they were not even part of the review. Furthermore, Animal Health Australia was assigned to develop the Standards and Guidelines. That panel consisted of Federal and State departments of agriculture, who were considered to be ‘standard bearers of producer interest’. This, therefore, purportedly created an obvious conflict of interest.\(^{47}\)

Whilst the AAWS has the potential to coordinate a national approach to animal welfare, the strategy is now in some doubt - the Coalition government has recently dissolved its Advisory Committee. Whilst the Agriculture Minister, Barnaby Joyce, assured the public that ‘this does
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not mean the Government is not concerned about improving animal welfare’, he advised
there would be a freeze on all new programs and that responsibility for the AAWS would be
taken over by the Department of Agriculture.48

6 Pig welfare issues

In order to assess the welfare of an animal, one must observe how it copes in its
environment. For active, sentient, social creatures such as pigs, confinement to small areas,
coupled with an inability to express normal behaviour, can be manifested by poor health and
behavioural issues.49

6.1 Sow stalls

APL has consistently maintained that keeping sows in stalls is good for the welfare of the
pregnant sow: it allows for individual feeding, thereby minimising fighting amongst the pigs,
and sows get individual attention which would not otherwise be possible if the pigs were
group housed. APL also contends that science shows that confining sows to stalls reduces
the likelihood of injuries.50

Studies have shown that pigs raised in natural or free-range conditions socially interact with
each other and aggression between sows is rarely an issue. Where pigs are housed in
groups, inter-sow aggression can occur where there is simultaneous access to food, or where
pigs, unfamiliar with each other, are confined to a small area. Contrary to APLs claims, inter-
sow aggression still occurs in sow stalls and is a considerable source of stress because the
aggression remains unresolved.51

Where a pig raised in a natural environment would spend a considerable amount of time
foraging, sow stalls force them into a life of inactivity. This culminates in stereotypies;
repetitive, unvarying behaviour patterns which have no real function. It is believed that
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welfare/housing>.
stereotypies, such as chain and bar biting, sham-chewing, nosing, tongue rolling and attempting to root the concrete, affect more than 90% of sows in stalls and are an inevitable result of stress, frustration and depression. The behaviours are less common amongst group-housed pigs and are a rare occurrence for pigs living in a natural or free-range environment.\textsuperscript{52}

Despite APL assertions, the health of sows is severely compromised by stall confinement. The lack of activity and the continual standing and lying on concrete floors is known to cause a reduction in muscle mass and bone strength, rendering pigs with damaged joints and lameness. They can suffer physical injuries from stereotypic behaviour, in addition to abrasions to the back area caused by rubbing or pressing against the stall bars. Sows also suffer greater incidence of sickness and disease due to having weakened immune systems, and endure urinary tract infections, gastrointestinal problems and reduced cardiovascular health. Ultimately, they are culled early in their lives, with few surviving past 2-3 years of age.\textsuperscript{53}

There have been numerous studies conducted both in Australia and overseas in relation to the productivity performance of pigs raised in different housing conditions. There was no conclusive evidence that productivity rates of sows confined to stalls were any different from those housed in groups. Interestingly, in the UK and Sweden, where the use of stalls has been abolished, and sows are housed exclusively in groups, their productivity rates were greater than or equal to Australian pig producers.\textsuperscript{54}

\subsection*{6.2 Farrowing crates}

APL maintains that confining sows to farrowing crates increases their reproductive performance and protects piglets from being crushed by their mother. The industry claims to have invested substantial funds researching alternatives to the farrowing crates but have found nothing that is comparable to their productivity rates.\textsuperscript{55}
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In addition to some of the welfare issues noted earlier in the use of sow stalls, farrowing crates cause great stress to pregnant sows. Although unable to build nests for their litter, they still attempt to perform these activities. Birthing occurs on concrete or slatted floors, often resulting in injury to both mother and babies.\textsuperscript{56}

Animal advocates maintain that farrowing crates are used solely for the purpose of reducing the amount of space required by sows, thereby maximising sow/piglet numbers and production profits. Sows still manage to inadvertently roll on their piglets but muscle weakness, injury or confinement often prevents them from standing up, thereby crushing the piglet.\textsuperscript{57} Animals Australia has reported that farrowing crates do not achieve their purpose of preventing deaths, with \textit{an estimated 600,000 piglets dying each year in crates}.\textsuperscript{58}

\section*{6.3 The welfare of piglets}

As outlined earlier, piglets are subjected to a rapid weaning process, generally around two to three weeks after birth. This is highly stressful for both mother and piglets, and typically results in piglets experiencing diarrhoea and clinical disease.\textsuperscript{59}

Piglets also undergo a number of procedures without the benefit of anaesthesia or pain relief, including tail docking, teeth clipping and castration.\textsuperscript{60} It is unclear how widespread these procedures are (they are listed as ‘elective procedures’ on the industry website)\textsuperscript{61} however, they are not prohibited or restricted under legislation.\textsuperscript{62}

Tail docking is purportedly performed to reduce tail biting in piglets but it is unclear just how effective this method is. Animal advocates report that biting still occurs regardless of tail docking, and that it is due mainly to stress from overcrowding, boredom and shed conditions. Scientists agree that it is highly likely that the pain experienced by this procedure is

\textsuperscript{56} Brian Sherman, Ondine Sherman, Katrina Sharman, above n 2, 17.
considerable for at least a few days, resulting in trembling, leg shaking, vomiting and tail jerking.63

Piglets are born with eight sharp needle or milk teeth. Teeth clipping is used in the pork industry to prevent laceration to the teats and udders of nursing sows, and prevent injury to littermates.64 Animal advocates argue that injury occurs to sows due to the confinement of farrowing crates. In a natural setting, a sow is able to push her piglets away, or will move away from them, if they are causing her pain or discomfort. However, confinement prevents this from occurring.65 Teeth clipping causes considerable pain to piglets, particularly if it is performed inaccurately, and it is unclear if it is beneficial in protecting sows from injury.66

The castration of male pigs is widespread and results in pain and stress for the animals, particularly when performed without anaesthesia. APL advises that castration is ‘a necessary management practice for production to meet the consumer requirements’. Furthermore, without this procedure, APL states that pig meat develops ‘undesirable flavour and odour characteristics of the meat that are rejected by consumers’ - otherwise known as ‘boar taint’.67 Vaccination against boar taint is available but research has shown that it is not cost-effective, the results are not as reliable as castration and the quality of pig meat is compromised.68

It is interesting to note that in the 2012-2013 Annual Report, APL lists their core values as:

1. Passion and dedication to the cause of our farmers;
2. Deliver what we promise, when we promised it;
3. Respect and support colleagues;
4. Creating the future our farmers need;

64 Katrina Sharman, above n 7, 68.
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5. Celebrate achievement.⁶⁹

There is no inclusion of statements or values in relation to animal welfare standards in the industry, and there is no mention of them by Andrew Spencer, the current CEO, in his ‘message’ contained within the APL Report. Instead, Mr Spencer refers to the industry’s ‘historic’ voluntary phasing-out of sow stalls and how this has been implemented in order to ‘improve our product for consumers’.⁷⁰

7 The Way Forward

Whilst there have been some legislative progress, there is some scepticism that the 2017 voluntary ban on sow stalls by the pig industry will eventuate. Malcolm Caulfield opines that APL is not committed to the phasing out of stalls and the industry has a poor self-regulation record. Caulfield asserts that the Pig Code should prohibit sow stalls outright, thereby putting pressure on State and Territory governments to introduce or amend their legislation.⁷¹

Caulfield believes a greater way forward is for each jurisdiction to ensure that the responsibility for animal welfare is not allocated to the primary industry or agriculture ministers and should be assigned to an impartial minister. He is also of the opinion that there should be uniform animal cruelty legislation, applicable to all animals, which is drafted, reviewed and enforced by an independent statutory body.⁷²

Animal advocates would prefer to see an end to intensive pig farming altogether. Most agree that consumers are the key to reform and that awareness and education about the cruel practices in the pig industry are essential for change to occur.⁷³ It is encouraging to see that Coles made a public commitment from January 2013, stating it would source its brand-name pig meat products only from Australian and international suppliers that do not use sow stalls for more than 24 hours per pregnancy. Woolworths has also stated that 98% of its fresh pork

---
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comes from suppliers who do not use sow stalls and that by mid-2013, all of its fresh pork will be produced in sow stall-free farms.\textsuperscript{74} This is surely a step in the right direction for retailers, and one that consumers and those within the pig industry can consider.

\section*{8 Conclusion}

Intensively farms pigs are subjected to horrific and tortuous conditions – being housed in sheds, kept in cages, subjected to inhumane practices and never seeing daylight. Animal welfare legislation provided by State and Territory statutes does little to protect pigs. Despite the Commonwealth providing a national Model Code of Practice outlining the care and husbandry requirements for pigs, it is not a legally binding document. Some States, therefore, have adopted these standards in their legislation, whilst others have amended them or ignored them altogether.

Whilst there has been some recent legislative initiatives, the pig farming industry is in need of an urgent overhaul in order to stop the institutionalised cruelty inflicted on farmed pigs. Implementing uniform legislation for the States and Territories appears to be the logical solution, with all animals being treated equally, regardless of their status, and exemptions being abolished.

Other countries have managed to prohibit some of the crueller practices that are still permissible in Australia. What is required is greater public involvement, scrutiny, awareness and education in terms of industry practices. Consumers also need to be aware of the impact their dietary choices have on both the animals and on the industry. It is through public demand, and through stances taken by such companies as Coles and Woolworths, that pressure can be brought to bear on the Government and the pig industry in order to end these horrific and barbaric practices.

\textsuperscript{74} Ruth Hatten, \textit{Minister backflips on sow stall ban} (9 November, 2012) Sydney Morning Herald
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