Non-stun Slaughter : Key facts

The EU and UK require all livestock at abattoirs to be stunned (rendered unconscious and insensible to pain) before slaughter. Non-stun slaughter is banned in several countries but in the UK it is permitted for religious slaughter. UK legislation (WATOK) requires that for non-stun slaughter, each animal has a rapid, uninterrupted cut to the neck by hand-held knife to sever both carotid arteries and jugular veins. The animal must be restrained suitably and be left still during exsanguination for a minimum defined time post-cut (p11).

Several studies have measured time to loss of consciousness (and therefore sensibility to pain and distress) through a variety of methods including loss of posture. Following non-stun slaughter and across several studies, poultry reportedly took 12-15 seconds following throat cut before signs of unconsciousness were apparent. In sheep this was between 2-14 seconds and in cattle 11-265 seconds. Cattle time to collapse may be longer due to a unique alternative blood supply to the brain (p22).

The number of sheep and goats slaughtered without stunning has doubled in the last six years. In 2017 just over a quarter (27%, 3.3 million) sheep/goats were not stunned before slaughter. A Food Standard Agency survey for England and Wales estimates that 184 million poultry and 21 thousand cattle were also slaughtered without an effective stun in 2017 (p15).

Muslim Halal Slaughter

- The method of slaughter used by the Muslim community is called Dhabihah, but is commonly referred to as halal slaughter (p13).
- The majority of red meat (63% sheep, 75% cattle) slaughtered by Dhabihah is stunned (reversibly pre-stunned), but the remainder of halal meat is non-stun (p13).

Jewish Shechita Slaughter

- The method of slaughter used by the Jewish community is called Shechita and meat labelled Kosher (p12).
- All Shechita slaughter is non-stun.
- Approximately 70% of meat produced by Shechita slaughter is sold on the general market without Kosher labelling (p13).

Several Food Assurance bodies including Assured Food Standards (Red Tractor), Soil Association Organic and RSPCA Assured (previously Freedom Foods) do not allow non-stun slaughter meat to be accredited (p30).
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**EC Regulation and UK Law**

**European Law**

1. The law governing the protection of animals at the time of killing is set out in Council Regulation (EC) 1099/2009 the Protection of Animals at the Time of Killing (PATOK) and applies in all EU Member States since it came into effect on 1st January 2013.¹

2. In Great Britain, the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (WATOK) Regulations came into effect in Scotland in 2012², in both Wales³ and Northern Ireland⁴ in 2014 and in England in 2015⁵.

3. The UK voted to leave the European Union (EU) during a referendum held on the 23rd June 2016. The process of leaving the UK is expected to take at least two years with a proposed leaving date of 29th March 2019. In the meantime current legislation will continue to apply and existing EU regulations translated into UK law under the EU Withdrawal Bill, which is still under debate.

4. On the other hand, Member States have to comply with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and the restriction on slaughter without stunning shall not affect the freedom of religion, which is enshrined in the Charter. Such an assessment can only be done on a case-by-case basis according to the Commission.

5. PATOK requires that animals are stunned before slaughter. In Annex 1 of PATOK the accepted stunning methods are listed and parameters are specified for each method and species, an abridged version is shown in Table 1 (p10). Some methods of stunning are not authorized due to insufficient scientific evidence demonstrating that they can provide reliable and efficient stunning under commercial conditions.⁶ Cutting of the throat is not listed as a recognised stunning method.

---


“Animals shall only be killed after stunning in accordance with the methods and specific requirements related to the application of those methods […]. The loss of consciousness and sensibility shall be maintained until the death of the animal.

The [stunning] methods referred to in Annex 1 which do not result in instantaneous death [...] shall be followed as quickly as possible by a procedure ensuring death such as bleeding, pithing, electrocution or prolonged exposure to anoxia.”

Paragraph 1, Article 4, Chapter II of the EC Council Reg. No. 1099/2009

6. Recital 18 and Article 4 of the PATOK allows for Member States, should they choose, to provide an exemption from pre-slaughter stunning of animals for religious purposes:

“In the case of animals subject to particular methods of slaughter prescribed by religious rites, the requirements of Paragraph 1 [above] shall not apply provided the slaughter takes place in a slaughterhouse.”

Paragraph 4, Article 4, Chapter II of the EC Council Reg. No. 1099/2009

7. WATOK 2014 Regulations were due to come into force in England on 20th May 2014 but were revoked on 19th May 2014 before coming into force. After making the 2014 WATOK Regulations, the Government decided that the impact on some aspects of religious slaughter needed further consideration. The WATOK (England) 2015 Regulations differ from the 2014 WATOK Regulations in that they do not explicitly require animals which are stunned before killing in accordance with religious rites to be stunned in accordance with the parameters in Annex I of the EU Regulation (PATOK).

UK

8. The UK currently offers an exemption for religious purposes in Schedule 3 of WATOK 2015. This schedule also gives rules for humane restraint of bovines for non-stun slaughter, method of slaughter and uninterrupted bleed out times for different species (see page 11).

“No person may kill an animal in accordance with religious rites without prior stunning unless it is a sheep, goat, bovine animal or bird killed in a slaughterhouse in accordance with this Schedule”


“[Any bovine killed without stunning must be] individually restrained in an upright position in a restraining pen which has been approved in writing by the competent authority … [And to

7 Council Regulation (EC) 1099/2009
be approved it must be] of such a size and design, and is able to be operated, so as to protect an adult bovine animal from avoidable pain, suffering, agitation, injuries or contusions while confined in it"


“[For all non-stun slaughter an animal must be] killed by the severance of both its carotid arteries and jugular veins by rapid, uninterrupted movements of a hand-held knife … [that is] undamaged and of sufficient size and sharpness"


“[Where a bovine, sheep or goat is killed without stunning it must not be] shackled, hoisted or moved in any way until it is unconscious and in any event not before the expiry of (a) in the case of a sheep or a goat, a period of not less than 20 seconds; and (b) in the case of a bovine animal, a period of not less than 30 seconds… [And where a bird is killed without prior stunning] no further dressing procedure or any electrical stimulation is performed on the bird if it presents any signs of life and in any event not before the expiry of (a) in the case of a turkey or goose, a period of not less than 2 minutes; and (b) in the case of any other bird, a period of not less than 90 seconds”


EU Member states and worldwide practice and trade

9. In the EU, of cattle slaughtered without stunning, most (84%) occurred in France, The Netherlands, Spain and United Kingdom, involving approximately 400 slaughterhouses.9

10. The following EU Member States do not allow any exemption from pre-slaughter stunning: Denmark, Malta, Slovenia, Sweden, Cyprus, Finland and Luxembourg.10,11 Latvia use a post-cut stun and are reported to supply non-stun meat demand in Sweden.12 Austria, Finland, Estonia and Slovakia permit non-stun slaughter but require a post-cut stun.13,14 Germany require that abattoirs apply for a licence by defining the number of animals to

10 Minor, J. European Commission UK Office. Evidence to the All-party Parliamentary Group for Beef & Lamb. 10th June 2014.
undergo non-stun slaughter to meet local demand only. A 2017 vote in two regions of Belgium was in favour of banning non-stun slaughter from 2019, however, an exemption was made for cattle until technological advances allow reversible stunning. In France an argument against banning of non-stun slaughter used Human Rights legislation, results of which were that an exemption from a ban was allowed on religious grounds, but if an animal is still conscious after 90 seconds, then a post-cut stun must be applied. In the Netherlands, an animal that has not lost consciousness after 40 seconds must be stunned. Information on time to collapse is presented in Table 9 (p23). Lithuania legalised non-stun slaughter in 2014 aiming to increase exports to Israel. A ban in Poland in 2013 was overturned in 2014 but most recently a draft Bill in Poland (November 2017) proposes to ban non-stun slaughter again. Cyprus permit slaughter without prior stunning provided that a number of legal requirements are respected.

11. Globally, non-stun slaughter is not permitted in Switzerland, Norway and Iceland. New Zealand requires all animals to be stunned before slaughter, but offers an exemption for a small fixed number of poultry and sheep for local Jewish consumption only (which receive a post-cut stun). New Zealand successfully exports stunned-Halal beef and sheep meat to other countries. Australia is similar in that it requires pre-cut stunning but allows an exemption for religious slaughter for the domestic market only, and utilizes a post-cut stun in these cases.

12. Future legislation: Defra in England intend to make CCTV mandatory in all slaughterhouses in 2018 following ‘extremely positive reaction’ to a public consultation in which 99% of 4000 respondents from the industry, welfare groups and the public were supportive. The Scottish Government will consult on the introduction of compulsory video recording of slaughter at abattoirs in Scotland to aid enforcement of welfare requirements by abattoir management and Food Standards Scotland.


16 Jewish Liturgical Association Cha'are Shalom Ve Tsedek v. France, European Court of Human Rights, No. 27417/95, 27/6/2000


20 Ferrari, S., Bottori, R., (2010). EC DIALREL Project, Deliverable 1.4, Legislation regarding religious slaughter in the EU member, candidate and associated countries.


23 Compassion in World farming, Briefing – Religious Slaughter, May 2011


Definitions & terminology

13. It is recommended to use the term ‘non-stun’ slaughter rather than ‘ritual’ or ‘religious’ slaughter.

14. Stunning: any intentionally induced process which causes loss of consciousness and sensibility without pain, including any process resulting in instantaneous death.26

15. Pre-cut stun: A stun prior to the throat cut.

16. Post-cut stun: A stun immediately after cutting the throat.

17. Reversible/simple stun: ‘any intentionally induced process which causes loss of consciousness and sensibility without pain’ that does not cause instantaneous death. Head-only electronarcosis is an accepted form of reversible stunning.27

18. Porging: applicable to kosher production, is the process of removing portions of the animal that are not kosher: the blood and vessels, certain fats (chailev) & the sciatic nerve (the gid hanasheh).28 Also see paragraph 37 (p12).

19. Unconsciousness: an abnormal state of lack of response to sensory stimuli, resulting from injury, illness, shock or some other bodily disorder29, occurs when the brain’s ability to integrate information is blocked or disrupted. In animals, loss of consciousness is functionally defined by Loss of Righting Reflex (LORR), also called Loss of Posture (LOP).30, 31, 32

20. Insensibility: not perceptible to the senses.31

21. Pain: The perception of pain is defined as a conscious experience and requires nerve impulses from peripheral nociceptors to reach a functioning conscious cerebral cortex and the associated subcortical brain structures.30,32

22. Sticking: To cut the throat and sever both carotid arteries and jugular veins of an animal to allow exsanguination.33

---

26 Council Regulation (EC) 1099/2009 - Chapter 1, Article 2, item (f).
27 Council Regulation (EC) 1099/2009 - Chapter 1, Article 4, Clause 1.
31 Dwyer CM. How has the risk of predation shaped the behavioural responses of sheep to fear and distress? Anim Welf 2004;13:269–281.
23. False aneurysm: When a severed artery end retracts within its connective tissue sheath and the artery end becomes blocked or sealed.\(^{34}\)

24. Mis-stunning: When a stun is not carried out correctly and the animal is not rendered immediately unconscious and insensitive to pain. See section on page 20.

25. Mis-cutting: When one or both of the major blood vessels of an animal remains intact or is incompletely cut\(^{35}\) and there follows delayed exsanguination.

**Stun slaughter process**

[Diagram taken from FSA Board Meeting 20/09/2017 Annex 2.]

26. Figure 1 shows the standard stun slaughter process:

27. Different methods of stun are used for different species, as listed in Annex 1 of PATOK, to provide the most rapid and humane stun possible, and account for anatomical differences (see Table 1). In no regulations is cutting the throat listed as a stun method.\(^{36}\) Table 2 describes the most common method of stun by species.


\(^{36}\) Council Regulation (EC) 1099/2009 - Annex 1 (as referred to in Article 4), Chapter 1, Tables 1,2,3 & 4.
Table 1: An abridged list of stunning methods listed in PATOK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanical methods</th>
<th>Species applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penetrative captive bolt device</td>
<td>All species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-penetrative captive bolt device</td>
<td>Ruminants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm with free projectile</td>
<td>All species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maceration</td>
<td>Chicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervical dislocation</td>
<td>Poultry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussive blow to the head</td>
<td>Piglets, lambs, kids, rabbits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electrical methods</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head-only electrical stunning</td>
<td>All species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head to Body electrical stunning</td>
<td>All species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical waterbath</td>
<td>Poultry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gas methods</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon dioxide at high concentration</td>
<td>Pigs only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon dioxide in two phases</td>
<td>Poultry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon dioxide associated with inert gases</td>
<td>Pigs and poultry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inert gases</td>
<td>Pigs and poultry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Most common method of stun by species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penetrative captive bolt</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronarcosis (head only or head to back)</td>
<td>Sheep &amp; goats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas stun until dead (thus listed under kill methods)</td>
<td>Pigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas stun until dead (thus listed under kill methods)</td>
<td>Poultry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. The electrical parameters for different forms of electrical stunning are laid out in Annex I of the PATOK (EU) regulations. This states that poultry should be stunned for at least 4 seconds according to the electrical parameters presented in Table 3. Parameters for other forms of electrical stunning as well as gas killing are also included. These parameters have been based on a scientific review performed by the European Food Safety Authority.37

29. In the UK, WATOK Regulations (Schedule I, Part 5) allow for stunning by captive bolt (penetrative and non-penetrative), electrical stunning (including by waterbath for poultry) and by exposure to gas (pigs and poultry). Specific provisions are given to ensure stunning methods are effective. It is not permitted to stun animals by a non-mechanical percussive blow to the head with the exception of rabbits.

The WATOK (England) 2015 do not explicitly require animals which are stunned before killing in accordance with religious rites to be stunned in accordance with the parameters in Annex I of the EU Regulation (PATOK)\(^{38}\).

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (Hz)</th>
<th>Chickens</th>
<th>Turkeys</th>
<th>Ducks and geese</th>
<th>Quails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 200 Hz</td>
<td>100 mA</td>
<td>250 mA</td>
<td>130 mA</td>
<td>45 mA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 - 400 Hz</td>
<td>150 mA</td>
<td>400 mA</td>
<td>Not permitted</td>
<td>Not permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 - 1500 Hz</td>
<td>200 mA</td>
<td>400 mA</td>
<td>Not permitted</td>
<td>Not permitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-stun slaughter processes

Diagram adapted from FSA Board Meeting 20/09/2017 Annex 2,

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Standstill time (post-cut prior to any further dressing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>30 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep and Goats</td>
<td>20 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>Goose or turkey 2 minutes Any other bird 90 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Non-stun slaughter does not use any of the stun methods listed in Table 1 prior to the sticking of an animal to allow exsanguination.

32. Non-stun slaughter must be carried out in accordance with WATOK Regulations. Animals must be slaughtered one at a time and in an approved restraint; for example, a bovine in an upright restraining pen that will take the weight of the animal and effectively restrain the head. Any blade used must be examined for size and sharpness before rapid, uninterrupted severance of both carotid arteries and jugular veins.

33. WATOK 2015 regulations also state that when non-stun slaughter is carried out in cattle, sheep or goats “appropriate back-up stunning equipment is kept close to the restraining equipment for use in case of emergency”.\(^\text{39}\)

34. Animals must be checked for signs of consciousness or sensitivity before being released from restraint and must not present any sign of life before being further processed (EC N°1099/2009 Article 5+16).

35. The method of non-stun slaughter used by the Jewish community is called Shechita. Only meat that passes the Shechita process fully is labelled kosher.

36. All Shechita slaughter is non-stun\(^\text{41}\). A surgically sharp immaculate blade (the chalaf) is passed in one rapid and uninterrupted action across the trachea, oesophagus, carotid arteries and jugular veins. And exsanguination follows. There are five Halachic requirements which must be followed: (a) the incision must be uninterrupted (Shehiya); (b)...

---


the chalaf must not be pressed against the neck (Derasa); (c) the chalaf must be of an adequate size that it is not covered by hide of cattle, wool of sheep or feathers of birds (Chalada); (d) the incision must be at the appropriate site (Hagrama); and (e) there must be no tearing of the vessels before or during Shechita (Ikkur). Also see page 21 section on mis-cutting.

Shechita is performed only by trained Shochetim. They must serve an apprenticeship with an experienced Shochet prior to becoming fully qualified. A UK Shochet must hold two licences, one issued by Meat Hygiene Service and the other by the Rabbincial Commission for the Licensing of Shochetim. Shochetim must apply for renewal of his license every 12 months and undergo annual examination by this Commission. The Shochet is responsible for examining the chalaf for imperfections, visual and tactile examination of the organs and vessels of the animal immediately after severance to ascertain proper Shechita and examination of the internal organs and lungs to ascertain if abnormalities or defects are present.42

37. Not all meat produced by Shechita slaughter remains in the kosher food chain.43
   a. Approximately 60 out of every 100 animals slaughtered are accepted into the kosher food chain.44
   b. In the UK, only the forequarters of an animal (approx. ¼ of the carcass weight) is eaten because it is uneconomical to porge the hindquarters.45
   c. Zivotofsky estimated that for the reasons above, approximately 70% of meat produced by Shechita slaughter is sold on the general market.46

**Dhabihah (Halal) slaughter**

38. The method of non-stun slaughter used by the Muslim community is called Dhabihah, but is commonly referred to as halal slaughter. Meat produced by this method is labelled halal.

39. The majority of sheep and goats (63%) and cattle (75%) slaughtered by Dhabihah is reversibly pre-stunned, but the remainder of halal meat is non-stun47 (see table 8, p18).

---

40. The reversible pre-stun used in cattle is usually a non-penetrative captive bolt device that applies a concussive blow to the brain without penetrating the skull. In sheep and goats, an electrical stun to the head is commonly used. In poultry, electrical stunning in a waterbath is often used but this may occur at lower currents than PATOK regulations require (but in accordance with WATOK regulations in the UK). Concerns for using higher current electrical stunning come from it being a potentially lethal dose, thereby not meeting the necessity for a reversible stun.

41. There is no universal agreement on a system for approval of halal slaughter, although previous attempts have been made to issue rulings (fatwas). General guidelines are outlined in the DIALREL Report: Religious rules and requirements – Halal slaughter

At the time of slaughter, the slaughterer must say ‘Bismillah Wallahuakbar’ over each carcass or group of animals being slaughtered continuously. A blade with a sharp edge of not less than 12cm must sever the neck of the animal just below the glottis, incising the trachea, oesophagus, both carotid arteries and jugular veins. A ‘sawing’ action is permitted provided the blade is not lifted from the neck of the animal.

The slaughterer must be a Muslim of sound mind and understand the rules and conditions related to the slaughter of animals. He must have a certificate of halal slaughter issued by a competent authority. 48

**Number of animals involved**

42. Defra collects monthly data from all major slaughterhouses registered in the UK49, 50, 51 on the number of livestock slaughtered. The survey data can be used to determine total numbers of animals slaughtered annually (Table 5). Using these totals and the proportion of


animals undergoing non-stun slaughter (FSA surveys, see below\textsuperscript{52,53}), estimates of numbers of animals slaughtered without an effective pre-cut stun are shown in Table 6.

### TABLE 5: Estimated annual number of animals slaughtered in abattoirs in UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2017**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>2.76 million</td>
<td>2.53 million</td>
<td>2.56 million</td>
<td>1.77 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep &amp; Goats</td>
<td>14.5 million</td>
<td>14.5 million</td>
<td>14.6 million</td>
<td>12.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>916 million</td>
<td>962 million</td>
<td>957 million</td>
<td>982.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data estimated from Q1 figures \textsuperscript{54}, it is not expected that annual 2017 slaughter data will show much difference from previous years once data become available for the whole year (personal communication, FSA). In 2017 a new monitoring system Chronos was introduced to collect data on throughput from abattoirs in England and Wales.**

### TABLE 6: Proportion of animals undergoing non-stun slaughter as a percentage of annual number slaughtered 2011-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011*</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2017 **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>3.6% (99 thousand)</td>
<td>1.9% (48 thousand)</td>
<td>1.23% (31 thousand)</td>
<td>1.18% (~21 thousand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep and goats</td>
<td>10.2% (1.5 million)</td>
<td>15.4% (2.2 million)</td>
<td>22.5% (3.29 million)</td>
<td>27.2% (~3.38 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>4.0% (37 million)</td>
<td>3.5% (34 million)</td>
<td>***WATOK 4.3% (41 million), PATOK 16% (155 million)</td>
<td>18.7% (~184 million)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated number of animals slaughtered without stun per year are shown in brackets and have been calculated by extrapolation from national figures in Table 5.

*2011 and 2013 surveys were for Great Britain and in 2015 and 2017 surveys were for England and Wales only. However, Scotland had only one abattoir performing non-stun slaughter in 2011 and there were none in 2013 onwards.

**Estimated numbers of animals for 2017 are extrapolated from Q1 figures and overall abattoir slaughter method only.

***Non-stun slaughter figures for poultry are based on WATOK regulations for 2011-2015 (applicable in England only), 2017 figures use PATOK regulations as the cut-off and 2015 figures list both.

---


\textsuperscript{54} Animal Welfare non-compliances for Q1 2017/18 [https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fsa170905b.pdf](https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fsa170905b.pdf)
Surveys by the Food Standards Agency (FSA) report the proportion of stunned and non-stunned animals but have differed in their data collection methods and sample population (see footnotes of Table 6). This limits the usefulness of direct comparisons to absolute previous numbers, however the proportion of animals undergoing non-stun slaughter can be compared (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Non-stun slaughter animals as proportion of total slaughtered by species 2011-2017*

*Overall total number of animals slaughtered and number of abattoirs in England and Wales/Great Britain are show in Table 5.

2017 data are taken from the minutes of an FSA board meeting 20/09/2017 discussing incidence of welfare non-compliances at the different stages of slaughter. Data in this survey differ from previous surveys as total numbers have been extrapolated from the dominant overall slaughter method at the abattoir (being stun, non-stun or combined 50% each) rather than the slaughter method for individual animals.

2017 data use the PATOK regulations as the cut-off for non-stun slaughter in poultry where abattoirs in England and Wales during the survey period are governed by WATOK regulations. Therefore figures for non-stun slaughter in poultry for 2017 are only comparable to those from 2015.

43. The FSA survey in 2013 determined the number of animals subject to non-stun and stun slaughter during one week at 232 red meat and 69 white meat slaughterhouses. A similar survey was carried out in 2011 during one week at 248 red meat and 75 white meat slaughterhouses. The results of these surveys can be used to estimate the proportion of

---


animals that are slaughtered by halal (both those reversibly pre-stunned and non-stunned) and shechita methods (Table 7 and 8).

All animals killed by Jewish (Shechita) methods are not stunned before slaughter. There was an increase in the proportion of non-stun Halal slaughter across all sectors but particularly in the sheep and goat sector between 2011-2013 (Table 8). It is not possible to determine what proportion of the increases in non-stun slaughter between 2015 and 2017 is attributable to Halal or Shechita.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7: 2011 and 2013 data showing the proportion of all animals slaughtered for non-stun Shechita, and stunned and non-stunned Halal (estimates of actual numbers from proportions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shechita (Jewish) slaughter</strong> (all non-stun slaughter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% (83 thousand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep and goat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8: Estimated* % Non-stun Halal slaughter compared to all Halal slaughter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep and goat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures estimated from data in Table 7
Basis of the religious proscription of stunning

44. The Jewish faith requires animals or birds to be alive, healthy and unhurt (unblemished to the naked eye) prior to Shechita. Thus, stunning and unconsciousness, may not be regarded by some in the Jewish community as consistent with their requirements.\(^{57}\)

45. The Muslim faith requires animals to be “alive and healthy” at slaughter. This is interpreted by the various Muslim authorities in one of two ways- (a) meat that has been reversibly stunned by a demonstrably recoverable method such as electric head-only stunning is acceptable as Halal \(^{58}\) or (b) meat that has been stunned in any form is not acceptable as Halal.\(^{59}\)

46. The religious requirements for slaughter were written prior to the current methods of stun being developed. Furthermore, there was no access to the information available nowadays on the health and welfare of the animals presented for slaughter or ante-mortem inspection to ensure animals are in good health and welfare before slaughter for human consumption.

Effect of stunning and bleeding out

47. Meat with lower blood content is desirable for kosher and halal. The effect of stunning on bleeding out has been raised in the discussion for non-stun slaughter, with some claiming non-stunned animals bleed out more effectively. Anil et al. investigated this in two separate peer-reviewed studies in 2004 and 2006. The first study compared the exsanguination of sheep that had been electrically or captive bolt stunned before the throat cut with sheep that were not stunned and were slaughtered by a Muslim method; there was no significant difference between blood loss in the three groups.\(^{60}\) The second study compared cattle that had been captive bolt stunned before the throat cut with cattle that were not stunned and slaughtered by a Muslim method; again there was no significant difference between the two groups.\(^{61}\)

48. An older review paper by Warriss in 1984 concluded that there was no evidence that the residual blood content of lean meat was affected by different slaughter methods and the


amount of blood lost was an approximately constant fraction of the total blood volume. This is further supported by work done by Griffiths et al. in 1985, which found no difference when comparing the blood loss from poultry carcasses following different methods of slaughter.

Mis-stunning, mis-cutting and welfare non-compliances

49. The EU funded DIALREL report (see page 25, para64), acknowledged that all slaughter methods are vulnerable to non-compliances related to inadequate equipment, insufficient knowledge or skills. The report from the APPG for Beef and Lamb (2014) recommended that incidence of compliance failures should be presented for stun and non-stunned slaughter. Recent FSA data has done this although the overall abattoir type has been used to define stun or non-stun failures, rather than the slaughter method used on each individual or batch of animals. As such, figures may not be fairly representative of the incidences for each slaughter type.

50. The frequency of mis-stunning incidents in UK abattoirs has been raised in argument against the practise of stunning. Attempting to stun an animal carries a risk of a mis-stunning incident occurring. Immediate and appropriate action is required to be taken to rectify such an incident; the Food Standards Agency Manual for Official Controls makes the following statements clarifying the Food Business Operator responsibility for a Standard Operating Procedure for mis-stun incidents and the role of the Official Veterinarian in periodically monitoring stunning efficacy:

“As regards stunning, the Standard Operating Procedure shall: […] (c) specify the measures to be taken when checks indicate that an animal is not properly stunned or in the case of animals slaughtered or in the case of animals slaughtered in accordance with Article 4(4) (religious slaughter), that the animal still presents signs of life.”

“Page 2-2, Chapter 2.3, Manual for Official Controls

“The OV should carry out checks: […] to monitor stunning.”

“Page 3-2, Chapter 2.3, Manual for Official Controls

51. There is some controversy about the frequency of mis-stunning. In 2004 the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) reported that when using captive bolt stun in cattle, between

4-6.6% cattle needed a second stun. There is a marked contrast between these figures and recent figures from the FSA (Table 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Non-stun abattoirs bleeding</th>
<th>Stun Abattoirs bleeding</th>
<th>Stun Abattoirs stunning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/goats</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are similar to those reported in response to a Parliamentary Written Question in 24/03/14 for non-compliances in 2013.

Previously, only major and critical welfare breaches were recorded. The FSA survey is now recording incidents of minor breaches including where back-up stunning equipment is used or a second stun is carried out without the intervention of the Official Veterinarian. There has been some dispute over figures for incidents of welfare non-compliance in the past.

A 2016 study of 346 cattle compared mis-stunning between animals stunned by penetrative captive bolt (279) and non-penetrative captive bolt (used as a reversible stunning method) (67). The proportion of cattle mis-stunned was higher when using the non-penetrative bolt stunning (prior to halal slaughter) with 46% mis-stunning compared to just 2% for penetrative captive bolt stunning (used in secular slaughter).

Cutting the throat of non-stunned animals, as in Shechita or Dhabihah, also carries a risk of a mis-cutting incident. Mis-cutting the throat of a non-stunned animal usually involves one or both of the carotid arteries remaining intact or being incompletely cut; there follows delayed exsanguination, and the animal is conscious and sensitive to pain for an extended time.

The UK legislation requires that for non-stun slaughter, each animal is slaughtered by the severance, by rapid, uninterrupted movements of a hand-held knife, of both its carotid

---

arteries and both its jugular veins. Gregory et al. remark that this could be interpreted to allow for changes of direction in cut, provided they were uninterrupted, nevertheless the more cuts that are made, the higher the risk of pain sensation in the animal. In the same study, it was determined that the prevalence of failure to cut a carotid artery was 6% during shechita slaughter and 1% during halal slaughter. This suggests that several cuts are required for non-stun slaughter methods to ensure severance of both carotid arteries and jugular veins, increasing the risk of stimulation of free nerve endings in the skin and pain sensation in the animal.

56. The Food Standards Agency Manual for Official Controls makes the following statement with regard to intervention to address mis-cutting:

“In establishments where killing by a religious method takes place, there should be checks by the business operator that animals are unconscious before being released from restraint and checks that the animal does not present any sign of life before undergoing dressing or scalding.”

Page 4-2, Chapter 2.3, Manual for Official Controls

Time to unconsciousness or collapse and evidence of pain and suffering

57. Loss of posture (LOP) and loss of righting reflex (LORR) are recognised as an easily observable proxy for loss of consciousness by the American Veterinary Medicine Association.

58. Gregory et al. studied the time to collapse in 174 cattle undergoing non-stun Halal slaughter. Table 9 and Figure 4 summarise the results of the study.
Table 9: Time to collapse in 174 cattle subject to non-stun Halal slaughter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average time to collapse (seconds)</td>
<td>20 (±33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median time to collapse (seconds)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum time to collapse (seconds)</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cattle ≥60 seconds to collapse</td>
<td>14 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cattle that collapsed and stood again before final collapse.</td>
<td>25 (14%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Frequency distribution of the cattle according to time to collapse (in seconds) following Halal slaughter without stunning.

59. The AVMA refer to several studies examining unconsciousness in ruminants as measured by loss of posture. In sheep loss of posture occurred on average 2-14 seconds after throat cut but eye rotation was shown to take 15 seconds in a more recent 2012 study. Grandin noted that there was little behavioural reaction in restrained cattle to the

---

throat cut when performed by a skilled slaughter man (Shochet)\textsuperscript{83,84} but loss of posture only occurred between 17-85 seconds. In another study of chickens undergoing Shechitah slaughter they also note most did not exhibit physical responses to the cut but time to collapse was 12-15 seconds.\textsuperscript{85}

60. The Farm Animal Welfare Council (FAWC) took evidence in 2003 to assess the welfare of animals at slaughter without stunning. They presented the data in Table 10 on species differences in time to loss of consciousness from the evidence presented to them.\textsuperscript{86}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Time to Loss of Brain Responsiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult cattle</td>
<td>22-40 (or longer with carotid occlusion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calves</td>
<td>10-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>3-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cattle are unique in possessing an alternative blood supply to the brain other than the carotid arteries – the vertebral-basilar plexus. If exsanguination is incomplete because blood flow from the carotid arteries is arrested due to false aneurysm (see paragraph 23, page 9 for definition), blood can continue to flow to the brain via this plexus and consciousness is maintained.\textsuperscript{87,88}

The FAWC report also reports expert opinion as describing:

“When a very large transverse incision is made across the neck a number of vital tissues are transected including: skin, muscle, trachea, oesophagus, carotid arteries, jugular veins, major nerve trunks (e.g. vagus and phrenic nerves) plus numerous minor nerves. Such a drastic cut will inevitably trigger a barrage of sensory information to the brain in a sensible (conscious) animal. We are persuaded that such a massive injury would result in very significant pain and distress in the period before insensitivity supervenes.”

“Given that the exemption from pre-stunning is subject to the requirement that unnecessary suffering is not inflicted, we consider that the Government should take steps to repeal this exemption.”\textsuperscript{89}

\textsuperscript{88} Baldwin & Bell (1963) The anatomy of cerebral circulation of the sheep and ox. The dynamic distribution of the blood supplied to the carotid and vertebral arteries to cranial regions. Journal of Anatomy (97) 203-215
61. Evidence for pain and suffering at the time of slaughter is contentious. It is important to note that objective measurements of pain and distress are hard to take during the slaughter process and subjective indicators may be limited by restraint methods.

62. Previous parliamentary debates\textsuperscript{90} have argued that there are few nerve endings in the throat thus disputing the expert opinion given in the FAWC report. However, anatomical text books show there to be nerve fibres below the skin in the throats of both humans and bovines\textsuperscript{91,92}.

63. A 2017 European commission report on best practices for the protection of animals at the time of killing recognises that the 'duration of the pain provoked by the neck cut can be reduced if stunning is performed immediately after the cut (post-cut stunning)'\textsuperscript{93}.

64. The European Commission also funded the DIALREL Project from 2006 to 2010, entitled 'Religious slaughter, improving knowledge and expertise through dialogue and debate on issues of welfare, legislation and socio-economic aspects'. The project addressed five work packages (1) religion, legislation and animal welfare: conflicting standards; (2) religious slaughter: evaluation of current practices; (3) halal consumer and consumption issues; (4) concerns, knowledge and information in the general public; and (5) promotion of the debate and dissemination.

The following conclusions were made in Deliverable 1.3, ‘Report on good and adverse practices – Animal welfare concerns in relation to slaughter practices from the viewpoint of the veterinary sciences’:

‘[There is a] high probability that animals feel pain during and after the throat cut without prior stunning. This applies even to a good cut performed by a skilled operator, because substantial tissue damage is inflicted to areas well supplied with nociceptors and subsequent perception of pain is not exclusively related to the quality of the cut.’\textsuperscript{94}

65. Gibson et al., published two peer-reviewed research papers in the New Zealand Veterinary Journal in 2009. They examined the pain-associated electroencephalographic (EEG) responses of halothane-anaesthetised calves to non-stun slaughter (a true replication of Shechita slaughter was not possible due to laws protecting animal welfare in


\textsuperscript{91} Klein, B (2012) Cunningham’s textbook of anatomy, Elsevier, pages 737-742 ISBN 9781437723618


experimentation requiring some anaesthesia). In summary, following a cut to the neck, pain-like responses were recorded in the brain and use of a stun removed these pain-like responses:

“[The first study] demonstrated that there is a period following slaughter where ventral neck incision represents a noxious stimulus.” 95

“[In the second study] non-penetrative captive bolt stunning after ventral neck incision resulted in the cessation of functional cortical activity in the majority of calves. This procedure prevented the development of cerebrocortical responses to ventral neck incision, demonstrated elsewhere, which would be painful in conscious animals subjected to this procedure”. 96

However, current EEG-based brain function monitors cannot provide definitive answers as to the exact onset of unconsciousness. 97, 98

66. An argument used by Shechita UK 99, is that the throat cut acts as a stun methods. This is not however recognised by the legislation. A study of 88 cattle slaughtered by the Shechita method (published in 2016) found response to nostril stimulation and tongue pinch, spontaneous blinking and rhythmic breathing in 7, 4, 10 and 100% of cattle, respectively, 20 seconds after throat cut but none of these responses in animals that had been stunned. The study concluded that slaughter without previous stunning may result in greater risk of cattle experiencing suffering, pain and distress at slaughter. 100

67. The European Food Safety Authority also supported the opinion that animals endured more pain and suffering where there was no stun. 101

68. In his review article in the Veterinary Record, ‘Physiological insights into Shechita’ Rosen refers to work described in an unpublished thesis (Levinger 1961 102), and an essay from the same author published in a non-peer reviewed book from 1976, ‘Shechita. Religious,
Historical and Scientific Aspects'. We were unable to access these original sources following an online literature search. When talking about cerebral perfusion, loss of consciousness and consequent insensibility, Rosen claims:

“the collapse in arterial blood pressure that follows on from severance of the carotid arteries at Shechita causes a dramatic fall in cerebral perfusion […] Consciousness is lost rapidly (within approximately two seconds) and irreversibly.”

“…Shechita is a painless and effective method by which to stun and dispatch an animal in one rapid act.”

Stakeholder position statements: Religious groups

69. The position of stakeholder groups on pain and suffering at the time of slaughter is also divided.

a. Shechita UK is a community-wide campaign that unites representatives from the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the National Council of Shechita Boards, the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations and the Campaign for the Protection of Shechita. It incorporates representatives from all the Kashrus Authorities in the UK. They state:

“The legal definition of “stunning” in the UK is to “render an animal unconscious until death”. The process of Shechita conforms to this legal definition”.

“With Shechita there is no delay because the slaughter method incorporates an immediate stun. Shechita both stuns and slaughters in one action, thereby making it the most humane and efficient method.”

Also see p22-23 ‘Time to unconsciousness and evidence of pain and suffering’.

b. The Halal Food Authority (HFA) group, is a widely recognised Halal certifier that estimates that it certifies 70% of UK Halal meat, states:

“…animal welfare as well as human safety at slaughterhouse would be jeopardised if slaughter without stunning was performed for large-scale production. HFA argues that kosher meat can be produced … without stunning because, contrary to Halal meat, it is

---

produced in low quantities, manually even in the case of chickens, at low speed and high costs, supplying a small percentage of the population.\textsuperscript{106}

A survey of 66 Islamic scholars, funded by the Halal Food Foundation (parent company of the HFA), found that 95% of scholars agreed it was permissible for Halal slaughter to include pre-stunning provided that the stun did not cause death, physical injury or obstruct bleed-out and that slaughter was carried out by a Muslim. However, many scholars would still not recommend the use of stunning as they regarded it as a cruel and inhumane practice that adversely affects the volume of blood loss during exsanguination and produces meat of inferior quality\textsuperscript{107} (see p19 ‘Effect of stunning and bleeding out’).

c. The Halal Monitoring Committee (HMC) is a Halal certifier with a different view. Their certification criteria require that:

“[A] swift and humane incision [is made,] rendering the animal insensible to pain (hand slaughter).”

They go on to state that: “Stunning prevents the drainage of blood, and deprives animals of the benefits of Tasmiyah [the Islamic prayer] as it is unconscious. It is seen as inhumane to animals and causes pain and suffering.”\textsuperscript{108} (see p19 ‘Effect of stunning and bleeding out’).

d. The Halal Authority Board (HAB) is one of the newest certification bodies and is part of a bigger global group and brand, Al Hijaz. Their standard does not include specifics on animal welfare, but their spokesperson gave this statement:

“The government regulations on animal welfare in this country are very good and where we feel there are gaps it is our duty to inform the government and improve those standards for animal welfare purposes. But because those regulations exist, we do not have to repeat those regulations in our standard – there is no point ... If the government was not doing it then we would put it into our own standard.”\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{108} HMC Criteria for Halal https://halalhmc.org/about/hmc-criteria-for-halal/ [Accessed15th January 2018]
Stakeholder position statements: Animal welfare groups and assurance bodies

70. A number of animal welfare organisations have considered the evidence available and taken positions as follows:

a. **The British Veterinary Association (BVA),**

“The BVA view is that all animals should be stunned before slaughter, and if slaughter without stunning is still to be permitted then any meat or fish from this source must be clearly labelled.”

b. **The Farm Animal Welfare Council,**

“Council considers that slaughter without pre-stunning is unacceptable and that the Government should repeal the current exemption.”

c. **The Federation of Veterinarians in Europe (FVE),**

“FVE is of the opinion that the practice of slaughtering animals without prior stunning is unacceptable under any circumstances and that animals should be effectively stunned before slaughter. FVE calls on policy makers to stop the excessive use of slaughter without stunning as a priority.”

d. **The Humane Slaughter Association (HSA),**

“Whilst respecting differing religious beliefs, the HSA’s position on the pre-slaughter stunning of animals has always been unequivocal, all animals should be effectively stunned prior to being bled. Recent advances in the electrical stunning of cattle now make reversible stunning a practical option for all. This overcomes one of the main obstacles preventing a full uptake of pre-slaughter stunning.

As long as meat from animals slaughtered without pre-stunning is available in the UK (whether slaughtered in the UK or imported), we believe it should be clearly and accurately labelled.

---


labelled as such. The aim of the HSA remains that all animals should be effectively stunned prior to being bled, because this precludes the possibility of suffering.”


slaughter sheep, pigs and cattle. The meat is sent to either our manufacturing sites for further processing (we are the second largest fresh food manufacturer in the UK) or to our in-store butchers counters.

We sell a range of branded halal and kosher products where there is strong demand. In addition, we have a small number of independent halal concessions operating in certain stores where there is a particularly large Muslim catchment. The meat from these concessions is from non-stunned sources.”

b. **Marks and Spencer,**

“Animal welfare is at the heart of our livestock procurement policies and therefore all M&S foods have a requirement for pre-stunning prior to slaughter.”

“We take a pro-active stance on labelling, trying to always ensure that where we have a policy or procedure that our customers would expect to know about, we ensure our labelling reflects this. […] as we don’t source non-stunned livestock, we have no experience of labelling in this area.”

Marks & Spencer Head of Agriculture and Fisheries

c. **Waitrose,**

“We place the highest importance on animal welfare in our business and require that all livestock supplying our own label meat is stunned before slaughter.”

“We would support labelling by exception; that is the labelling of all meat from animals not stunned before kill.”

Waitrose Senior Manager of Agri-food Communications

d. **Tesco,**

“We require all slaughter processes for Tesco branded products to meet our stringent animal welfare requirements, without exception. In every case, the animal is stunned before slaughter. We do however, in some stores, sell branded meat or host concessions that sell un-stunned halal and kosher meat. This is to serve customers who specifically wish to purchase un-stunned meat. This meat is clearly labelled Halal or Kosher, so that our customers are able to make informed choices.”

“Regarding labelling should the Government choose to look at this area it will be important that any guidance offered delivers a consistent approach across the food industry and enables us to provide even greater transparency for our customer.”

Tesco Director of Agriculture

118 Scott, D, Head of Corporate Services, Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc Personal Communication 1st February 2018
121 McNeill, A. The Co-operative Group Press and Media Manager Personal Communication 30th January 2018
e. The Co-operative Group,

“All Co-op own-brand fresh and frozen meat and poultry sold has been humanely stunned prior to slaughter, and all abattoirs and processing plants supplying our own-brand products are required to work to the standards laid down by our strict animal welfare requirements as well as the Humane Slaughter Association in their Codes of Practice.

We do sell some branded Halal certified meat in a small number of stores where there is sufficient demand, but again this is all pre-stunned prior to slaughter.”

Press and Media Manager (Food)

f. ASDA

“ASDA policy is for meat for our Own Brand products to be from livestock which are stunned prior to slaughter.” 122

Senior Director Sustainability and Sourcing

g. McDonalds

“We listen to our customers in every country where we operate and, as a result, develop food offers that are most relevant to them. While there are diverse customer needs, we base our food development on dominant preferences and customer demands. We do not, therefore, currently offer specialist food options like kosher or halal in the UK.

All the meat sold in our UK and Irish restaurants is reared in accordance to nationally recognised farm assurance scheme including RSPCA Assured, Red Tractor and Bord Bia schemes or their national equivalent for animals reared outside the UK and Ireland.

All animals are required to be stunned prior to slaughter.” 123

McDonald’s UK Agriculture Manager

h. Replies were not received from Sainsburys or Lidl as of 5th February 2018.

122 Brown, C. Asda, Senior Director Sustainability and Sourcing, Personal Communication 5th February 2018
123 Garbutt, P. McDonald’s UK Agriculture Manager. Personal Communication 5th February 2018
Stakeholder position statements: Purchasers

73. Lancashire Council voted to end the use of non-stunned meat in council-run schools in 2017. 124, 125

Parliamentary debate

30 Jan 2018 Written Answers — Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs: Ritual Slaughter

George Eustice The Minister of State, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs: The Government encourages the highest standards of welfare at slaughter. The Government would prefer all animals to be stunned before slaughter, but respects the right of the Jewish and Muslim communities to eat meat prepared in accordance with their religious beliefs.

We have stricter national rules aimed at reducing stress and providing protection for animals slaughtered in accordance with religious rites. These national rules include requirements for sheep, goats and bovines to be slaughtered immediately that they are restrained and not to be released from restraint until they are unconscious and at least 20 seconds have elapsed, in the case of sheep and goats, and at least 30 seconds have elapsed in the case of bovines.

This year the Government is introducing mandatory CCTV recording in slaughterhouses. This will further enable official veterinarians to monitor and verify animal welfare standards in the slaughterhouse and ensure strict adherence to stand still time rules

8 Dec 2017 Written Answers — Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs: Slaughterhouses: Animal Welfare

Kerry McCarthy MP (Lab): To ask the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, if he will launch an investigation into the variation in rates of animal welfare between (a) non-stun halal and (b) other abattoirs.


124 Review of the County Council’s policy relating to the supply of Halal meat to schools by Lancashire County council’s Learning and Skills – Start Well team

125 Lancashire council bans schools from serving pupils non-stunned halal meat
Kerry McCarthy MP (Lab): To ask the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, if the Government will ban non-stun animal slaughter.

25 May 2016 Queen’s Speech - Debate (5th Day)

Lord Trees (Cross Bench): “…there is good evidence that stunning removes unnecessary pain and, in so far as I understand the religious issues, modern stunning methods are compatible with historical religious requirements if the will is there among religious leaders. It is regrettable that the introduction of the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (England) Regulations—the WATOK regulations—in November last year failed to include critical parameters to ensure adequate water-bath stunning of poultry prior to religious slaughter. It is also a matter of great regret that the number of sheep killed without stunning has risen between 2011 and 2013—just two years—by more than half a million animals, based on Food Standards Agency surveys. Irrespective of whether killing involves stunning or not, in order to ensure existing laws are observed at slaughter, compulsory CCTV should be introduced in all abattoirs and the stored record should be available for independent scrutiny.”

15 Dec 2015 Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (England) Regulations 2015 — Motion to Regret

Lord Hodgson: “…this House regrets that, since the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (England) Regulations 2015 do not in all cases specify parameters for electrical water-bath stunning, poultry in England will be afforded a less rigorous level of welfare at slaughter than available in Wales and Northern Ireland (SI 2015/1782).”

4 Mar 2015 Written Answers — Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs: Ritual Slaughter

Frank Field MP: To ask the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, if she will take steps to prevent non-stun slaughter of animals

23 Feb 2015 Backbench business — Animal Welfare (Non-stun Slaughter)

David Jones MP: Why are such a high proportion of sheep and goats being killed by the non-stun method? The figure is 15%, as we have heard, whereas the Jewish and Muslim population of this country accounts for only some 5% of the total population.

4 Nov 2014 Animal Slaughter (Religious Methods)

Neil Parish MP (chair of all-party group on beef and lamb): “It is the all-party group’s belief that labelling should be considered, and it should be on the basis of stun or non-stun methods—not halal versus kosher—because consumers are thought to have a sufficient understanding of what the terms “stunned” or “non-stunned” mean. The group believes, however, that more work can be done to clarify, for consumers of halal and kosher meat, and the wider public, what the terms
entail, specifically. That applies particularly to halal, where there is disagreement about the permissibility of stunning, as I mentioned earlier.

There is a danger that an outright ban on religious slaughter would not improve the welfare of animals at the point of slaughter. At the moment about 80% of the halal meat produced in this country has been stunned. Driving our halal and shechita meat industry abroad to countries without our robust animal welfare standards and our supply chain traceability might result in more animals being slaughtered without stunning.”

16 Jan 2014 Grand committee - Animal Welfare: Methods of Slaughter

Lord Trees: “I make it clear that I am not asking in this debate for non-stun slaughter to be banned. I am not a believer in bans; I would rather that society collectively arrived at decisions about what is acceptable and what is not. However, I sincerely ask the Muslim and Jewish communities and their leaders to reflect and consider whether ancient practices, for which there were good reasons many hundreds of years ago, are necessary today. There are non-lethal, non-invasive methods of stunning, and even if there is disagreement on the extent or duration of pain perception, is it not time to adopt stunning to preclude the possibility of unnecessary suffering—as some Muslim food authorities have allowed?”
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