

original submission, the **prevalence of unauthorised activity** on Victorian farms and related industries is only exposed through the undercover work of animal advocates and whistleblowers. The **new evidence** confirms this.

In my original submission dated 1 August 2019, I also emphasised that in the context of **biosecurity** and antimicrobial resistance, intensive animal agriculture is the greatest threat (see my original submission under points 2 and 4 addressing terms of reference b and f). The **new evidence** of the illegal slaughterhouse provides further proof of serious **biosecurity** breaches.

Indeed, it is because the illegal/unauthorised activities of the animal agriculture industry and related industries is covert and, even when exposed by animal advocates/whistleblowers, not given the same exposure as other illegal activity, ALL submissions made on behalf of the animals are at a significant disadvantage from the outset compared to the submissions made by the animal agriculture industry and related industries (and their supporters). Those acting on behalf of the animals only have knowledge of illegal activity that is exposed when it is exposed, whereas those in the animal agriculture industry and related industries who know (or ought reasonably know) about illegal activity not only fail to disclose it but also deny it. I believe that this must be taken into account when considering the submissions.

Submitted by Robert Bates, 2 August 2019