

**Email correspondence sent to all State and Territory MPs
18/11/2020 alerting them of developments at the Federal level
regarding the [Pet Food Review Working Group](#)**

Dear,

Please see correspondence below and attached regarding government failure to acknowledge and deal with the costs -- hidden in plain sight -- of the junk pet food/veterinary/RSPCA alliance.

Please seek responses from the Attorney General, Treasurer and Ministers for Education, Health and Science.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Lonsdale (veterinarian)

Mob: 0437 2928 00

Date: Thu, 03 Sep 2020 12:58:48 +1000

To: "Bragg, Andrew (Senator)" <Senator.Bragg@aph.gov.au>

From: Tom Lonsdale <tom@rawmeatybones.com>

Subject: RE: Pet Food Review Working Group -- Regulatory Capture

Bcc: \Journosmedia releases\AttorneyGen2018

Dear Senator Bragg,

Thank you for making representations to Minister Littleproud regarding the Pet Food Review Working Group.

Minister Littleproud's 25 August 2020 response (attached) unfortunately appears to be a copy and paste of Senator Davey's 27 July 2020 letter (below).

It is more than unfortunate that the 'safety' of pet food as reviewed by the Working Group fails to look at the fundamental issue: whether highly processed industrial junk products are *per se* safe and in the longer-term health interests of pets.

Anyone who has walked down the pet food aisle of a suburban supermarket or entered the waiting room of a suburban vet knows that Australian pet owners are not effectively provided with a choice, and that greater effort is needed to ensure consumers are aware that choosing amongst highly-processed products is only a 'choice' between competing junk foods, and that there is a better (and far superior) choice.

To put it in simple terms: the Working Group has compared junk foods but has avoided

evaluating whether junk foods are appropriate either at all or as a pet's sole diet.

My view remains that it has done so because it is a captive of the multinational pet food makers -- principally Mars, Nestle and Colgate -- and their veterinary allies. Please see the Pet Food Manufacturers Association of Australia (the companies accused of widespread criminal conduct) [celebrating their influence over Government policy](#).

As per my letters to Senator Davey and the Attorney General below, there are important questions regarding legal liability for mass animal cruelty and consumer fraud that cross several ministerial portfolios.

I respectfully request that you obtain responses from the Attorney General, Treasurer and Ministers for Education, Health and Science.

Thanking you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Lonsdale

CC: Interested parties

At 12:14 PM 11/08/2020, you wrote:

Dear Attorney-General,

Thank you for your 5 August letter (copied below) referring the matters raised to the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment.

I acknowledge that the Department of Agriculture has responsibility for the Pet Food Review Working Group, for animal diets and animal welfare more generally. However, I believe that many aspects of the Department of Agriculture, veterinary profession and RSPCA endorsement of highly processed industrial products as staple diets of pet carnivores has implications for several portfolios including **Education, Treasury (ACCC), Health and Science**.

If we accept that the biological imperative for carnivores, whether wild or domestic, is that they should rip tear and chew at whole prey or something similar in order to: i.) stimulate brain chemicals and thus the immune system, ii.) clean and tone their teeth and oral cavity then we can see that canned and packaged products fail catastrophically.

Further if we accept the biological imperatives regarding the nutrient constituents of the diet of carnivores should be hide, meat, bones and offal of appropriate prey or close mimic of the same, then we must also accept that diets of pulverised grains are intrinsically harmful, cruel to the animals and a fraud upon consumers.

Back in 1993 Dr Douglas Bryden, Director of Sydney University Post Graduate Committee in Veterinary Science was impressed by the remarkable health turnaround for dogs and cats when their diets were changed from commercial junk foods to a more natural diet. He commissioned me to write [a definitive article](#) which included the following passage:

My NSW-based solicitor was asked for an opinion and he advised that the following matters may become issues of relevance in the future.

1. Potential claims by pet owners under various pieces of consumer legislation throughout the States and Territories of Australia.
2. In the Federal sphere potential Trade Practices Act claims for false or misleading claims may be made either in relation to advertising or promotional material or labels.
3. The new Truth in Labelling activities instituted by the Federal Government.
4. Potential problems or claims under the recently introduced Product Liability provisions in Part V of the Trade Practices Act.
5. The, as yet, unknown effect of class actions which have been lawful in Australia since the 5th day of March 1992 which may tend to overcome the existing drawbacks to actions brought by individual pet owners, namely the high cost of litigation and claims which may amount to only several hundreds of dollars in relation to an individual pet.

The foregoing relates to potential claims against manufacturers, distributors and possibly even retailers of processed pet food. Query what may be the legal problems of veterinarians who fail to consider the issues in this paper or fail to address those issues in advising pet owners who make known to the veterinarian that they rely wholly and solely on processed pet food to supply their pets' diet. Is it too much to suggest that, as pet owners, in common with everyone else in the community become more litigious, veterinarians may some day share top billing on a Writ?"

As per my 30 July 2020 email to Senator Davey (below), I have asked where she believes liability resides for the promotion and sale of packaged products.

At this stage, the ACCC (which is within the portfolio of **Treasury**) has informed me that it has no remit for regulating the false and misleading promotion and sale of processed products for daily consumption by pet dogs and cats. This, I believe, is a matter that should be resolved at the earliest.

For the **Education** Department, there's the issue of knowingly teaching veterinary students partial information concerning pet feeding, which information is based almost exclusively on processed products (to the benefit of the processed pet food industries and not the animals) in the [nation's veterinary schools](#). I believe such activity breaches various Acts and regulations in respect to false and misleading conduct and the provisions of the [Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000](#).

The Department of **Health** can reasonably expect that the veterinary profession would play a supportive role in the push for humans to eat minimally processed food most of the time. The Department of Health should also be provided with a wealth of scientific information showing the divergence between health outcomes when pet dogs and cats are fed alternately natural food or highly processed products. Due to the dead hand of the pet food industry/veterinary/RSPCA alliance there is virtually NO such *published* data.

Further, none of the departments of government should be led to believe that the vast number of dog bites are a normal function of modern life when in fact there's data indicating that

[artificial diets predispose dogs to aggressive and dangerous behaviour.](#)

The Department of Industry, **Science**, Energy and Resources should be able to assume the nation's veterinary research and teaching is of the highest order -- not as is currently the case founded on the fallacy that artificial products are nutritious and healthy for pet carnivores. Just dispelling this shameful set of assumptions should release a renaissance of scientific endeavour and understanding. However, first, *all* Government departments must shed their passive acceptance of the 'regulatory capture' of the last 150 years.

Please liaise with your ministerial colleagues and seek cross-party support for a properly constituted enquiry into these important matters that are vital to the health, welfare and economy of Australia.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours faithfully,

Tom Lonsdale

Cc: Interested parties

MC20-025649

5 August 2020

Dear Mr Lonsdale

Thank you for your correspondence of 30 July 2020 to the Attorney-General and Minister for Industrial Relations, the Hon Christian Porter MP, relating to Pet Food Review Working Group. The Attorney-General has provided your correspondence to the Attorney-General's Department for consideration.

The matters you raise do not fall within the Attorney-General's portfolio responsibilities so your correspondence has been referred to the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment for their information and response as appropriate.

The following link may be used should you wish to follow up this matter directly with the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment.

<http://www.agriculture.gov.au/about/contactus>

Regards,

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

Attorney-General's Department

=====

Date: Thu, 30 Jul 2020 15:21:40 +1000

To: Christian.Porter.MP@aph.gov.au

From: Tom Lonsdale <tom@rawmeatybones.com>

Subject: RE: Pet Food Review Working Group -- Regulatory Capture

Bcc: \Journosmedia releases\AttorneyGen2018

Dear Mr Porter,

Please see correspondence below.

Australian pets and their owners need your help.

We welcome you to our premises to see for yourself what needs to be done.

With thanks.

Your sincerely,

Tom Lonsdale

=====

30 July 2020

Dear Senator Davey,

Thank you for your response reaffirming the Government position regarding the Pet Food Review Working Group.

Since the Government Working Group asserts that a diet of processed products is inevitable, suitable and safe for pet carnivores then there becomes a matter of liability if, as is the case, the products are neither suitable nor safe -- when looked at by any objective measure.

I've reattached the email correspondence with the Working Group that shows how focusing on relatively minor matters of product improvement -- whilst ignoring major safety issues -- may assist the manufacturers and vets but does little or nothing for pets and pet owners.

As I see it, there are two significant issues, i.) mass cruelty to pets and ii.) mass defrauding of pet owners, that carry criminal penalties. These issues have been known to Government for some considerable time. As a refresher please see the videos:

- [Stop the Mass Poisoning of Pets by Vets](#)
- [Avenging Kitty](#)
- [Avenging Kitty: Part II](#)

The ABC Investigators programme [exposed the issues in 1993](#).

If, as is currently the case, millions of pets suffer daily torture as a result of their diets and pet owners are encouraged by Government to believe that processed diets are acceptable and owners are then trapped into vicious cycles of veterinary incompetence and over-servicing then where does the liability reside?

Please advise.

For further evidence of the veracity of my allegations please see the 37 submissions to the Senate Inquiry under the heading: [Expert witness statements: Raw meaty bones proponents](#).

My clients, staff and I hope that any future discussions will be founded on facts. Accordingly we invite you and your parliamentary colleagues to visit us at Bligh Park Pet Health Centre.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Lonsdale

Cc: Interested parties

At 08:58 AM 28/07/20, Davey, Perin (Senator) wrote:

Dear Mr Lonsdale,

Thank you for your email of 8 July 2020 expressing your concerns about the Pet Food Review Working Group.

The Pet Food Review Working Group was established in November 2018 at the request of the Hon. David Littleproud MP (then Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources) following a number of pet food safety incidents. The Working Group was tasked with reviewing the recommendations of the 2018 Senate inquiry on the *Regulatory approaches to ensure the safety of pet food* and the current regulatory system governing pet food and to consider options to manage the health and safety of pet food in Australia.

Pet owners have a choice in the type of foods that they feed their pets. The aim of the working group is to ensure that, where owners chose to feed their pets prepared and packaged pet food, it is safe and meets their pets nutritional needs. It also aims to ensure that the regulatory controls in place are appropriate.

You are free to share your personal views that pets should be fed unprocessed food. However, Government consider claims that the working group is compromised by multinational pet food makers and suffers from regulatory capture are not justified.

I trust this information is of assistance.

Kind Regards,

Senator Perin Davey

Senator for New South Wales

The Nationals Whip in the Senate

217 Cressy Street (PO Box 612), Deniliquin NSW 2710

Electorate Office: (02) 9159 9310 | Parliament: (02) 6277 3565

From: Tom Lonsdale [<mailto:tom@rawmeatybones.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, 8 July 2020 4:53 PM

To: senator.davey@

Subject: Pet Food Review Working Group -- Regulatory Capture

Dear Senator Davey,

Please see attachments and message to Minister Littleproud below.

Please support the call for improved pet health and consumer protection -- worth \$billions to

the Australian economy.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Lonsdale

=====

Date: 8 July 2020

Dear Minister Littleproud,

Pet Food Review Working Group -- Regulatory Capture

As you know, I am a veterinarian with 48 years clinical experience. I write in relation to deep concerns about the Pet Food Review Working Group.

Everyone knows that, for humans, an exclusive diet of industrial, highly processed offerings guarantees ill-health and early death. For carnivores, with their special dietary imperatives, the consequences are arguably much worse.

According to the available evidence, the Pet Food Review Working Group:

- makes the assumption that pets, unlike all other wild or domestic animals, must inevitably be fed industrial, highly processed products.
- declines to specify what an optimum diet for domestic carnivores, as dictated by nature, might look like.
- declines to examine the evidence that industrial, highly processed products devastate the health of pets.
- is compromised by its involvement with the multinational pet-food makers, Mars Inc., Nestle and Colgate-Palmolive.
- focuses on relatively minor matters of product improvement acceptable to the multinational corporations.
- bends to the needs and dictates of the multinational corporations and their veterinary allies.
- provides government validation and thus a propaganda vehicle for the manufacturers of harmful dietary products.

ACCC representatives sit on the Working Group. However the ACCC asserts that it has no remit for regulating the suitability and safety of pet food.

Health Department representatives sit on the Working Group. It seems, however, that those representatives have made little or no impression on the Working Group in respect to the ravages of highly processed diets.

On the evidence, it appears that the government Working Group suffers from layers of 'regulatory capture' -- primarily serving the interests of pet-food makers and vets at the expense of pets, pet owners and the wider community.

- 1.) Please see the attached email correspondence, consultants' reports and FOI disclosure. The hyperlinks in the email correspondence provide important background information.
- 2.) Please advise if the government will review the membership and conduct of the Pet Food Review Working Group.
- 3.) Please advise if the government will take the necessary steps to investigate and resolve the widespread animal cruelty and \$multi-billion consumer fraud arising from many years of government neglect and 'regulatory capture'.
- 4.) [Since 1991 it has been well known in veterinary circles that highly processed diets devastate the health of pets.](#) Will the government commission a rigorous examination of the scientific and medical issues free from direct or indirect sponsorship and affiliations with the pet food industry?
- 5.) Please indicate the reasons for your decisions.

With thanks.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Lonsdale

Bligh Park Pet Health Centre
48 Rifle Range Road
South Windsor
NSW 2756

Tel: 02 4577 7061

Email: tom@rawmeatybones.com

CC Interested parties

Kitty, twelve year old Pomeranian victim of Mars Inc. junk food. Kitty's rotten, stinking mouth illustrative of the torture faced by millions of pets everyday of their miserable lives.

