

**Joint submission from the  
Jersey Milk Marketing Board and  
Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society**

In relation to

**Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel  
Review of Animal Welfare & Control including the Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202-  
(P.97/2025)**

The Dairy Industry in Jersey is committed to the very highest standards of animal welfare. It is practitioners in the industry who best recognise that the success of our enterprise is based on well-managed, healthy and content animals.

This can be demonstrated by the requirement for farms supplying Jersey Dairy to have regular veterinary consultations to not only treat animals as required, but also to ensure pro-active management of the herd to maintain the health and welfare to optimum standards.

The cattle population in Jersey enjoys the highest health status, as independently certified by the UK based CHeCS programme ([Cattle Health Certification Scheme](#)). We are very grateful for the support given by the Government of Jersey Veterinary Service, and the veterinary surgeons in private practice, in helping us to maintain such high standards. The liaison, advice and work of the States Vet, Susana Ramos, and her team is much appreciated.

There are a few points on which we should like clarification in the DRAFT ANIMAL WELFARE (JERSEY) LAW 202-, as follows:

1. Part 1 Article 4 – Responsibility for Animals

The draft law reads:

*In animal welfare legislation -*

*(a) subject to sub-paragraph (b)(iii), the owner of an animal is always a person who is responsible for that animal;*

*(b) a reference to a person responsible for an animal*

*(i) applies whether the person is permanently or temporarily responsible;*

*(ii) includes a person who is in charge of the animal at the time that is relevant; and*

*(iii) means, if the owner of the animal is a child, the child's parent or guardian.*

It is potentially ambiguous as to who has ultimate responsibility, the owner or a person (presumably a **competent** person) to whom the owner has contracted responsibility, i.e. a keeper. We should avoid confusion between legal title (ownership) and responsibility for care (keepership). It should be clearly the keeper who is responsible.

In other legislation there is a clear distinction between the responsibilities of an owner versus those of a keeper. For example, Diseases of Animals (Pigs, Goats and Sheep Registration, Identification and Movement) (Jersey) Order 2007.

An example of unintended impact could be to the thriving junior membership of the RJA&HS in which young people own and compete their own animals at shows. Many of these animals reside in a herd belonging to someone other than their parents, and we would not wish to see this inadvertently discouraged.

## 2. Part 4 Article 15 – Offences in relation to straying animals

The draft law reads:

*A person responsible for livestock commits an offence if livestock stray into a public place and that person –*

- (a) fails to co-operate with an inspector to remove the livestock to a safe place; or*
- (b) fails to take all reasonable steps to immediately secure the livestock in that public place.*

It is presumed that the intention of the draft legislation is to enable action to be taken against any keepers of livestock who habitually allow their stock to stray, either through negligence in containment or poor management. It is important to understand that there can be multiple reasons for straying, including; storm damage to fencing, deliberate and malicious removal of fencing equipment, and the mere fact that grazing animals have an instinct to 'move on' as they graze.

All keepers of animals will experience straying from time to time and it is important that distinction is drawn between habitual offenders and the occasional incident. The wording of this article potentially leaves too much to the opinion of the inspector. Especially as the penalties are severe. It should be clear that action would be reserved for habitual rather than occasional offenders.

There is the potential for unintended consequences resulting from farm liability insurance requiring permanent fencing that would; change the face of the Jersey countryside, prove extremely costly, and interfere with the good agricultural practice of rotational grazing.

## 3. Part 7 Article 34 – Orders

The draft law reads:

*The Minister may by Order make provision – .....*

- (2) (g) to prohibit, or further regulate, activities relating to animals, and operations on and treatments of animals;*

It would be helpful to know what orders are in force, or likely to be in force, and how any changes would be consulted upon and what right of challenge there would be.

There are many routine activities that are undertaken in livestock management that could become subject to an order. Examples include; disbudding calves, removal of blind teats from cows, teeth clipping piglets, tail docking lambs, pinioning fowl. There is potential for individuals to introduce restrictions without a formal consultation process.

## 4. Part 7 Article 35 – Codes of Practice

Is it necessary for Jersey to have to produce its own codes of practice, when many are available already, and does this not add to costs of government.

16<sup>th</sup> January 2026

*P Le Maistre*

Philip Le Maistre  
Chairman  
Jersey Milk Marketing Board

*P M Houzé*

Paul Houzé  
President  
Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society