

The Sheiling,  
London Road,  
Sholden,  
Deal  
Kent CT14 0AD  
2<sup>nd</sup> October 2013

Adam Broderick,  
DEFRA,  
CCU 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Nobel House,  
Smith Square,  
London SW1P 3JR

Dear Sir

Ref: -DW0322567

I would like to answer the letter you sent me in September in reply to an e mail sent to you on the 5<sup>th</sup> of that month.

Firstly, the reason we understand the regime of Animal Health run a 'one in three' policy of checks on the transporters at the port of Dover is because we were told by the authorities i.e. David Heath or his minions, that there would be a 30% check at the port after a supervised loading. To us that means roughly 1 in 3 vehicles.

From our observations we have also noted that this also appears to be 1 in 3 vehicles but, of course, that just could be how it looks to the observer sat on the cliffs with binoculars and cameras.

Secondly, on the night in question it appeared, to our observers, that Workman, third vehicle to enter the port that night in the convoy of four was being called into the inspection shed when suddenly it was waved through and vehicle number 4 was stopped. Maybe we jumped to conclusions but understandably so.

Thirdly, we can only report what we see, and there were over 50 people there that night who felt the same, the animals looked sick and dehydrated. We are not all balaclava wearing yobs and many were professional people, as we are. That we can only report what our eyes see must be what is reported!!!

You refer to the fact that there was no terrible stench, however everyone there including the Kent Police Liason Officer commented on the smell of this vehicle and we have smelt many vehicles in the 18 years we have done this. We understand the sheep were unloaded in Kent, had a 6 day stand and then returned to point of origin but forgive our suspicions when the very same vehicle returned on the night of the 6<sup>th</sup> September after being held up on the Dartford crossing for some 7 hours during the bomb scare on that night. Suspicions brought about by the speed he managed to get a new load as he was on the

road before 3pm that afternoon. Very convenient he was able to find another 500 sheep so quickly ready for export.

Under freedom of information my wife received a letter from your records department stating that this consignment was loaded at 03.30am in the morning prior to the sailing in the evening that it was refused at. It stated that the inspector who was to do the supervised loading was taken ill and due to the early hour a replacement was unable to be found.

I sympathise with this inspector but ask what on earth were the animals doing from 03.30hrs until they arrived at Dover at 18.23hrs in the evening? May I suggest that this was the reason for the 'terrible stench' because from these timings the animals had been on this vehicle nearly 15 hours and after inspection and refusal and then return to suitable facilities we were looking at nearer 18 hours. I know you will say they are allowed to be on a total of 29 hours but we, in our stupid concerns, feel this is far too long no matter what legislation in Brussels says. I ask if you have ever been at the port and witnessed with your own senses the look and smell of these animals or are you relying on the senses of others for your remarks made from an office desk?

Finally, you say there has NEVER been a promise of 100% inspections at the port. I think you will find that Elliott Morley, in the last Government, made such a promise which was changed in 2006 by the retiring head of Animal Health at that time because of staff pressures.

Since the start of the operation at Dover up to the 6<sup>th</sup> of September there have been 15 sailings of the Joline carrying a total of 55 transporters. From a question asked in the House by Charlie Elphike, our MP, up to that time there had been a total of 7 non compliance certificates issued and one refusal. If you work this out using the 30% checks at the port this means nearly half the vehicles checked had non compliance certificates issued. Even you must agree that nearly 50% of 30% is high in anyone's standards. We ask just how many would have been issued should there have been 100% checks? This is of course with 100% supervised loadings. You must agree we have cause for concerns.

Yours Faithfully

I.F.Birchall