

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 January 2018 10:39:14
To: Public Engagement Unit
Subject: FW: Letter attached

Attachments: Fergus E letter 0118.pdf

For MACCs, diary case for Ms Cunningham

[REDACTED] to Fergus Ewing MSP, Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy and Connectivity
The Scottish Government
2N.11 St Andrew's House | Regent Road | Edinburgh | EH1 3DG
Tel: [REDACTED] Email: CabSecRec@gov.scot<mailto:CabSecRec@gov.scot>

Please check our updated Ministerial Preferences<<http://saltire/my-workplace/ministerial-preferences-and-support/Rural-Economy-and-Connectivity/Pages/Fergus-Ewing.aspx>>.

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to another official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Office do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]@parliament.scot] On Behalf Of Ewing F (Fergus), MSP
Sent: 28 January 2018 13:21
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy and Connectivity
Subject: FW: Letter attached

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 24 January 2018 17:38
To: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP
<Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>>
Subject: Letter attached

[REDACTED]
I hope this finds you well.

Letter attached.

Kindest Regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

To join: [REDACTED]

*

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of
Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot<<http://www.parliament.scot>> :
facebook.com/scottishparliament<<http://facebook.com/scottishparliament>> :
twitter.com/scotparl<<http://twitter.com/ScotParl>>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this
email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>



24/01/2018

Technical review of the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002

Fergus,

I hope that you had a wonderful festive break and managed to get some respite from the day job...It all seems such a long time ago.

I write to ask for a short appointment to discuss the progress of the ScotsGovs review and subsequent consultation on the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002.

You are aware that Lord Bonomy was commissioned to review the protection offered to wild mammals under the Act not to debate fox hunting. Rightly or not, this debate was resolved in the Scottish Parliament with the implementation of the 2002 Act.

Lord Bonomys recommendations are mainly of a technical nature and concentrate on the wording of the Act in a bid to make it clearer for both practitioners and legal enforcement as opposed to restriction or indeed an outright ban.

I am concerned that the hysteria generated by Animal Rights organisations and Alison Johnstone MSPs hijacking of the consultation process will confuse the issue and lead many into a debate on the morals and ethics of fox hunting.

At a time when rural communities in Scotland face so many challenges, not least the fundamental changes that Brexit will bring, it is quite extraordinary that any politicians are giving serious consideration to returning to the pointless pursuit of hunting.

It would be a sad day for the Scottish Parliament, and Scottish politicians, if the long-settled issue of hunting with hounds were to return to the top of the political agenda.

I look forward to your response

Kind Regards

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 26 February 2019 19:20
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Scottish Hunting Law

Another not for me. F

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 26 February 2019 at 18:56:13 GMT
To: "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: Scottish Hunting Law

Dear Mr.Ewing

As all of us involved with foxhunting know, the present law as it stands in Scotland provides an effective and the most humane method of controlling foxes. I personally have evidence of horrendous suffering to foxes caused by snares and wounds from gunfire. However efficient gamekeepers (and others) may claim to be with their modern night-sights etc., they rarely stray from roads & tracks for safety reasons in the dark. Foxes are very astute and will avoid vehicle noise. If we wish to retain the appearance of our countryside, especially in the hill & upland parts, sheep make an invaluable contribution. I have heard instances this year of hoggets, not only lambs, being attacked by foxes. With the Govt.'s increasing push for more afforestation - the ideal haven for foxes - a crisis is looming.

I despair of the biggotted ignorance of some of those elected representatives of the Scottish people.

[Redacted]

Sent from Outlook

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

[Redacted]

24/3/19

Dear Fergus Ewing MSP

I am writing to register my concern over the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

I understand that whilst some of the recommendations of the Lord Bonomo report have been supported, it appears that his most important one has been dismissed ie regarding limiting the number of hounds to 2 for mounted packs. Not only does this contradict Bonomo's recommendations but contradicts the only published science by 'Naylor and Knott' who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack. Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the 'Uplands', but no-where else.

The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer Mr Edgar gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year which is not acceptable. Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting its services. In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand.

Horses are an important focus for the Border community and hunting plays a very important part in this. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders way of life and economy. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow local hunts. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It would appear that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the south of Scotland and allowing it in the 'Uplands' smacks wholly of prejudice and people who live and work in the Scottish Borders are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us and ensure that this proposal does not happen

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 28 March 2019 11:43
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: SNP Fox Control Bill

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 28 March 2019 at 10:19:11 GMT
To: "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: SNP Fox Control Bill

Dear Mr Ewing

I am writing to express my concern and shock over the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs in Scotland.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and undoubtedly money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy which seems to have been kicked into touch. The proposal of going out on fox control with only two hounds is ludicrous and would prolong the time of searching and flushing considerably.

The idea of allowing packs of hounds only in the 'Uplands', seems prejudice against any horse riders. We lose countless lambs here in the Borders too and need the efficiency of the whole pack of hounds.

Horses and hunting is a vital part of Border life. There is a huge range of people from all walks of life it would effect if we weren't able to meet, enjoy our horses, educate young horses over rough terrain and encourage children in their riding skills, keeping them off the streets and off their phones and iPads. Proper exercise in fresh air and integrating with older generations.

Those of us who understand and enjoy country life, feel angry and let down by the prejudice against us. The Government are not listening to our side of the argument. I have retired from riding but I still enjoy following and hope my grandchildren will be able to continue to benefit from all aspects of hunting life.

All of us who ride or have ridden horses in the Borders following Hounds admiring the skills of huntsmen and efficiency of the hounds are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. PLEASE support us.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 27 March 2019 18:08
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: SNP Fox Control Bill

Another. F

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 27 March 2019 at 18:00:46 GMT
To: "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: **SNP Fox Control Bill**

Dear Sir/Madam,

Foxes need to be controlled. So do badgers, their apex predators are missing.

Attempting to flush foxes out of cover with only 2 hounds is a waste of time. In terms of limits, 30 would be a better number.

The equestrian culture is an important tradition of the Borders. The Victor of Waterloo said that border Horsemen were the best light cavalry in Europe. Common Ridings in summer and hunting in winter maintain this tradition.

If we are to attract tourists, our traditions need to be upheld. One of these is hunting foxes by the traditional method. It is quite effective, relatively humane and allows the fox population to be monitored.

It should be encouraged by government.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 27 March 2019 11:04
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: SNP Fox control bill

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 27 March 2019 at 10:36:15 GMT
To: Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot
Subject: SNP Fox control bill

Dear Fergus Ewing

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by 'Naylor and Knott' who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack.

Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the 'Uplands', but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer [Redacted] gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs

of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services.

As I understand it, there were nearly 19,000 responses to the consultation, of which 18,497 (98%) were from 5 online campaigns where the respondents could not be identified, and who probably did not even live in Scotland. 290 (2%) were substantive replies and 298 and 25 organisation's had the courage and decency to supply their names and addresses. Is this really democracy at work?

In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand.

Horses are an important focus for the Border community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the Buccleuch Hunt. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the south of Scotland and allowing it in the 'Uplands' is totally illogical and flies in the face of your own reports. Those of us who ride horses in the Borders are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 23 March 2019 13:50
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: SNP Fox Control Bill

Follow Up Flag: Fwd to PEU 25/3
Flag Status: Flagged

Another

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 23 March 2019 at 13:11:47 GMT
To: "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: FW: SNP Fox Control Bill

Dear Mr Ewing

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by 'Naylor and Knott'

who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack.

Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the 'Uplands', but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer [Redacted] gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services.

As I understand it, there were nearly 19,000 responses to the consultation, of which 18,497 (98%) were from 5 online campaigns where the respondents could not be identified, and who probably did not even live in Scotland. 290 (2%) were substantive replies and 298 and 25 organisation's had the courage and decency to supply their names and addresses. Is this really democracy at work?

In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand.

Horses are an important focus for the Border community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the Buccleuch Hunt. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the

south of Scotland and allowing it in the 'Uplands' smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. Those of us who ride horses in the Borders are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland

Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : [facebook.com/scottishparliament](https://www.facebook.com/scottishparliament) : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 23 March 2019 13:50
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: SNP Fox Control Bill

Follow Up Flag: Fwd to PEU 25/3

Flag Status: Flagged

Another

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 23 March 2019 at 13:11:47 GMT
To: "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: FW: SNP Fox Control Bill

Dear Mr Ewing

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by 'Naylor and Knott'

who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack.

Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the 'Uplands', but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer [Redacted] gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services.

As I understand it, there were nearly 19,000 responses to the consultation, of which 18,497 (98%) were from 5 online campaigns where the respondents could not be identified, and who probably did not even live in Scotland. 290 (2%) were substantive replies and 298 and 25 organisation's had the courage and decency to supply their names and addresses. Is this really democracy at work?

In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand.

Horses are an important focus for the Border community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the Buccleuch Hunt. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the

south of Scotland and allowing it in the 'Uplands' smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. Those of us who ride horses in the Borders are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland

Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 22 March 2019 17:43
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: SNP Fox Control Bill

Another one

F

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 22 March 2019 at 17:41:39 GMT
To: "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: SNP Fox Control Bill

Dear Fergus,

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by 'Naylor and Knott' who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack.

Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the 'Uplands', but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer Mr Edgar gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services.

As I understand it, there were nearly 19,000 responses to the consultation, of which 18,497 (98%) were from 5 online campaigns where the respondents could not be identified, and who probably did not even live in Scotland. 290 (2%) were substantive replies and 298 and 25 organisation's had the courage and decency to supply their names and addresses. Is this really democracy at work?

In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand.

Horses are an important focus for the Border community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the south of Scotland and allowing it in the 'Uplands' smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. I would urge you to support us.

Yours sincerely [Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 10 April 2019 13:04
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Wild Mammals Act

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 10 April 2019 at 13:03:04 BST
To: "Oliver.Mundell.msp@parliament.scot" <Oliver.Mundell.msp@parliament.scot>, "Finlay.Carson.msp@parliament.scot" <Finlay.Carson.msp@parliament.scot>, "John.Scott.msp@parliament.scot" <John.Scott.msp@parliament.scot>, "Willie.Coffey.msp@parliament.scot" <Willie.Coffey.msp@parliament.scot>, "Iain.Gray.msp@parliament.scot" <Iain.Gray.msp@parliament.scot>, "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>, "Brian.Whittle.msp@parliament.scot" <Brian.Whittle.msp@parliament.scot>, "Colin.Smyth.msp@parliament.scot" <Colin.Smyth.msp@parliament.scot>, "Paul.Wheelhouse.msp@parliament.scot" <Paul.Wheelhouse.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: Wild Mammals Act

Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that the Scottish Government plans to amend the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act to effectively ban the control of fox populations by packs of hounds. My strong feelings on this matter compel me to you write in support of foxhunting.

The facts put forward supporting hunting with hounds for the necessary control of a fox population are well known and I am sure I need not dwell these. However, there are other strong reasons for supporting hunting as a rural business and social activity that may escape the notice of those only interested in preserving the lives of foxes at any expense.

The economic benefits of hunting are many, and those who see foxhunting as a battleground between the haves and the have nots are missing the point. In rural southern Scotland we have a unique economic situation with few large employers. Every pound spent locally helps small businesses stay at the heart of rural life and communities, supporting those who live in the countryside. Hunts are also proud fundraisers for local charities. People support hunts in many ways, not just on horseback but the privilege of following a hunt on a horse takes a significant amount of financial input. This money is spent locally in equestrian and other small businesses. Hunting has

a strong historic and current relationship with horse racing. Scottish racing is on the up. In my area the Borders College is planning courses to serve the industry so that our young people can cash in on this boom. Those set for a career in racing will lose out if hunting comes to an end. For these reasons I would argue that thriving Hunts should be seen as an indicator of economic success in the Borders.

The social aspect of hunting cannot be ignored. There is no one social project that will solve the problems of mental health, social isolation and access to services in small communities. Every small effort counts here. The bonds and relationships formed within hunts extend into everyday life, with people taking care of their neighbours and friends. The benefits to physical and mental health of hunting, however you follow or support, are huge. Hunts organise events throughout the year providing social contact within their communities. Hunting brings people together, old and young, from every background, and contributes to a rich and inclusive rural life in a unique way. On a personal level, my teenage daughter has enjoyed her first season as a mounted follower. She certainly hasn't been protected from the significant issues affecting young people today by the fact that her parents work hard and provide a comfortable life. However, on winter Saturday all her troubles melt away and it is a pleasure to have seen her grow in confidence and develop, coming home tired and happy after a day with the Buccleuch. They have been the kindest most welcoming bunch of folk you would ever wish to meet.

As a veterinary surgeon I undertake to be an advocate for animal welfare. It might seem incongruous that I support hunting foxes with hounds. Over the course of a long career I have reconciled my passion for welfare with the fact that, like it or not, animals live in a human world. We are their carers and we decide their fate, be this life or death. The best that we can do is allow them to live a natural life, one that would be of their choosing, and afford them a quick and humane death. In the course of my work, I regularly see animals suffer at the hands of the well-meaning but ill informed. I fully support previous changes to the Act, banning the killing of foxes by hounds. All hunts must always carry out their activities within the law. However, the proposed changes will not affect in any way how a fox sees his world, and will have minimal, if any, benefit in enhancing his welfare. The need for management of a fox population is undisputed. A wild animal that has lived a healthy life, which ends after a short period of stress with single clean shot is the lucky one. Mounted packs have a vested interest in conserving a fox population. If fox hunting with hounds is banned, foxes will be controlled by people who have no interest in whether the population is wiped out or not. Fox control will essentially be unregulated, unmonitored and carried out away from the public eye. The guarantee that comes with hunts being seen to be respectful of animal welfare will be lost.

Throughout the evolution of man, hunters have recognised that their continuing ability to survive relies on conservation of resources. This is as important today as it was for prehistoric hunters. Supporters of hunting with hounds are a vital resource in caring for our rural landscape and conserving wildlife habitat. Hedgerows, coverts, and a variety of crops are grown to

provide habitat for wildlife from prey to predators. A healthy varied landscape that is pleasing to the eye and provides supporters with day of thrills and spills is the same one that allows predators and prey to thrive. A thriving countryside benefits us all. People who enjoy country sports know their landscape intimately and this knowledge needs to be cherished and passed on before it is lost forever. Hunting plays a huge part in this. The conservation of our Border landscape, and the conservation of knowledge and lore of those living, working and playing in it is supported by hunting.

When it comes to the positive contribution made to Border life by hunts, I struggle to find a comparison. Hunting in its current form, with scrupulous regard for animal welfare, should be preserved at all costs and I urge you to see beyond attempts by the politically correct to bring this way of life to an end. The proposed changes to the Act are an underhand way of bringing foxhunting with a pack of hounds to an end. Those proposing and supporting these changes are not those who stand to lose by them and changes to the current legislation will damage the lives of country folk irrevocably. In the words of a famous song "you don't know what you've got 'til it's gone". I ask you, please, to give serious consideration to the deeper issues when deciding whether or not to support changes to the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act.

Kind regards,

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 27 March 2019 17:56
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Fox Control Bill

Another one. F

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 27 March 2019 at 15:55:21 GMT
To: Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot
Subject: Fox Control Bill

Dear Mr Ewing,

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by 'Naylor and Knott' who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack.

Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the 'Uplands', but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer [Redacted] gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services.

In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand.

Horses are an important focus for the Border community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of

this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the Buccleuch Hunt. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the south of Scotland and allowing it in the 'Uplands' smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. Those of us who ride horses in the Borders are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : [facebook.com/scottishparliament](https://www.facebook.com/scottishparliament) : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 27 March 2019 17:55
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Fox Control Bill

ANother one F

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 27 March 2019 at 17:38:33 GMT
To: <fergus.ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: Fox Control Bill

Mr Ewing,

It would appear that the present Scottish Government are hell-bent on destroying the rural countryside that they, supposedly, represent. The U-turn they have just taken regarding the Fox Control Bill is a fine example.

Lord Bonython's Report was thorough and a great deal of time was spent by meeting and speaking to all involved and listening to all sides. Unlike the recent online campaigns where anyone can respond – and not be identified, how very useful to the bean counters.

The Scottish Borders has a history steeped in horses and rural pursuits, and many people still owe their living to the equine world – whether it be farriers, vets or fox control staff.

The Buccleuch Hunt is supported by many branches of the local community – dentists, plumbers and undertakers to name but a few.

The Scottish Government seem to have a seriously biased, and certainly not democratic, agenda on Fox Control and, personally, I think it shows itself in a very poor light.

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : [facebook.com/scottishparliament](https://www.facebook.com/scottishparliament) : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 23 March 2019 12:22
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: FOX CONTROL WITH DOGS

Another one. F

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]

Date: 23 March 2019 at 11:49:26 GMT

To: Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot

Subject: FOX CONTROL WITH DOGS

Dear Mr Ewing,

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by 'Naylor and Knott' who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack.

Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the 'Uplands', but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer [Redacted] gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services.

As I understand it, there were nearly 19,000 responses to the consultation, of which 18,497 (98%) were from 5 online campaigns where the respondents could not be

The Borders are home to 6 of the 9 packs of foxhounds. If the fox control were to stop in this area it could have a profound impact on the rural community and businesses. There is a huge cross section of people who partake in the fox control and many who do not ride but support from their cars or on foot. It is a time when the community including all manner of tradesmen, nurses, farmers, pensioners, business's, undertakers come together to support each other with functions surrounding the Hunts as the common thread.

This idea of banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the Border area but allowing it elsewhere is totally illogical - I am feeling totally let down by the Scottish Government and would urge you to look hard at this proposal. Please do support us for the sake of the fox welfare and the rural community.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

identified, and who probably did not even live in Scotland. 290 (2%) were substantive replies and 298 and 25 organisation's had the courage and decency to supply their names and addresses. Is this really democracy at work?

In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand. Horses are an important focus for the Border community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the Buccleuch Hunt. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the south of Scotland and allowing it in the 'Uplands' smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. Those of us who ride horses in the Borders are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us.

Yours sincerely.

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : [facebook.com/scottishparliament](https://www.facebook.com/scottishparliament) : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 25 April 2019 13:34
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Fox Pest Control

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 25 April 2019 at 13:15:06 BST
To: Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot
Subject: Fox Pest Control

Dear Fergus

Fox Hunting for pest control & the proposal to limit foxhunting to 2 hounds

This is a huge mistake for the following reasons and Lord Banomy's report seems to be being ignored by the Scottish Parliament

Efficiency of pest control with hounds

2 hounds can no way flush out foxes to the gun in the way that a pack of hounds can.

Financing pest control with hounds

The field (riders on horses), the hunt supporters and foot followers, hunt horse shows and point to points (run by volunteer staff who love hunting) all help pay for the upkeep of the hunt staff and the hounds.

If limited to 2 hounds, not only will it be far less efficient, but who is going to pay for the upkeep? It will be of far less interest to hunting folk and so a valuable service to farmers may well be lost.

Countryside interest

Hunt followers love hunting for all sorts of reasons, helping with pest control whilst preserving the fox population in sensible numbers, sport, the exercise and horse control, riding out with all the other followers and making lots of friends from all walks of life, appreciation of the countryside. It is a way of life old as the hills and gives a meaning to dreary winter weather.

Countryside Finances

It provides income (not that easy in the countryside of the Borders) for many people indirectly involved with the hunt at a time of year when little else is going on: blacksmiths, vets, horse liveries, horse breeders, horse hirers, food outlets and caterers, horse box sellers and garages etc.

Countryside layout

The countryside is laid out in a way with the help of farmers, to keep small woodlands for shelter belts, hunting and shooting. The beauty in Borders is a therefore a wonderful mixture of parkland style farm land for crops and crazing and moorland with amazing views for sheep, for walking, for riding, mountain biking, with a limited amount of forestry, which everyone can enjoy. Blanket forestry, tempting if no shooting or hunting, would destroy all this for all.

Social Issue

It is believed that a lot of people are anti 'hunting with horses' as they believe it is a 'snobs' sport, a sport done by the idle rich! (but jolly few of those anymore). This could not be further from the truth. Hunting provides a really good social mix. Country people from all walks of life enjoy hunting and all the different aspects of it.

The Scottish Parliament, in particular the SNP, need to try and understand the way countryside life works and how everything is interlinked giving a rich pattern of activities and social life and to make sure that there is no law limiting the number of hounds to 2!!

Kind regards

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 27 March 2019 09:51
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Hunting Act

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 27 March 2019 at 09:30:12 GMT
To: "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: Hunting Act

Dear Fergus

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by 'Naylor and Knott' who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack.

Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the 'Uplands', but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer [Redacted] gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services.

In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand.

Horses are an important focus for the Borders community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the Buccleuch Hunt. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities; amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the south of Scotland and allowing it in the 'Uplands' smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. Those of us who ride horses in the Borders are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

Sent from my iPad

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 25 April 2019 13:34
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Hunting Review

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 25 April 2019 at 13:11:24 BST
To: "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: Hunting Review

I understand that the Scottish parliament is due to introduce legislation following the Lord Bonomy review of the Protection of Wild Mammals Act 2002. I further understand that this independent review was commissioned by the parliament and paid for out of public funds. The initial indications seem to be that the parliament is going to ignore the findings of the review and limit the flushing of foxes to the guns to two hounds.

I wish to raise two points.

Firstly, it is clear from the Lord Bonomy's review that it does not support reducing the number of hounds used to flush a fox to just two. I cannot accept that any Body would commission a Report then fail to abide by and follow its findings. This is a flagrant misuse of parliamentary time and public funds.

Secondly, I have lived in the Scottish Borders for almost 25 years. During that time I have hunted with and supported the Lauderdale Hunt, a farmers' hunt which provides a free vermin control service. Foxes are vermin and cause a lot of financial losses not just to farmers but also to gamekeepers. In the Borders, farming and shooting are substantial industries providing many jobs and support to other businesses. The various Borders Hunts are a vital support to these industries, as well as themselves bringing income and jobs into the area. If the packs of hounds are to be substantially reduced, the Hunts would not be sustainable and the free vermin service would be lost along with many jobs and much income to the Borders economy.

I urge you follow Lord Bonomy's Review and leave the existing law as it is.

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 23 March 2019 10:42
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Letter - Animal Welfare

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 23 March 2019 at 09:39:46 GMT
To: Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot
Subject: Letter - Animal Welfare

Dear Fergus,

I write in concern over recent announcements from Mairi Gougeon, Minister for Rural Affairs & The Natural Environment with her intentions to reduce the numbers of dogs used to help control foxes. Lord Bonython in his review conducted on behalf of The Scottish Government states the necessity of a pack of dogs (approx 25) to help search for foxes which are then flushed to gunmen and shot. **Mairi implies a change to two dogs, this will not work and will result in poor animal welfare for the fox,** science experts (Naylor & Knot) fear a fox could be hunted five times longer with two hounds, also acknowledged in Lord Bonython's report.

I was raised in the Scottish Borders on a small sheep farm with a handful of hens for our own egg collection. Our hens were killed by foxes and every year lambs taken by foxes from the fields. Recent evidence given by Lowland hill farmer [Redacted] quoted 100 lambs plus are killed yearly by foxes on his hill farm. The fox is seen by many as a cuddly teddy bear replica taking pity on a hunted animal. However a fox is classified by the Government as vermin for all reasons stated including interference with ground nesting birds. Myself and the public love animals but for Scottish farmers producing quality Scottish food for our nation humane fox control is paramount. Other allowed methods incl trapping/snaring, shooting at nighttime are less humane by comparison; snaring can be a slow death, night time shooting is not guaranteed accurate in darker conditions. Dogs go centuries back, mans oldest hunting acquaintance and like police dogs and mountain rescue dogs are highly effective at finding their quarry, in this instance the fox then flushing to guns. The process happens during daylight by a leader i.e. the huntsman and his capable team - foxes are responsibly culled maintaining a **balanced and healthy fox population.**

I now live and work in Edinburgh, my children at a local state school in Leith. From time spent in the city I witness the detachment urban people have with the countryside and where their food comes from, yet are the first to challenge our farmers and practises. Yes, there can be improvements to farming but why change a fox control method using dogs flushing foxes to guns that works. I would not support this method of fox control if it were ineffective and inhumane.

Mairi implies she will grant licences to the 'Uplands', but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Fox control by packs of dogs/hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers requesting these services.

The flawed response the Government consultation received from 18,497 unidentifiable respondents generated by five online campaigns not giving their names or details compared to the reputed organisations and individuals that did needs to be questioned. Hardly democratic when gathering evidence?

A local community, as with any area is integral and this is evident with fox control, these days people from every walk of life, every generation and from varied political backgrounds all mix together to support. Folk follow on foot, mountain bikes, horses and motorbikes taking this opportunity to access their love of the countryside. Public interest despises historical upper class fox hunting rituals, fortunately no longer but unfortunately misconstrued by opponents.

I appreciate your time reading this letter and hope it will bear some influence.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 25 May 2018 20:43
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: On the ground
Attachments: Fox Hunting Permission response [Redacted].pdf; ATT00001.htm; Response to G Dey MSP SEC-18-23.pdf; ATT00002.htm; response to G Dey MSP re SEC-18-23 Follow up email.pdf; ATT00003.htm

I wish briefing on this from FE FCS

Obviously foxes must be controlled

I wish to make sure I fully understand what has been the approach to this

I have raised this matter before in other areas and have as a result reached a good outcome and wish the same here

F

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Dey G (Graeme), MSP" <Graeme.Dey.msp@parliament.scot>
To: "Ewing F (Fergus), MSP" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: On the ground

Fergus

Hope you don't mind me bringing this to your attention.

It relates to an estate in my constituency that is an example of exactly how you would want such a business to operate.

The attached outlines my exchanges with FCS and failed attempts to find a sensible compromise.

Below, reproduced as sent to me, is from the head keeper/manager of the estate within the last few days.

The final letter from FCS means there can be no compromise because of the identified presence of Wildcats.

And I get that.

But [Redacted] email lays out what that means in practice for a responsible land manager.

I care passionately about enhancing our natural environment and protecting biodiversity but when threatened species of ground nesting birds are in jeopardy because FCS are not dealing with vermin then something surely needs to give.

I'm not seeking an intervention from you on this. But I promised [Redacted] I would share details of the impact in the hope that might lead to commonsense prevailing in future such cases.

Have a good weekend.

Graeme

Graeme

"So foxes and the forestry, this one is not going to go away. I feel the need to keep you informed on such things. Very few have a clue on real countryside matters, and you have become my ear to burn on such matters, sorry. You do however have some understanding of some of the burning issues, and are in a position to influence what happens next.

You will remember the story, I seek permission to run hounds through the commission woods pre lambing / nesting, Forestry say no due to presents of wildcats etc etc, they tell us they are killing foxes and all is well.

Here's the reality, [Redacted] here who has just become a father again at 48 (not recommend!!) has spent at least half of the thirty odd nights [Redacted] on the hillside in a sleeping bag trying to kill foxes that are taking sanctuary with the FCS wood of [Redacted]. Why, because I fully understand and have witnessed the destruction these animals cause to ground nesting bird whilst they feed their young. There are at least three foxes currently hunting from within the forestry into neighbouring land.

Number one priority for me is to have a shootable surplus of grouse each summer, that is what keeps me and the six other full timers here in jobs and homes. Key to this is vigorous and thorough legal vermin control. Bye product of this, is an abundance of waders.

Here's my point, a privately funded half educated project protecting cats that have be cross breeding with domestic cats since the Romans first brought cats to the country is directly working against the Scottish government funded working for waders project, and baring heavy on the financial strains of [Redacted] estate.

These foxes need to be controlled and the easiest most time affective, and financially viable option is the use fox hounds in the woods pre spring.

These countryside matters need to be managed by people experienced in the consequences of decisions and not office bound civil servants."

[Redacted -- Not in Scope]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : [facebook.com/scottishparliament](https://www.facebook.com/scottishparliament) : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 26 March 2019 15:38
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Proposed Legislation on Fox Control

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 26 March 2019 at 14:45:27 GMT
To: "Roseanna.Cunningham.msp@parliament.scot" <Roseanna.Cunningham.msp@parliament.scot>, "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>, "Mairi.Gougeon.msp@parliament.scot" <Mairi.Gougeon.msp@parliament.scot>, "Claudia.Beamish.msp@parliament.scot" <Claudia.Beamish.msp@parliament.scot>, "Joan.McAlpine.msp@parliament.scot" <Joan.McAlpine.msp@parliament.scot>, "Brian.Whittle.msp@parliament.scot" <Brian.Whittle.msp@parliament.scot>, "Emma.Harper.msp@parliament.scot" <Emma.Harper.msp@parliament.scot>, "Colin.Smyth.msp@parliament.scot" <Colin.Smyth.msp@parliament.scot>, "Paul.Wheelhouse.msp@parliament.scot" <Paul.Wheelhouse.msp@parliament.scot>, "Michelle.Ballantyne.msp@parliament.scot" <Michelle.Ballantyne.msp@parliament.scot>, "Rachael.Hamilton.msp@parliament.scot" <Rachael.Hamilton.msp@parliament.scot>, "Oliver.Mundell.msp@parliament.scot" <Oliver.Mundell.msp@parliament.scot>, "Finlay.Carson.msp@parliament.scot" <Finlay.Carson.msp@parliament.scot>, "Jeane.Freeman.msp@parliament.scot" <Jeane.Freeman.msp@parliament.scot>, "John.Scott.msp@parliament.scot" <John.Scott.msp@parliament.scot>, "Willie.Coffey.msp@parliament.scot" <Willie.Coffey.msp@parliament.scot>, "Aileen.Campbell.msp@parliament.com" <Aileen.Campbell.msp@parliament.com>, "Christine.Grahame.msp@parliament.scot" <Christine.Grahame.msp@parliament.scot>, "Ian.Gray.msp@parliament.scot" <Ian.Gray.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: Proposed Legislation on Fox Control

Dear Sirs

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by 'Naylor and Knott' who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack. The proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the 'Uplands', but no-where else. I fail to see the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? With a large sheep breeding area the need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. A Borders farmer, [Redacted], gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this

acceptable? Fox control by a pack of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services. As I understand it, there were nearly 19,000 responses to the consultation, of which 18,497 (98%) were from 5 online campaigns where the respondents could not be identified, and who probably did not even live in Scotland. 290 (2%) were substantive replies and 298 and 25 organisation's had the courage and decency to supply their names and addresses. Is this really democracy at work? In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand.

Horses are an integral part of the Border community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is a key part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the Buccleuch Hunt. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the south of Scotland and allowing it in the 'Uplands' smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. Those of us who ride horses in the Borders are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us and stand up against this ill thought out proposed legislation.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 22 March 2019 13:20
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Proposed New Hunting Bill

Macs

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 22 March 2019 at 11:58:31 GMT
To: "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: Proposed New Hunting Bill

Dear Mr Ewing

I am writing as a farmer and landowner of 1,000 acres of mixed farming land (with arable & livestock) outside [Redacted] and who relies entirely on the activities of the Buccleuch Foxhounds to control the number of foxes in the interest of protecting both sheep and ground nesting birds on our property. I have also been involved in the past in the management of the Hunt and am an active participant as a mounted follower.

I would like to remind you and your parliamentary colleagues that the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002 separated what was regarded as unacceptable, namely the chasing and killing of foxes by hounds, from procedures legitimate for the control of foxes for specific reasons. Accordingly traditional fox hunting in Scotland involving the chase and kill became an illegal activity and the Act established a new basis for fox control using dogs to flush the fox from cover to be shot once it was safe to do so. Since 2003 the Buccleuch Foxhounds have operated a fox control service to farmers free of charge on over 100 days per annum between August and March each year for the past 15 years. The Scottish Fox Control Protocol first drafted in September 2002 (and subsequently amended) and now superseded by the new Code of Practice for Scottish Fox Hound Packs drawn up following Lord Bonomy's recommendation have been accepted and respected by all parties including hunt officials, farmers, landowners and Police Scotland. In my opinion the existing legislation drawn up after many hours of advice and debate by the Rural Affairs Committee and the Scottish Parliament in 2002, seems to have achieved a balance between "providing the necessary level of protection" for wild mammals whilst "allowing for their effective and humane control". This is a view held by the majority

of people who live and work in the countryside and love and understand the rural way of life. The drive for change comes from well funded animal rights organisations whose agenda does not include the need to control a predator species.

What are the Scottish Government trying to achieve by wishing to change this ?

Firstly the suggestion that the number of dogs used to flush foxes from cover should be reduced to two would render this form of fox control as ineffective. As pointed out by Lord Bonomy, the practice of using a pack of hounds to flush foxes to guns is however an effective form of pest control and this would be compromised by such a restriction. I have a single wood of 40 acres on my property and two bigger woods of 80 and 350 acres on my march. These are of the size that would make the use of two dogs as totally ineffective.

Secondly, the idea that a licencing scheme might be introduced that would permit the use of more than two dogs if it was considered necessary for fox control seems quite illogical and contradictory. The existing PWM Act 2002 already makes the hunting of a wild mammal illegal unless it is for fox control purposes to protect livestock, ground-nesting birds and other defined purposes. A licence would therefore appear to be unnecessary. If this licencing proposal is designed to limit this form of fox control to moorland and areas of large afforestation, it would be removing this form of fox control from those of us who farm on lower ground and have sizeable woodland plantations in the vicinity - woods which are the equivalent as breeding areas and shelter for foxes as those in the hills.

Thirdly, references have been made to the fact that measures will be put forward to address the likelihood of "trail hunting" being developed in Scotland. Trail hunting is a perfectly legal activity involving hounds being used to follow a drag line not the scent of a wild mammal. It has nothing to do with either animal welfare or the need for fox control which the PWM Act 2002 addresses. It is all to do with political prejudice.

Finally, I would like to point out that following hounds, either before or since the PWM Act 2002, forms an integral part of the equestrian culture of the Scottish Borders. There are strong and interlocking links with the Common Ridings, Riding Clubs, Horse Racing and Eventing. Many of the riders, horses, organisers and horse related businesses are involved in all such activities and they feed off each other. There is a

common love of horses and the Foxhound Packs are very often the point of contact with the land owners and farmers to gain access because of the free fox control service that they offer. It is also worth mentioning that The Scottish Borders Council and others are involved in promoting the area as a tourist destination under the banner of "Ride Scotland's Horse Country" and following hounds forms a part in this initiative. Foxhunting, along with all the other equestrian activities, offer so many people from all walks of life and of any age a chance to meet and socialise, enjoy fresh air and exercise and feel part of traditional rural life. Lord Boney made the following comment in his report : "The hunts continue to make a major contribution to the social cohesion and community spirit of the locality". Politicians especially from urban areas would be wise to heed these words.

I ask you to think very hard before allowing a Bill of this sort to pass into law. It has little to do with animal welfare and all to do with prejudice.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 24 April 2019 16:31
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002
Attachments: RE_Fox Hunting (Case Ref_CB2911).eml; ATT00001.htm

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 24 April 2019 at 16:27:34 BST
To: "Roseanna.Cunningham.msp@parliament.scot" <Roseanna.Cunningham.msp@parliament.scot>, "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>, "Mairi.Gugeon.msp@parliament.scot" <Mairi.Gugeon.msp@parliament.scot>, "Brian.Whittle.msp@parliament.scot" <Brian.Whittle.msp@parliament.scot>, "Finlay.Carson.msp@parliament.scot" <Finlay.Carson.msp@parliament.scot>, "John.Scott.msp@parliament.scot" <John.Scott.msp@parliament.scot>, "Oliver.Mundell.msp@parliament.scot" <Oliver.Mundell.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: FW: Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002

I sent an e mail along these lines to several MSPs and received a reply from Claudia Beamish. I attach this reply and my reply to it for your information.

[Redacted]

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2019 2:21:33 PM
To: Paul.Wheelhouse.msp@parliament.scot
Subject: Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002

Dear Paul Wheelhouse

It is our understanding that in the coming weeks the Scottish Government seek to make legislative changes driven by the outcome of the Lord Bonomy review of the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002, and we are writing to express a small farmer's and conservationist's point of view. We have a modest holding, but breed donkeys, sheep and run free range chickens and bantams. While this is not our principal income source, it is important to the management of our holding, the use of the land and buildings we have, maintaining them in a way which enhances the wildlife habitats.

The ever present impact on stock levels and wildlife due to fox predation of lambs, poultry and wildlife, particularly ground nesting birds, is real and significant and one we fear that might well worsen if there is be a change in the way we are allowed to control these pests.

We suffer major losses to foxes every year, and while all farms are likely to lose some animals as a result of fox predation during the year, a large and growing number report losses which have reduced their already low incomes by thousands of pounds. We are grateful for the service offered by the Scottish Mounted Foxhound packs who operate across the Scottish Borders and Dumfries and Galloway, without their help, we would surely lose more stock to foxes.

The impact of such losses is already recognised by the Scottish Government in their annual £50,000 payment to the hill packs operating in the highlands and to the island crofters. Ironically, the service we receive in South Scotland from the foxhound packs is free.

The problems caused by foxes did not lessen with the introduction of the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002. Foxes still killed many lambs, poultry and wildlife. The welcome adaptation of the organised packs to flush the foxes from cover such as gorse banks and forestry plantations, so that they may be shot offers protection at key times of the year to both keep down localised populations and to react to particular lamb killing activity.

From our conversations with English and Welsh farming acquaintances, thoughts are that the exemptions allowed under the 2004 Hunting Act are ineffectual in reducing losses. Two hounds cannot possibly be as effective at flushing foxes to guns from parcels of land which may be many hundreds of acres in area – something confirmed through research commissioned by the Federation of Welsh Farmers Packs, which you will be aware of.

Ground nesting bird populations are declining worldwide, with causes often being linked to the loss and degradation of habitats, increased predation, and a changing climate. Here in the Scotland we have seen dramatic declines in pee wit and oyster catcher populations over recent decades.

A recent study carried out by the British Trust for Ornithology and partner organisations found that curlew numbers were lower in areas with greater crow abundance and with a higher chance of fox predation. Consequently, conservation bodies such as the RSPB actively target foxes to protect vulnerable ground nesting birds.

Pest and predator control is often brutal and bloody. It means killing some species so that others may live. It may mean killing a fox that is hunting to feed cubs, so that a colony of Arctic terns can nest. It is well documented and widely accepted that foxes can have a devastating effect on colonies of ground-nesting birds, such as curlew and pee wits, birds in serious decline, as well as poultry and lambs.

Research carried out by the Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust demonstrates that the breeding success of some species was significantly improved with predator control. For pee wits, golden plover, curlew, red grouse and meadow pipit, on average a three-fold improvement was seen with predator control.

The GWCT further tell us that wild ground-nesting birds like black grouse, partridge, pee wit and curlew are particularly vulnerable to predation by foxes,

as are brown hares. Several of these are species of conservation concern; others are game species; some are both. In order to protect vulnerable species while they are breeding, land owners and managers aim to control fox numbers, particularly from late winter to early summer.

Such problems, which were specifically addressed by Lord Bonomy in his report to the Scottish Government.

"The use of packs of hounds to flush out foxes to be shot remains a significant pest control measure, both to control the general level of foxes in an area as well as to address particular problems affecting a farm or estate." Lord Bonomy report to the Scottish Government 2016

"Searching and flushing by two dogs would not be as effective as that done by a full pack of hounds, imposing restrictions could seriously compromise effective pest control in the country" Lord Bonomy report to the Scottish Government 2016.

The Scottish Government has set ambitious targets for a doubling of Scotland's food and drinks sector by 2030. The contribution from the livestock sector is unlikely to achieve any meaningful contribution unless we are able to continue with the use of a pack of foxhounds to flush foxes from cover to reduce loss from fox predation..

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 25 February 2019 16:37
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Review of the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002

Macs for ms G

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 25 February 2019 at 15:02:50 GMT
To: "fergus.ewing.msp@parliament.scot" <fergus.ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Cc: "[Redacted]"
Subject: Review of the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002

Dear Mr Ewing

I listened with interest to The Minister's recent announcement on this matter.

There are, therefore, a number of points I (as a private individual) would like to make to you:-

1. Pest control across lowland Scotland is essential. Farmer [Redacted] recently gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of 100 lambs per year to foxes. This is on just one farm. Is this acceptable? Fox control using a pack of hounds is effective and is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers requesting/permitting local pest control services;
2. In the announcement it was suggested that there is "justification for lowland exclusion" in relation to a licence for the Uplands. Why? What is the difference in carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands/Highlands? Could there be an ulterior motive?
3. Having asked Lord Bonomy to undertake a review, why has The Minister chosen to disregard a significant number of his findings?
4. The Government consultation received 18,787 responses. However, 18,497 were generated by five online campaigns from unidentifiable respondents (98%) while 290 were substantive responses (2%). Two hundred and sixty-five individuals and twenty-five organisations took the responsible attitude of supplying their names and addresses. In all honesty, can the outcome of a consultation which accepts the views of unidentifiable respondents over that of identifiable members of Scottish society be accepted with any confidence in representing the democratic voice of Scotland? In addition, in compliance with Lord Bonomy's recommendations, the mounted hunts worked for over a year with a range of stakeholders including the League Against Cruel Sports, Onekind and the SSPCA to produce the Code of Practice for Mounted Foxhounds. Like Lord Bonomy's recommendations, it would seem that all of that good work has been dismissed out of hand?
5. Why has The Government rejected the only published science in relation to flushing with hounds (Naylor and Knot)? The only research of its kind concludes that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack. This was recognised by Lord Bonomy;

6. Lord Bonomy also recognised, horses are an important focus for the Border community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the Buccleuch Hunt regularly. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs. Why does your Government choose to ignore this important point?

I look forward to receiving your full response to this letter.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

====Knight Frank LLP Disclaimer=====

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : [facebook.com/scottishparliament](https://www.facebook.com/scottishparliament) : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP <Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Sent: 12 April 2019 15:40
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: Fox Control Bill

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: 12 April 2019 at 15:31:04 BST
To: Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot
Subject: Fox Control Bill

Dear Fergus,

I am writing to you about my worries concerning the fox control proposals .

It seems that after the Lord Bonomy report was commissioned by the Scottish government the findings have been totally ignored. The report must have cost a considerable amount and seems criminal in a time of cutbacks to ignore it. He had recommended that the number of dogs used to search and flush should not be limited to two as it would take 5 times longer and would cause more distress to the fox. It would also seem to contradict the scientific report from Naylor & Knot which is of the same opinion.

The proposal to issue licences to "Uplands" only packs seems to be very prejudiced towards the "Lowlands". What is the difference in controlling foxes in these areas? Both parts of Scotland have huge problems with fox control and particularly at this time of year with lambing. We regularly lose lambs to foxes and they are not always the young ones. The only animals large and quick enough to take an older lamb is a fox or a dog.

The Borders are home to 6 of the 9 packs of foxhounds. If the fox control were to stop in this area it could have a profound impact on the rural community and businesses. There is a huge cross section of people who partake in the fox control and many who do not ride but support from their cars or on foot. It is a time when the community including all manner of tradesmen, nurses, farmers, pensioners, business's, undertakers come together to support each other with functions surrounding the Hunts as the common thread.

This idea of banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the Border area but allowing it elsewhere is totally illogical - I am feeling totally let down by the Scottish Government and would urge you to look hard at this proposal. Please do support us for the sake of the fox welfare and the rural community.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot : facebook.com/scottishparliament : twitter.com/scotparl

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 January 2018 10:39:14
To: Public Engagement Unit
Subject: FW: Letter attached

Attachments: Fergus E letter 0118.pdf

For MACCs, diary case for Ms Cunningham

[REDACTED] to Fergus Ewing MSP, Cabinet Secretary for the Rural
Economy and Connectivity
The Scottish Government
2N.11 St Andrew's House | Regent Road | Edinburgh | EH1 3DG
Tel: 0131 244 8415 Email: CabSecRec@gov.scot<mailto:CabSecRec@gov.scot>

Please check our updated Ministerial Preferences<<http://saltire/my-workplace/ministerial-preferences-and-support/Rural-Economy-and-Connectivity/Pages/Fergus-Ewing.aspx>>.

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to another official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Office do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@parliament.scot] On Behalf Of
Ewing F (Fergus), MSP
Sent: 28 January 2018 13:21
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy and Connectivity
Subject: FW: Letter attached

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 January 2018 17:38
To: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP
<Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>>
Subject: Letter attached

Fergus,

I hope this finds you well.

Letter attached.

Kindest Regards

[REDACTED]

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
To join: www.parliament.scot >

*
The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot<<http://www.parliament.scot>> :
facebook.com/scottishparliament<<http://facebook.com/scottishparliament>> :
[twitter.com/scotparl](http://twitter.com/ScotParl)<<http://twitter.com/ScotParl>>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

24/01/2018

Technical review of the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002

Fergus,

I hope that you had a wonderful festive break and managed to get some respite from the day job...It all seems such a long time ago.

I write to ask for a short appointment to discuss the progress of the ScotsGovs review and subsequent consultation on the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002.

You are aware that Lord Bonomy was commissioned to review the protection offered to wild mammals under the Act not to debate fox hunting. Rightly or not, this debate was resolved in the Scottish Parliament with the implementation of the 2002 Act.

Lord Bonomys recommendations are mainly of a technical nature and concentrate on the wording of the Act in a bid to make it clearer for both practitioners and legal enforcement as opposed to restriction or indeed an outright ban.

I am concerned that the hysteria generated by Animal Rights organisations and Alison Johnstone MSPs hijacking of the consultation process will confuse the issue and lead many into a debate on the morals and ethics of fox hunting.

At a time when rural communities in Scotland face so many challenges, not least the fundamental changes that Brexit will bring, it is quite extraordinary that any politicians are giving serious consideration to returning to the pointless pursuit of hunting.

It would be a sad day for the Scottish Parliament, and Scottish politicians, if the long-settled issue of hunting with hounds were to return to the top of the political agenda.

I look forward to your response

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 March 2019 08:58:32
To: Public Engagement Unit
Cc: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: FW: Letter - Animal Welfare

PEU,

Please add to MACCS and assign to [REDACTED]

Thanks,

[REDACTED]
Cabinet Secretary for Rural Economy
CabsecRE@gov.scot<mailto:CabsecRE@gov.scot>
0131 244 4538

Please check our Ministerial Preferences<<http://saltire/my-workplace/ministerial-preferences-and-support/Environment-and-Rural-Economy/Pages/Fergus-Ewing.aspx>>

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to any other official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Offices do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

Scottish Ministers, Special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot<<http://www.lobbying.scot/>>

From: [REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>
Date: 23 March 2019 at 09:39:46 GMT
To: Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: Letter - Animal Welfare
Dear Fergus,

I write in concern over recent announcements from Mairi Gougeon, Minister for Rural Affairs & The Natural Environment with her intentions to reduce the numbers of dogs used to help control foxes. Lord Bonomy in his review conducted on behalf of The Scottish Government states the necessity of a pack of dogs (approx 25) to help search for foxes which are then flushed to gunmen and shot. Mairi implies a change to two dogs, this will not work and will result in poor animal welfare for the fox, science experts (Naylor & Knot) fear a fox could be hunted five times longer with two hounds, also acknowledged in Lord Bonomy's report.

I was raised in the Scottish Borders on a small sheep farm with a handful of hens for our own egg collection. Our hens were killed by foxes and every year lambs taken by foxes from the fields. Recent evidence given by Lowland hill farmer Tom Edgar near Kelso quoted 100 lambs plus are killed yearly by foxes on his hill farm. The fox is seen by many as a cuddly teddy bear replica taking pity on a hunted animal. However a fox is classified by the Government as vermin for all reasons stated including interference with ground nesting birds. Myself and the public love animals but for

Scottish farmers producing quality Scottish food for our nation humane fox control is paramount. Other allowed methods incl trapping/snaring, shooting at nighttime are less humane by comparison; snaring can be a slow death, night time shooting is not guaranteed accurate in darker conditions. Dogs go centuries back, mans oldest hunting acquaintance and like police dogs and mountain rescue dogs are highly effective at finding their quarry, in this instance the fox then flushing to guns. The process happens during daylight by a leader i.e. the huntsman and his capable team - foxes are responsibly culled maintaining a balanced and healthy fox population.

I now live and work in Edinburgh, my children at a local state school [REDACTED] From time spent in the city I witness the detachment urban people have with the countryside and where their food comes from, yet are the first to challenge our farmers and practises. Yes, there can be improvements to farming but why change a fox control method using dogs flushing foxes to guns that works. I would not support this method of fox control if it were ineffective and inhumane.

Mairi implies she will grant licences to the ?Uplands?, but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Fox control by packs of dogs/hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers requesting these services.

The flawed response the Government consultation received from 18,497 unidentifiable respondents generated by five online campaigns not giving their names or details compared to the reputed organisations and individuals that did needs to be questioned. Hardly democratic when gathering evidence?

A local community, as with any area is integral and this is evident with fox control, these days people from every walk of life, every generation and from varied political backgrounds all mix together to support. Folk follow on foot, mountain bikes, horses and motorbikes taking this opportunity to access their love of the countryside. Public interest despises historical upper class fox hunting rituals, fortunately no longer but unfortunately misconstrued by opponents.

I appreciate your time reading this letter and hope it will bear some influence.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Registered in Scotland [REDACTED]

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. All attachments remain copyright Carnival Chaos Productions unless otherwise stated. If you have received this email in error please notify Carnival Chaos Productions. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Carnival Chaos Productions. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. Carnival Chaos Productions accept no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

*

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
P?rlamaid na h-Alba: A? toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot<<http://www.parliament.scot>> :
facebook.com/scottishparliament<<http://facebook.com/scottishparliament>> :
[twitter.com/scotparl](http://twitter.com/ScotParl)<<http://twitter.com/ScotParl>>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 March 2019 08:59:20
To: Public Engagement Unit
Cc: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: FW: SNP Fox Control Bill

PEU,

Please add to MACCS and assign to [REDACTED]

Thanks,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Cabinet Secretary for Rural Economy
CabsecRE@gov.scot<mailto:CabsecRE@gov.scot>
0131 244 4538

Please check our Ministerial Preferences<<http://saltire/my-workplace/ministerial-preferences-and-support/Environment-and-Rural-Economy/Pages/Fergus-Ewing.aspx>>

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to any other official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Offices do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

Scottish Ministers, Special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot<<http://www.lobbying.scot/>>

From: [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]>
Date: 27 March 2019 at 18:00:46 GMT
To: "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>"
<Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>>
Subject: SNP Fox Control Bill
Dear Sir/Madam,

Foxes need to be controlled. So do badgers, their apex predators are missing.

Attempting to flush foxes out of cover with only 2 hounds is a waste of time. In terms of limits, 30 would be a better number.

The equestrian culture is an important tradition of the Borders. The Victor of Waterloo said that border Horsemen were the best light cavalry in Europe. Common Ridings in summer and hunting in winter maintain this tradition.

If we are to attract tourists, our traditions need to be upheld. One of these is hunting foxes by the traditional method. It is quite effective, relatively humane and allows the fox population to be monitored.

It should be encouraged by government.

Yours faithfully,



*

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of
Scotland

Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot<<http://www.parliament.scot>> :

[facebook.com/scottishparliament](https://www.facebook.com/scottishparliament)<[http://facebook.com/scottishparliament](https://www.facebook.com/scottishparliament)> :

[twitter.com/scotparl](https://twitter.com/ScotParl)<[http://twitter.com/ScotParl](https://twitter.com/ScotParl)>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this
email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 March 2019 08:52:31
To: Public Engagement Unit
Cc: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: FW: Fox Control Bill

PEU,

Please add to MACCS and assign to

Thanks,
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Cabinet Secretary for Rural Economy
CabsecRE@gov.scot<mailto:CabsecRE@gov.scot>
0131 244 4538

Please check our Ministerial Preferences<<http://saltire/my-workplace/ministerial-preferences-and-support/Environment-and-Rural-Economy/Pages/Fergus-Ewing.aspx>>

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to any other official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Offices do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

Scottish Ministers, Special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot<<http://www.lobbying.scot>>

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 27 March 2019 at 17:38:33 GMT
To: <fergus.ewing.msp@parliament.scot<<mailto:fergus.ewing.msp@parliament.scot>>>
Subject: Fox Control Bill
Mr Ewing,

It would appear that the present Scottish Government are hell-bent on destroying the rural countryside that they, supposedly, represent. The U-turn they have just taken regarding the Fox Control Bill is a fine example. Lord Bonython's Report was thorough and a great deal of time was spent by meeting and speaking to all involved and listening to all sides. Unlike the recent online campaigns where anyone can respond ? and not be identified, how very useful to the bean counters.

The Scottish Borders has a history steeped in horses and rural pursuits, and many people still owe their living to the equine world ? whether it be farriers, vets or fox control staff.

The Buccleuch Hunt is supported by many branches of the local community ? dentists, plumbers and undertakers to name but a few.

The Scottish Government seem to have a seriously biased, and certainly not

democratic, agenda on Fox Control and, personally, I think it shows itself in a very poor light.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

*

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
P?rlamaid na h-Alba: A? toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot<<http://www.parliament.scot>> :
facebook.com/scottishparliament<<http://facebook.com/scottishparliament>> :
[twitter.com/scotparl](http://twitter.com/ScotParl)<<http://twitter.com/ScotParl>>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 March 2019 12:45:16
To: Public Engagement Unit
Cc: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: FW: Fox Control Bill

AO [REDACTED]

Hi PEU,

Please add to MACCS as MR.

Thanks,
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Cabinet Secretary for Rural Economy
CabsecRE@gov.scot<mailto:CabsecRE@gov.scot>
0131 244 4538

Please check our Ministerial Preferences<<http://saltire/my-workplace/ministerial-preferences-and-support/Environment-and-Rural-Economy/Pages/Fergus-Ewing.aspx>>

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to any other official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Offices do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

Scottish Ministers, Special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot<<http://www.lobbying.scot/>>

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP
<Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>>>
Sent: 11 March 2019 12:25
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
<CabSecRE@gov.scot<<mailto:CabSecRE@gov.scot>>>
Subject: Fwd: Fox Control Bill

Macs. Can I discuss with mairi. F
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED] >
Date: 11 March 2019 at 12:22:23 GMT
To: "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>>"
<Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>>>
Subject: Fox Control Bill
Dear Cabinet Secretary

It has come to my attention that the Scottish Parliament is re looking into the bill on fox control with the intention of considering reducing the licenses for vermin control to only the ?Upland areas?. This makes little sense on the back of Lord Bonomy?s report on behalf of the Government and what really strikes me is, what is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and that of carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands/Highlands?

Sheep farmers in Lowland areas are just as vulnerable to the loss of lambs, and fox control by packs of hounds is effective and crucially important for the rural community, and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers requesting/permitting their services.

I live in the Borders where horses are an important focus for the Border community, as could be seen at the New Year Meets across the area with the New Year?s Meet in Hawick attracting over 1,000 members of the public. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the Buccleuch Hunt. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities; amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

Can I urge the Minister and the Rural Affairs Committee to pay attention to the recommendations of Lord Bonomy?s report, which support the continued existence of hunts in Scotland.

Yours sincerely

*

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland

P?rlamaid na h-Alba: A? toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot<<http://www.parliament.scot>> :
facebook.com/scottishparliament<<http://facebook.com/scottishparliament>> :
[twitter.com/scotparl](http://twitter.com/ScotParl)<<http://twitter.com/ScotParl>>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 March 2019 08:57:21
To: Public Engagement Unit
Cc: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: FW: Fox Control with Dogs

Attachments: Hunting letter to MSPs March 19.pdf

PEU,

Please add to MACCS and assign to Rebecca Greenan.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Cabinet Secretary for Rural Economy
CabsecRE@gov.scot<mailto:CabsecRE@gov.scot>
0131 244 4538

Please check our Ministerial Preferences<<http://saltire/my-workplace/ministerial-preferences-and-support/Environment-and-Rural-Economy/Pages/Fergus-Ewing.aspx>>

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to any other official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Offices do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

Scottish Ministers, Special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot<<http://www.lobbying.scot>>

From: [REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>
Date: 23 March 2019 at 11:14:44 GMT
To: <fergus.ewing.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:fergus.ewing.msp@parliament.scot>>
Subject: Fox Control with Dogs
Please see attached letter.

*

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot<<http://www.parliament.scot>> :
facebook.com/scottishparliament<<http://facebook.com/scottishparliament>> :
[twitter.com/scotparl](http://twitter.com/ScotParl)<<http://twitter.com/ScotParl>>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

23rd March 2019

Dear Mr Ewing

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. Whilst some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by 'Naylor and Knott', who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack.

Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the 'Uplands', but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands/Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south and central Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer Mr Edgar gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year to foxes. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers requesting/permitting our services.

Horses are an important focus for both Fife, where we live and the Border community, where we spend a lot of our time in the winter months. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding, pony clubs and riding clubs is deeply embedded in both Fife and Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders, gardeners and electricians are among those that follow hunting in both Fife and the Borders. These are wide ranging, hardworking individuals who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, many small businesses are supported by the hunting community, amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets and fox control staff.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in central and south of Scotland and allowing it in the 'Uplands' smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. Those of us who ride horses in both Fife and the Borders are very angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us.

Yours sincerely
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 March 2019 08:55:29
To: Public Engagement Unit
Cc: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: FW: FOX CONTROL WITH DOGS

PEU,

Please add to MACCS and assign to Rebecca Greenan.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]
Cabinet Secretary for Rural Economy
CabsecRE@gov.scot<mailto:CabsecRE@gov.scot>
0131 244 4538

Please check our Ministerial Preferences<<http://saltire/my-workplace/ministerial-preferences-and-support/Environment-and-Rural-Economy/Pages/Fergus-Ewing.aspx>>

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to any other official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Offices do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

Scottish Ministers, Special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot<<http://www.lobbying.scot>>

From: [REDACTED]>

Date: 23 March 2019 at 11:49:26 GMT

To:

Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>

Subject: FOX CONTROL WITH DOGS

Dear Mr Ewing,

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by Naylor and Knott who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack. Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the Uplands, but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the

government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer Mr Edgar gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services.

As I understand it, there were nearly 19,000 responses to the consultation, of which 18,497 (98%) were from 5 online campaigns where the respondents could not be identified, and who probably did not even live in Scotland. 290 (2%) were substantive replies and 298 and 25 organisation's had the courage and decency to supply their names and addresses. Is this really democracy at work?

In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand. Horses are an important focus for the Border community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the Buccleuch Hunt. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the south of Scotland and allowing it in the ?Uplands? smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. Those of us who ride horses in the Borders are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us.

Yours sincerely,



*

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland

P?rlamaid na h-Alba: A? toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot<<http://www.parliament.scot>> :

facebook.com/scottishparliament<<http://facebook.com/scottishparliament>> :

twitter.com/scotparl<<http://twitter.com/ScotParl>>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 March 2019 16:38:51
To: Public Engagement Unit
Cc: Minister for Rural Affairs and the Natural Environment
Subject: FW: Proposed New Hunting Bill

PEU

For MACCS, MR please ? AO

Thanks

[REDACTED]
Minister for Rural Affairs and the Natural Environment
2N.08 St Andrew's House | Regent Road | Edinburgh | EH1 3DG

? 0131 244 5596
MinisterRANE@gov.scot<mailto:MinisterRANE@gov.scot>

Please check our updated Ministerial preferences<<http://saltire/my-workplace/ministerial-preferences-and-support/Environment-and-Rural-Economy/Pages/Minister-for-Rural-Affairs-and-the-Natural-Environment.aspx>>!

[https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/0/01/Scottish_Government_Logo.svg/220px-Scottish_Government_Logo.svg.png]

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to any other official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Offices do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

Scottish Ministers, Special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot<<http://www.lobbying.scot/>>

From: [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]><mailto:[REDACTED]>
Date: 22 March 2019 at 11:43:36 GMT
To:
"Mairi.Gougeon.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:Mairi.Gougeon.msp@parliament.scot>"
<Mairi.Gougeon.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:Mairi.Gougeon.msp@parliament.scot>>
>>
Subject: Proposed New Hunting Bill
Dear Ms Gougeon

I am writing as a farmer and landowner of 1,000 acres of mixed farming land (with arable & livestock) outside [REDACTED] and who relies entirely on the activities of the [REDACTED] to control the number of foxes in the interest of protecting both sheep and ground nesting birds on our property. I have also been involved in the past in the management of the Hunt and am an active participant as a mounted follower.

I would like to remind you and your parliamentary colleagues that the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002 separated what was regarded as unacceptable, namely the chasing and killing of foxes by hounds, from procedures legitimate for the control of foxes for specific reasons. Accordingly traditional fox hunting in Scotland involving the chase and kill became an illegal activity and the Act established a new basis for fox control using dogs to flush the fox from cover to be shot once it was safe to do so. Since 2003 the Buccleuch Foxhounds have operated a fox control service to farmers free of charge on over 100 days per annum between August and March each year for the past 15 years. The Scottish Fox Control Protocol first drafted in September 2002 (and subsequently amended) and now superseded by the new Code of Practice for Scottish Fox Hound Packs drawn up following Lord Bonomy's recommendation have been accepted and respected by all parties including hunt officials, farmers, landowners and Police Scotland. In my opinion the existing legislation drawn up after many hours of advice and debate by the Rural Affairs Committee and the Scottish Parliament in 2002, seems to have achieved a balance between providing the necessary level of protection for wild mammals whilst allowing for their effective and humane control. This is a view held by the majority of people who live and work in the countryside and love and understand the rural way of life. The drive for change comes from well funded animal rights organisations whose agenda does not include the need to control a predator species.

What are the Scottish Government trying to achieve by wishing to change this ?

Firstly the suggestion that the number of dogs used to flush foxes from cover should be reduced to two would render this form of fox control as ineffective. As pointed out by Lord Bonomy, the practice of using a pack of hounds to flush foxes to guns is however an effective form of pest control and this would be compromised by such a restriction. I have a single wood of 40 acres on my property and two bigger woods of 80 and 350 acres on my march. These are of the size that would make the use of two dogs as totally ineffective.

Secondly, the idea that a licencing scheme might be introduced that would permit the use of more than two dogs if it was considered necessary for fox control seems quite illogical and contradictory. The existing PWM Act 2002 already makes the hunting of a wild mammal illegal unless it is for fox control purposes to protect livestock, ground-nesting birds and other defined purposes. A licence would therefore appear to be unnecessary. If this licencing proposal is designed to limit this form of fox control to moorland and areas of large afforestation, it would be removing this form of fox control from those of us who farm on lower ground and have sizeable woodland plantations in the vicinity - woods which are the equivalent as breeding areas and shelter for foxes as those in the hills.

Thirdly, references have been made to the fact that measures will be put forward to address the likelihood of trail hunting being developed in Scotland. Trail hunting is a perfectly legal activity involving hounds being used to follow a drag line not the scent of a wild mammal. It has nothing to do with either animal welfare or the need for fox control which the PWM Act 2002 addresses. It is all to do with political prejudice.

Finally, I would like to point out that following hounds, either before or since the PWM Act 2002, forms an integral part of the equestrian culture of the Scottish Borders. There are strong and interlocking links with the Common Ridings, Riding Clubs, Horse Racing and Eventing. Many of the riders, horses, organisers and horse related businesses are involved in all such activities and they feed off each other. There is a common love of horses and the Foxhound Packs are very often the point of contact with the land owners and farmers to gain access because of the free fox control service that they offer. It is also worth mentioning that The Scottish Borders Council and others are involved in promoting the area as a tourist destination under

the banner of 'Ride Scotland's Horse Country' and following hounds forms a part in this initiative. Foxhunting, along with all the other equestrian activities, offer so many people from all walks of life and of any age a chance to meet and socialise, enjoy fresh air and exercise and feel part of traditional rural life. Lord Bonython made the following comment in his report : 'The hunts continue to make a major contribution to the social cohesion and community spirit of the locality'. Politicians especially from urban areas would be wise to heed these words.

I ask you to think very hard before allowing a Bill of this sort to pass into law. It has little to do with animal welfare and all to do with prejudice.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

*

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland

Pàrlamaid na h-Alba: A' toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot <<http://www.parliament.scot>> :

[facebook.com/scottishparliament](https://www.facebook.com/scottishparliament) <[http://facebook.com/scottishparliament](https://www.facebook.com/scottishparliament)> :

[twitter.com/scotparl](https://twitter.com/ScotParl) <[http://twitter.com/ScotParl](https://twitter.com/ScotParl)>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 March 2019 09:00:39
To: Public Engagement Unit
Cc: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: FW: SNP Fox Control Bill

PEU,

Please add to MACCS and assign to

Thanks,

[REDACTED]
Cabinet Secretary for Rural Economy
CabsecRE@gov.scot<mailto:CabsecRE@gov.scot>
0131 244 4538

Please check our Ministerial Preferences<<http://saltire/my-workplace/ministerial-preferences-and-support/Environment-and-Rural-Economy/Pages/Fergus-Ewing.aspx>>

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to any other official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Offices do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

Scottish Ministers, Special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot<<http://www.lobbying.scot>>

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 22 March 2019 at 17:41:39 GMT
To: "Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>"
<Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>>
Subject: SNP Fox Control Bill

Dear Fergus,

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by Naylor and Knott who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack.

Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the Uplands, but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer Mr Edgar

gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services.

As I understand it, there were nearly 19,000 responses to the consultation, of which 18,497 (98%) were from 5 online campaigns where the respondents could not be identified, and who probably did not even live in Scotland. 290 (2%) were substantive replies and 298 and 25 organisation?s had the courage and decency to supply their names and addresses. Is this really democracy at work?

In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand. Horses are an important focus for the Borders community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs. It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the south of Scotland and allowing it in the ?Uplands? smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. I would urge you to support us.

Yours sincerely [REDACTED]

*

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland

P?rlamaid na h-Alba: A? toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot<<http://www.parliament.scot>> :
facebook.com/scottishparliament<<http://facebook.com/scottishparliament>> :
twitter.com/scotparl<<http://twitter.com/ScotParl>>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 October 2018 17:39:36
To: Scottish Ministers
Subject: Fox hunting

AO ? [REDACTED] ? OR

Dear Sir

At the end of 2017 I was one of almost 20,000 people who took part in a Scottish Government consultation on improving the welfare of wild mammals in relation to fox hunting. Of those who responded, 98% agree with me that the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002 needs to be strengthened to really ban hunting in Scotland.

I am disappointed that over eight months after the consultation closed, the Scottish Government has failed to reach a decision on what it plans to do to improve the law. In just a couple of weeks the full hunting season will get underway. This is the fourth season since Lord Bonython was commissioned to report on the workings of the law and nothing has changed. I think the time has come for the Scottish Government to be accountable to everyone who gave their views through the consultation and act to improve the law.

Please can you write to the Scottish Government, asking for clarification on what it intends to do to improve the law and why it has taken so long to reach a decision. I believe the Scottish Government should make public its intentions before the hunting season gets underway next month.


As someone who opposes animal cruelty I am saddened that once again hunts will be out in Scotland chasing and killing foxes for sport. I look forward to hearing back from you about the Scottish Government's position, and I hope I can rely on your support to help stop animals suffering as a result of this outdated tradition.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] <x-apple-data-detectors://9/1>

[REDACTED] <x-apple-data-detectors://9/1>

 <x-apple-data-detectors://9/1>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

—

From: Ewing F (Fergus), MSP
Sent: 23 March 2019 12:21:52
To: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: Fwd: FOX CONTROL WITH DOGS

AO ? [REDACTED]

Another one. [REDACTED]
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
<mailto:[REDACTED]>
Date: 23 March 2019 at 11:49:26 GMT
To:
Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: FOX CONTROL WITH DOGS

Dear Mr Ewing,

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by Naylor and Knott who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack.

Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the Uplands, but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. [REDACTED] gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services.

As I understand it, there were nearly 19,000 responses to the consultation, of which 18,497 (98%) were from 5 online campaigns where the respondents could not be identified, and who probably did not even live in Scotland. 290 (2%) were substantive replies and 298 and 25 organisation's had the courage and decency to supply their names and addresses. Is this really democracy at work?

In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually

agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand.

Horses are an important focus for the Border community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the [REDACTED]. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the south of Scotland and allowing it in the ?Uplands? smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. Those of us who ride horses in the Borders are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

*

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland

P?rlamaid na h-Alba: A? toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba
www.parliament.scot<<http://www.parliament.scot>> :
facebook.com/scottishparliament<<http://facebook.com/scottishparliament>> :
twitter.com/scotparl<<http://twitter.com/ScotParl>>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 March 2019 08:57:31
To: Public Engagement Unit
Cc: Cabinet Secretary for the Rural Economy
Subject: FW: Fox Control Bill

PEU,

Please add to MACCS and assign to

Thanks,
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Assistant Private Secretary
Cabinet Secretary for Rural Economy
CabsecRE@gov.scot<mailto:CabsecRE@gov.scot>
0131 244 4538

Please check our Ministerial Preferences<<http://saltire/my-workplace/ministerial-preferences-and-support/Environment-and-Rural-Economy/Pages/Fergus-Ewing.aspx>>

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to any other official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Offices do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

Scottish Ministers, Special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot<<http://www.lobbying.scot/>>

From: [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]><mailto:[REDACTED]>>
Date: 27 March 2019 at 15:55:21 GMT
To: Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot<mailto:Fergus.Ewing.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: Fox Control Bill

Dear Mr Ewing,

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonomy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonomy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by Naylor and Knott who conclude that reducing the pack to two

hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack.

Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the 'Uplands', but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer Mr Edgar gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services.

In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand.

Horses are an important focus for the Border community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the Buccleuch Hunt. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the south of Scotland and allowing it in the 'Uplands' smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. Those of us who ride horses in the Borders are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us.

Kind regards

[Redacted signature]

--

[Redacted signature]

*

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of Scotland
P'rlamaid na h-Alba: A? toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot<<http://www.parliament.scot>> :

facebook.com/scottishparliament<<http://facebook.com/scottishparliament>> :
twitter.com/scotparl<<http://twitter.com/ScotParl>>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 March 2019 10:43:02
To: Public Engagement Unit
Cc: Cabinet Secretary for Health and Sport
Subject: FW:

AO ? [REDACTED]
PEU

Please could you scan this on to MACCS as an OR.

Thanks

[REDACTED]
Ministerial Private Office (Health)
St Andrew's House
Edinburgh

All e-mails and attachments sent by a Ministerial Private Office to any other official on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Minister, or a note of a Ministerial meeting, must be filed appropriately by the recipient. Private Offices do not keep official records of such e-mails or attachments.

Scottish Ministers, Special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> On Behalf Of
Freeman J (Jeane), MSP
Sent: 28 March 2019 10:11
To: Cabinet Secretary for Health and Sport <CabSecHS@gov.scot>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Subject: FW:

Hi [REDACTED]

Please see email below for response.

Thanks,
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | [REDACTED] Jeane Freeman MSP
46-48 Glaisnock Street, Cumnock, East Ayrshire, KA18 1BY Constituency Office:
01290 425876 Parliamentary Office: 0131 348 6745 jeanefreeman.scot |
@JeaneF1MSP | FB: Jeane Freeman MSP

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 27 March 2019 18:22
To: Freeman J (Jeane), MSP <Jeane.Freeman.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject:

I am writing to register my concern and disappointment with the recent announcement concerning fox control with dogs.

The Scottish Government spent a great deal of time and presumably money commissioning a report by Lord Bonymy. While some of his recommendations have been supported, it would seem that his most important one has been dismissed. It has been proposed that the number of hounds should be limited to 2 for mounted packs, in contradiction of Bonymy's recommendations and indeed in contradiction of the only published science by Naylor and Knott who conclude that reducing the pack to two hounds compromises the fox's welfare by increasing the time of the search and flush by as much as five times as long as a full pack.

Even worse, the proposal is that packs of hounds to carry out fox control will attract licences in the Uplands, but no-where else. Prejudice seems to play a big part in the government's approach. What is the difference between carrying out fox control with a pack of hounds in the Lowlands and carrying out the same fox control activities in the Uplands / Highlands? The need for fox control is as important in the south of Scotland as it is anywhere else. This approach is totally illogical. Farmer Mr Edgar gave evidence under oath in the "Buccleuch case" that he loses upwards of one hundred lambs per year. Is this acceptable? Fox control by packs of hounds is effective and this is evidenced by the support of landowners and farmers in requesting / permitting our services.

As I understand it, there were nearly 19,000 responses to the consultation, of which 18,497 (98%) were from 5 online campaigns where the respondents could not be identified, and who probably did not even live in Scotland. 290 (2%) were substantive replies and 298 and 25 organisation's had the courage and decency to supply their names and addresses. Is this really democracy at work?

In addition, stakeholders including the mounted packs, the League against Cruel Sports, the SSPCA and others worked together for a year to produce a mutually agreed code of practice. It would seem this work has been dismissed out of hand.

Horses are an important focus for the Borders community, as could be seen at the New Year Meet in Hawick in 2019, which over 1,000 members of the public attended. The equestrian culture, which includes racing, eventing, common riding and riding clubs, is deeply embedded in Borders culture. The hunting community is an integral part of this. By way of example, nurses, teachers, business men and women, pensioners, farmers, undertakers, plumbers, builders and electricians are among those that follow the Buccleuch Hunt. These are wide ranging, hardworking folk who enjoy being with friends who have similar horsey interests and who enjoy the social interaction. As importantly, the Borders has fragile employment opportunities: amongst others, farriers, feed merchants, vets, and fox control staff will suffer, with many likely to lose their jobs.

It seems to me that banning fox control with a pack of hounds in the south of Scotland and allowing it in the Uplands smacks wholly of prejudice. It is totally illogical. Those of us who ride horses in the Borders are angry, disillusioned and feel disenfranchised. I would urge you to support us.

Yours sincerely



*

The Scottish Parliament: Making a positive difference to the lives of the people of
Scotland P?rlamaid na h-Alba: A? toirt deagh bhuaidh air beatha sluagh na h-Alba

www.parliament.scot<<http://www.parliament.scot>> :
facebook.com/scottishparliament<<http://facebook.com/scottishparliament>> :
twitter.com/scotparl<<http://twitter.com/ScotParl>>

The information in this email may be confidential. If you think you have received this
email in error please delete it and do not share its contents.

*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
