

Proposed Responsible Breeding and Ownership of Dogs (Scotland) Bill

Page 1: Introduction

A Proposal for a Bill to improve the health and wellbeing of dogs throughout their lives by strengthening the regulation of the activity of breeding, and of selling or transferring puppies, and by establishing a more responsible and informed approach to acquiring and owning a puppy or dog. The consultation runs from 4 May 2018 to 30 July 2018 All those wishing to respond to the consultation are strongly encouraged to enter their responses electronically through this survey. This makes collation of responses much simpler and quicker. However, the option also exists of sending in a separate response (in hard copy or by other electronic means such as e-mail), and details of how to do so are included in the member's consultation document. Questions marked with an asterisk (*) require an answer All responses must include a name and contact details. Names will only be published if you give us permission, and contact details are never published – but we may use them to contact you if there is a query about your response. If you do not include a name and/or contact details, we may have to disregard your response. Please note that you must complete the survey in order for your response to be accepted. If you don't wish to complete the survey in a single session, you can choose "Save and Continue later" at any point. Whilst you have the option to skip particular questions, you must continue to the end of the survey and press "Submit" to have your response fully recorded. Please ensure you have read the consultation document before responding to any of the questions that follow. In particular, you should read the information contained in the document about how your response will be handled. The consultation document is available here: [Consultation document Privacy Notice](#)

I confirm that I have read and understood the Privacy Notice attached to this consultation which explains how my personal data will be used

Page 2: About you

Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

an individual

Which of the following best describes you? (If you are a professional or academic, but not in a subject relevant to the consultation, please choose "Member of the public".)

Member of the public

Please select the category which best describes your organisation

No Response

Please choose one of the following:

I am content for this response to be published and attributed to me or my organisation

Please provide your name or the name of your organisation. This will not be published if you have asked for the response to be anonymous or "not for publication". Otherwise this is the name that will be published with your response.

Georgina Spiers

Please provide details of a way in which we can contact you if there are queries regarding your response. Email is preferred but you can also provide a postal address or phone number. We will not publish these details.

Page 8: A - Reducing the threshold for a breeding licence to three litters a year

Q1. Which of the following best describes your view of reducing the threshold for a breeding licence from five to three litters in a twelve month period?

Partially supportive

Please explain the reasons for your response, including any advantages or disadvantages.

A litter of say 6 French bulldog puppies sold at £1,200 average equates to income of £7,200 pa just one litter - so 3 litters a year the total rises to £20k plus pa, is this income taxed. ABSOLUTELY NOT. so if a litter is bred for pleasure it will be one litter probably during a two or three year period, if it is bred for profit it will BE EVERY YEAR, the profit from the litter must be declared. The revenue added to the local authority solely for animal welfare department. The proposed £200 fine for non registration is nonsense, it should be the total cost of the revenue received from the litter. If legislation is seriously being considered the law has to be as ruthless as the perpetrator. Once people realise that puppies are not commodities and they can play God with it's life and it's new owner's life that the result is LOSS OF INCOME they will find another way of making money.

Page 9: B - Extending the breeding licence regime to any form of transfer, not only sale

Q2. Which of the following best describes your view of requiring people to be licensed as breeders even if they do not sell their puppies, but transfer them/give them away?

Fully supportive

Please give reasons for your answer, including any advantages or disadvantages.

There can be NO LOOPHOLES. Be ruthless, be straight, be direct. In the case of someone becoming ill unable to keep their dog and need to rehome is totally different from someone regularly "giving" away dogs. The nonsense will be the dog is for free but the collar is £1,200... if you are seriously wanting to stamp out dealers, deliberate breeding/transfer for profit there will be traceability. Adverts on websites, local papers, facebook, and whatever media people use these days. It would take but a whisper for someone to visit the sites, mark the adverts for future activity, when it pings up week or month after month, that supplier/dealer/breeder is caught. The authorities can contact the number themselves and follow through, monies generated from fines/capture streamed to finance the manpower to undertake the work.

Page 10: C - Introducing a temporary registration scheme for those that breed fewer than three litters a year

Q3. Which of the following best describes your view of introducing a temporary registration scheme for those breeding one or two litters in a 12 month period who wish to sell or transfer their puppies?

Partially opposed

Please explain the reasons for your answer, including any advantages or disadvantages.

Because any breeding of dogs for profit needs to be taxed because there are huge monetary gains from dog breeding. The caveat being that people who breed because they love that breed, want that breed to be healthy into the future, want their puppies to enrich peoples lives should not be penalised and pressured into making a paper trail. It's too expensive and not viable. THESE people would only breed every two or three years anyway. Breeding puppies to show at Kennel Club registered events is ANOTHER matter altogether and the authorities need to link up with the Kennel Club. I know from experience when I showed dogs that there are fortunes made from show dogs, Go to a championship dog show, say Scottish Kennel Club, walk around the car park, the vehicles parked, caravans too, are mainly financed by dog showing and breeding. Traceability is easy, the Kennel Club register the puppies from the same breeders The KC itself has huge revenue stream from dogs (obviously and I am absolutely not saying a WITCH HUNT that would be disgusting because the KC does do some good works, There are issues with extreme breeding by which I mean bulldogs unable to walk, pekingnese unable to breathe, german shephers unable to stand because the KC has breed standards and allow people to overstep the mark and let them win at shows. The recent German shepherd outcry at Crufts a couple of years ago etc etc etc.

Q4. Under the proposal, someone with only one or two litters in a 12 month period found to be selling or transferring puppies without completing an online temporary registration would be committing an offence and may be liable to pay a fine. Which of the following best describes your view on this?

Partially supportive

Please give reasons for your answer, including any advantages or disadvantages.

It is improbable that there would be manpower to follow through on this, please see my previous comment. I would remind you that designer dogs, French bulldogs, raise huge amounts of money. Once monetary gain is lost, dog breeding will stop.

Page 11: D - Ensuring future health and welfare needs of dogs through a more responsible and informed approach to acquiring and owning a puppy/dog

Q5. Which of the following best describes your view of creating an obligation on prospective owners to consider carefully a set of questions related to their capacity to take on a puppy/dog?

Fully supportive

Please give reasons for your answer, including any advantages or disadvantages.

But it won't happen. Countless television programmes show dog rescue, show mistreated animals, show appalling puppy farms yet the public SEE a dog, WANT a dog, HAVE a dog. Like everything else we are throwaway society, animals included. As the report states there are half a million dogs a year in Scotland a year, where on earth do these dogs go, a high percentage sadly die because of neglectful breeders and new owners. IT'S the source that has to be made to explain dog ownership, show people adult dogs, show them the commitment. Good breeders definitely do, and it is obvious when one meets them, they need to be elevated

Q5. Which of the following best describes your view of creating an obligation on prospective owners to consider carefully a set of questions related to their capacity to take on a puppy/dog?

into the public eye whilst buying from vans for cash has to stop.

Q6. Which of the following best describes your view of placing an obligation on the breeder/keeper of a dog to check that any prospective owner is aware that they should have considered these questions?

Fully supportive

Please give reasons for your answer, including any advantages or disadvantages

The supplier is receiving the money and for that they must protect the DOG from any danger to ensure it has a very good quality of life. The people have choices, the dog does not, it is our slave and it's being is solely at our discretion. Actually applies to all animals. Some show dog breeders are implementing breeding contracts whereby suggestions are made and the new owner has to sign it. Sounds good, but who on earth regulates it. Unless it is registered formerly say with the Kennel Club what safety net is there for the dog and even doing this doesn't ensure that the dog is safe.

Q7. Which of the following best describes your view of obliging anyone acquiring a puppy from a breeder in Scotland to check that the breeder is licensed or registered?

Fully supportive

Please give reasons for your answer, including any advantages or disadvantages

If it is a breeder who breeds for profit absolutely. And... the owner must notify that local authority when the puppy is purchased from that breeder so that there is traceability on how much money is being generated from those premises. ALSO inspection. Where I live there is a puppy farm in the glen, I asked a councillor once how many times that puppy farm had been inspected, SILENCE. So, if the premises are to be licensed then inspections at least twice a year, must be recorded too for the purchasers to see, the inspectors to be official, say donations to the RSPCA to undertake it, it has to be someone who understands that dogs can be bred from but to be able to do this they MUST be exercised, well fed, clean water, good housing, warmth. Not some idiot who works for the council who wants a jolly for the day and see some doggies that the farmer will put under his nose and kid him along. The Kennel Club operate a KC good breeders register. Don't make this legislation into another unaccountable for, useless, expensive register. MAKE IT WORK for the benefit of dogs.

Page 12: Financial impact

Q8. Taking account of both costs and potential savings, what financial impact would you expect the proposed Bill to have on:

	Significant increase in cost	Some increase in cost	Broadly cost neutral	Some reduction in cost	Significant reduction in cost	Unsure
(a) Local authorities		X				
(b) Dog breeders	X					
(c) General public (including dog owners)			X			

Q8. Taking account of both costs and potential savings, what financial impact would you expect the proposed Bill to have on:

(d) Police and animal welfare organisations			X			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Please explain the reasons for your response.

Local authorities should benefit but there will be initial set up costs. If it is operated sensibly and beneficially for the dogs and not just a political drum bashing exercise there will be gains on all sides. Dog breeders need to be made to declare all income from dogs minus legitimate traceable expenses. By dog breeders I mean a litter a year, not the family who breeds for fun for the children, that will be a once in a lifetime experience probably, and those interested in dog showing who breed only when they want a new puppy to show from their bloodline. Having said that if more than £5k net is generated then it must be declared. General public, shouldn't be extra costs, we pay our council tax and as our servants they must work out the best way of moving this legislation forward without penalty to us. The breeder is generating the income, that breeder needs to pay it's dues. Police and animal welfare organisations, again should be cost neutral, any incidents must be paid for by the breeder/dealer/supplier if these organisations are involved and they are proven to be negligent.

Q9. Are there ways in which the Bill could achieve its aim more cost-effectively (e.g. by reducing costs or increasing savings)?

Yes

Please explain the reasons for your response.

If you are going to legislate then make it happen. Don't waffle and procrastinate and politicise the legislation. It's about dog welfare, full stop. Be as ruthless and determined as the puppy farmers/dealers/suppliers/breeders. They are only in it for the money and so are you, you because you need that revenue to protect the dogs, and the money comes from the perpetrators, make them pay. DO NOT USE the legislation to hammer dog ownership, remember the people who will take any heed of the legislation are the law abiding, dog loving, concerned, tax payers in our society. We pay all of our dues. It is the undesirables who must be your focus. Hitting out at the easy targets would be unforgiveable of you and you do the dogs a huge disservice if you adopt that tack. So, buyer purchases dog. Buyer goes to local authority with the license number of the breeder and declare the purchase, price paid, the local authority issues a tag or whatever to record the information. Local authority notifies the breeder gives them the tag number of the puppy. The breeder notifies the Inland Revenue that x amount has been raised from the litter, gives them the tag number. The inland revenue notifies the council with the tag reference. OR the council can organise a programme with the inland revenue, the tax taken locally, and then an annual payment to the inland revenue from the council undertaken. Somehow it can be worked out I am sure, if there is a true desire to stop cruelty and unnecessary breeding of dogs. Dogs are a priveledge in our lives not a right, maybe the council make up some slogan to that effect. Health issues are a real concern too. Young pups cannot be inoculated despite the paperwork that accompanies them from Europe. Heart worm, lung worm, Alabama rot, rabbit mite, RABIES is a real threat to public health. It's a miracle nothing has happened yet. Remove all loopholes, hobbyist breeder, back yard breeder whatever tag these people think excludes them from society's regulations. Dare I say QUARANTINE be reinstated because that would close a major part of the problem. Scottish dogs bred in Scotland could become a premium brand? What I want from the legislation is a proper accountable, professional, sincere outcome, whether that is possible I don't know, but it would be marvellous for the benefit of one of most lovely, forgiving, life enriching creatures on this earth.

Page 13: Equalities

Q10. What overall impact is the proposed Bill likely to have on equality, taking account of the following protected characteristics (under the Equality Act 2010): age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion and belief, sex, sexual orientation?

Q10. What overall impact is the proposed Bill likely to have on equality, taking account of the following protected characteristics (under the Equality Act 2010): age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion and belief, sex, sexual orientation?

Positive

Please explain the reasons for your response.

What a question, totally unnecessary, we are talking dogs, dogs have a huge positive effect on HUMAN BEINGS. Stop categorising people, it's insulting. People are not brands of people, people are people. The point of this legislation is the protection of dogs, concentrate on that issue.

Page 14: Sustainability

Q11. Do you consider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future disproportionate economic, social and/or environmental impacts?

Yes

Please explain the reasons for your response.

If the law is sincere in its objectives, of course it should be delivered sustainably. The costs stop when the problem is solved, it's up to you to stop it, that's what we pay you to do on our behalf. It doesn't have to be done as a vendetta against dog ownership, it's the puppy farmers/dealers/suppliers/importers that perpetrate the vile trade, again, it's up to you to stop it.

Page 15: General

Q12. Do you have any other comments or suggestions on the proposal?

Think about quarantine again, it would stop an easy market for the puppy trading. Cross border is an easy target, Ireland is working on it with some success and so could Scotland. Simultaneously target the local puppy farmers who allegedly are licensed. Then go for the multiple adds on websites, whatever media sites etc, mark them to ping on your computers when there is activity, monitor what is going on, make everyone aware that it is not spying, it is legitimate tracking. If they are honest they care less, if they are dishonest they will deviate but eventually run out of hiding places. People buying pups from vans for cash must take registration numbers etc and if possible get photos of the sellers. It can be done it's just how without breaking our sensibilities and right of privacy. See my previous comments. Take away the bureaucracy, of "oo, that's not my department" to "these dogs/animals are in danger NOW let's protect them NOW". Be ruthless, be determined, these breeders are, careless of the dogs, desperate for the money. You need to be ruthless, careless of the breeder, take their money and kill their desperation. From base level it can all be shown to the public, a new spreadsheet all accountable from the outset. No shilly-shallying, just get on with it. We live in a free world, we are lucky, free speech and we have laws, laws are good if they are respected but when they are not we have to make it hard for the law breakers.

Q13. Could the aims of the Bill be better delivered in another way (rather than by means of a Bill in the Scottish Parliament)?

Please explain the reasons for your response

I don't think that there is another way, until there is a base line no one is sure of how to deal with this sort of behaviour. Especially when huge sums of money are involved. Drugs raise huge sums of money and are a massive cost to society, the effects crippling, but it is an inanimate object. Dogs are living beings, sensitive,

Q13. Could the aims of the Bill be better delivered in another way (rather than by means of a Bill in the Scottish Parliament)?

intelligent, huge sums of money are being raised through them too but unlike drugs, dogs are beneficial to society and an enrichment. They need our protection and our respect.