

# 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".)

Professional with experience in a relevant subject

**Optional: You may wish to explain briefly what expertise or experience you have that is relevant to the subject-matter of the consultation:**

Owner of a 13 year old home bred red merle Border Collie and a 3 year old Dandie Dinmont Terrier Bred 8 litters with 4 bitches (41 pups) of Border Collies from 2004 - 2009 Qualified and Accredited Trainer no 2101192 with the Institute of Modern Dog Trainers. see [www.imdt.uk.com](http://www.imdt.uk.com) and have attended all the courses held in Scotland Canine First Aider Studying a correspondence course on Learning Motivation and Re-inforcement with the IMDT Attend IMDT conferences and Puppy Conference (PACT) Jan 2018 and SSPCA Conference in Nov. 2017 in Edinburgh. Took part in local focus group with Northumbria university in 2017 which produced report announced at the SSPCA conference. SQA modules in small animal breeding, applied dog behaviour and genetics Qualified to judge Dandie Dinmont Terriers. Instrumental in bringing the Green Dog Walkers Campaign to Angus in 2011 and currently involved with Angus Council in re-launching it Angus wide at Canines at the Castle., Glamis in September 2018 Run 3 dog related Facebook pages namely Carnoustie Canine Capers, Green Dog Walkers Angus and Angus the County that Cares about Dogs. Co-ordinator of a not for profit community group Carnoustie Canine Capers. Committed to CPD in dog related issues.

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.

Flora Cairnie

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.**

It should help avoid a bitch being bred from at every season. Ethical breeders do not do this but rest their bitches for a year. It would be to reducing the number of litters bred by less than ethical back yard breeders i.e. those who do not give a lifetime support to puppy owners and who will not take back a puppy which then may end up in rescue at the adolescent stage. There are ethical breeders out there who breed say 5 litters per year who do put a strong emphasis on dog and pup welfare. These breeders could be penalised hence my choosing partially supportive of the reducing of the threshold. We have one locally who breeds unregistered pups but breeder is of a high standard compared with many "puppy farms".

## 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?

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.**

Anyone who breeds from their dog is a breeder whether it is a planned or accidental mating. There is no such thing as "we are not real breeders". All people who breed ought to have some sort of licence in place. People on benefit/low incomes/pensions could evidence benefit e.g. universal credit as a passport to a reduced cost of a licence. There needs to be an official record of puppies born whether they are registered or unregistered; checks that they are microchipped before being transferred or given away; and welfare checks in place.

## 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?

Fully supportive

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

If you have you have a litter whether through a planned or accidental mating you are a breeder. Even if you only plan to breed one litter there ought to be a registration scheme in place to check on the welfare of the bitch and the litter. The main disadvantage is the "policing" of one of/back yard breeders.

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?

Fully supportive

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

People need to start to be more responsible about managing "accidental matings". KC only allows registration of one mating per year. Some breeders register one litter and have an "accidental mating" at next season. "Accidental matings" e.g. merle to merle can lead to a range of deformities. People need education in the key times when a bitch can conceive. Education underpins a lot of the dog related issues. If there was a dog ownership test e.g. on line theory (and attendance at some training classes) people would hopefully learn about neutering and spaying, canine welfare, nutrition et alia. Temporary registration is after the event i.e. the mating. Would a permission to mate certificate be an option to cut down unwanted pregnancies and help reduce the number of dogs in rescue? If this was tied in with DOTs and passports this would tie up some loopholes with regard to those who will always flout the law. Ignorance of the law is no excuse. If you breed you need to register. Enforcement is a big issue. It is not a role of the police to monitor this. Local councils animal health depts would be the probable monitors but councils would have to be allocated money from the Scottish Government to enforce registration/administration/welfare checks etc. If there was a passport scheme in place for every dog born and breeders could not sell a pup or pass one on without a passport, this would give greater traceability.

## 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.**

Prospective owners need to undertake a Dog ownership test before they are ever allowed a dog. This would educate in the objective range of questions they need to ask a breeder and what to look for when going to buy a pup vs being emotionally influenced with cute puppy eyes or a need to take a pup out of a poor situation. This could be a theory test done on line e.g. driving test to cover all areas of the 5 freedoms. After all a dog can be as dangerous as a car in terms of causing injuries and fatalities. Breeders would need sight of the original certificate before selling on a puppy.

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**

Ethical breeders will do a huge range of suitability checks. Others will just take the money. Breeders therefore need monitoring and evaluation to ensure that they are educated in the right questions to ask a prospective adopter i.e about dog knowledge, lifestyle, training arrangements, domestic and family arrangements et alia. Rescues such as Animal Rescue Crew work through a comprehensive list of questions and a home visit before a potential owner is considered suitable as an owner/adopter. People fall in love with the cute puppy. They do not consider life costs for feeding and veterinary care, welfare issues, enrichment, training i.e. they don't come ready trained. Breeders need to take this level of responsibility. If you had a child whom you wanted to put in to childcare you would not just hand them over. You would want to know a whole lot about the carer/care provided etc. Prospective owners need to undertake compulsory practical training with their new pup/rescue/rehome/any dog for which they take on ownership. Practical training should be done in classes run by Accredited Trainers but not self confessed trainers/dog psychologists/dog philosophers as we have in our area. People need education about how to look for a force free accredited trainers vs self confessed dog psychologist/philosophers/behaviourist/ users and promoter of shock collars. Trainers could be registered with the local council Trading Standards or evidence training through APDT/IMDT/KCAI/PACT etc.

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**

You would not put your child to an unregistered childminder. A dog ownership certificate would cover areas such as this so that people are educated about what to look for.

## 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					
(d) Police and animal welfare organisations					X	

**Please explain the reasons for your response.**

The set up costs for the education and licencing would be significant for national government and local councils. However, in the longer term, there should be fewer welfare issues, fewer strays, fewer complaints about out of control dogs/dog attacks which need followed up and most particularly fewer dogs ending up in rescue because people did not ask the right question of the breeder and vice versa. There are already databases in place such as with the KC and ISDS. Could they be subcontracted to do a general database? If people i.e. breeders and potential adopters had clear guidelines. licences and education in place then ultimately costs will reduce. An ethical breeder who is doing all the breed specific testing available, feeding a high quality diet to bitch and pups who are being developed with programmes such as Puppy Culture, registered and microchipped is already paying out thousands of pounds to produce pups before these pups every go to a new home. A £25?? licence and passport costs will add to costs but that is included in the selling price. Those who are not doing any of the aforementioned will just add price to selling price of pup and probably make more money than an ethical breeder especially if they are a designer cross with a fancy name and no testing done. If a potential owner cannot afford to undertake a Dog Ownership test and buy a passported dog it begs the question "Can they afford a dog?". Obviously, there are exceptions e.g. certain benefits could be a passport to a reduced cost of test/passport etc. It is well documented that dogs help child and adult wellbeing so there could be spin offs in terms of less people using and costing NHS services for e.g. loneliness, depression, suicide, medications etc. Are the police a) the right organsation to monitor breed specific legislations and b) how high is it on their list of priorities with the current modus operandum in Police Scotland in 2018. More council dog wardens/animal care officers would be a preferred option. They have a greater understanding or and training in the presenting issues.

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

Unsure

## 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?

Unsure

**Please explain the reasons for your response.**

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?

Not sure that I totally understand this question to be honest and its relevance to having a dog licence. Happy to discuss further after clarification. I would hope that any legislation would be in line with all of the criteria mentioned and not discriminate.

## 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.**

The passing of the Bill and its communication by its very essence should encourage breeders/potential breeders to think more carefully about what they are doing/about to do in terms of breeding a litter. Hopefully it would reduce the idea that people want to breed because e.g. they want their children to see the birth and watch puppies grow. This is NOT the right reason to breed. Breeders like potential owners should have to undergo some education about the whole process from pre-conception, parturition, puppy development and importance of socialisation and key learning periods. Courses or classes could be covered by ILAs for example. Certain benefits need not debar some one from being a suitable breeder/owner. Benefits could be a passport to a reduced cost. Again this could be included in ILA funding. Environmental impacts should be beneficial in that there will hopefully be more owners who will clear up after their dogs thus decreasing local Council clean up costs. For example in training sessions and at community events I get people to sign up to the Green Dog Walkers campaign to encourage people to clean up after their dogs. There is a huge amount of work going on in Angus for example to keep Angus clean see [www.aceangus.co.uk](http://www.aceangus.co.uk) and Easthaven Together for more information. This level of work needs to be supported by Bills like this i.e. less pups = less mess. Licensing coupled with passporting, education in all its forms, enforcement should all add paw-sitives in terms of economic, social and environmental impacts and the key impact is that this should have a benefit on the welfare of dogs. The Bill needs the accompaniment of the aforementioned points

## Page 15: General

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

It is increasingly important that the Canine Industry becomes more regulated across the board intrinsically for the welfare of dogs. Microchipping is a tool that has made a start to this. Banning the shock collar is a way forward. This Bill is building on these by targeting the breeder i.e. starting point of many dog issues that cost councils money. Hopefully the rest will follow e.g. Dog Ownership Tests, Dog Passports, Nationally Approved Commercial Dog walkers, groomers, accredited trainers, accredited behaviourists et alia. "Angus the County that Cares about Dogs" is a Facebook page which was set up at the beginning of 2018. The idea is to bring together all aspects of the Canine Industry in Angus to share good practices, educate, offer accredited trainer recommendations, signpost, network and show some fun as well as all the serious stuff. Sincere thanks to Christine Grahame MSP for tabling this and seeking consultation on the subject.

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

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

No

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

The Aims of the Bill need to become law to offer a structure across Scotland and offer all the local councils et alia a reference point. All the underpinning work needs to be communicated to the various councils and many areas of the canine industry. Perhaps it could be supported by TV coverage, a national conferences for interested people or organisations, local seminars put on by local councils in conjunction with local veterinary practices trainers etc. Vet practices need to take a much greater role in the education across the board but specifically with regards to breeders. In Angus, Carnoustie Canine Capers and ACE (Angus Clean Environments) volunteers will be working with our local council to produce a "bottom up" Canine Strategy for Angus. It will be towards the end of 2019 before this is complete.