

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.

John Thomson

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?

Fully supportive

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

Under the current KC guidance, not to mention best practice, anyone breeding 5 litters per year would require to own 5 bitches. Breeding on this scale can no longer be described as a hobby or pastime. Furthermore, given the sums of money involved these days, a very comfortable living can be made from 5 litters. Personally, I would rather that there was a requirement for any breeder, even of one litter, to be licensed. Alternatively, a cap on the price of pets would dissuade the irresponsible and the greedy. It would also solve the problems of puppy farming and smuggling

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.

I would hope that any licensing requirements would be rigorously enforced and that the welfare of the animals would be paramount in such enforcement. Whether they are sold or given away is therefore irrelevant

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 opposed

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

A licensing scheme should cover breeders, full stop. I would assume that such a license would require to be renewed on an annual basis and can therefore see no need for a temporary registration scheme. Furthermore, such a scheme would lead to additional administration and cost

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.

As in my previous answers, I believe that all breeders should be licensed and that unlicensed breeding should be treated seriously with the appropriate penalties attached

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 should be able to demonstrate that they are able, physically, emotionally and financially, to care for a dog for the whole of its expected lifespan. A rigorous set of questions should weed out those who think a dog is a good idea without giving any thought as to what ownership would actually mean for them and their family

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

I would suggest that anyone who breeds animals has an obligation relating to the continued welfare of that animal, including a situation where the new owner wants to or has to, rehome the animal. This would hopefully cut down on the numbers of animals in shelters. I can see, however, that there may be difficulties enforcing such a measure

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

This would save situations such as those described in the consultation document where pups are bought from a car boot. It would also discourage back street breeders, puppy farmers and smugglers

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.

I would expect that the licensing fees would offset the increase in cost to local authorities, with breeders paying a far higher price than the general public. I would also expect that this will have little impact on the police or animal welfare organisations (SSPCA) as they seem to show little interest in all but the most severe, high profile cases

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

No

Please explain the reasons for your response.

If this legislation is to mean anything, there will be a substantial cost in admin and enforcement staff from day 1. This should be offset by the licensing fees. However, as back street breeders are discouraged and "casual" ownership of dogs falls, so will the revenue. That is assuming, of course, that the admin and enforcement are properly funded in the first place, or it will all have been for nothing

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?

Slightly negative

Please explain the reasons for your response.

It should have no effect whatsoever, other than on the disabled. i.e if a person is so disabled that they cannot care for themselves without assistance, I find it unlikely that they will be able to properly care for a dog

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.

I have answered YES as I cannot foresee any negative economic impact. I can, however, see a positive social and environmental impact when total idiots are no longer permitted to own a dog

Page 15: General

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

If these proposals become law, they have to be rigorously enforced if the aims are to be achieved. In addition (I am not sure if this is an appropriate bill to deal with this situation, but it certainly needs addressed) I recently witnessed a young couple walking with their young daughter (about 4/5) and their dog, on a lead. The dogs lead was wrapped round the wee girls arm and the parents walked about 20 feet behind. The dog in question was a Dogue du Bordeaux which weighed about 60 kg. I don't know if there are any laws which cover this situation, but if there are not, there should be

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

Perhaps if the police were given further guidance on animal welfare and had less reliance on the SSPCA, but that's not likely to happen