

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 19 January 2016 11:06

To: McLeod A (Aileen), MSP

Subject: fox hunting

Hi Aileen, I would like to raise a point on this issue which I do not believe has ever been discussed. As you know, the biggest day in the hunt calendar is Boxing day. The darkest day of the year is the 22nd of December. From various photographs of the Boxing day hunts, I noticed not a single rider or horse had any Hi Viz. I concluded either each individual rider either chose not to wear it, or the hunt did not allow it. I emailed a hunt, asking to join and whether or not I would need Hi Viz. I was told it was "there is no necessity to wear hi viz and it is totally inappropriate". It has prevented accidents and save lives all over the world. It avoids last minute braking and skidding. I cannot imagine why this is considered inappropriate. Should any rider with public liability insurance who is not wearing Hi Viz be involved in an accident, it is unlikely they would be covered. I see also most of the hunt, wear a Patey hat, which relies exclusively on its fit to stay on. This type of hat has almost disappeared, as the modern hats have an integrated harness which makes it impossible for it to bounce off, and is consequently much safer. If a rider is wearing one of these hats and no Hi Viz, I suspect it would reduce their chances of claiming insurance to nil. Even if the hunt was just concerned with their own safety, and they

were involved in a serious accident that required a helicopter rescue, they would be located far more easily with Hi Viz. There are many occasions where the helicopter has to abandon a search if it takes the fuel level to less than what it needs to return to base. Could I suggest, if there is any way in which Hi Viz could be made compulsory for groups of x or more, this would most certainly improve safety and very likely reduce the hunt numbers as they obviously do not consider it regal enough. Many thanks for reading, [REDACTED]

This message has been received from an external party and
has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [2002 Act Review](#)
Subject: submissions ref no2016/0001969
Date: 14 February 2016 01:24:20

Further to previous evidence. I would like to call attention to, firstly, a youtube clip "Fife Foxhounds drawn out death of a fox" and secondly to two BBC news clips. The youtube clip drew my attention to this issue. Video shows fox cubs held near hunt kennels, BBC news 11th June 2015 by rural affairs correspondent, Claire Marshall. 16 cubs were found in a barn 200 m from hunt kennels. Dr Toni Marshall said she believed the rearing of foxes solely for the purpose of entertaining the hunt was widespread. Captive fox released from Buckminster estate shed BBC news December 24th 2015. A charity covertly filmed a hunt employee visiting the fox, however, it was removed and the same man was filmed with a net and a bag shortly before the hunt was due to meet. These two articles, as Dr Sheppard says, blow apart the argument that hunting is about controlling numbers. I believe it is cruelty for cruelty's sake. As thousands of acres have been taken out of greenbelt to build houses, many roads have been constructed to service them, resulting in more vehicles and making it impossible for most foxes to avoid being killed. This alone would keep numbers down if that was required. Finally, I would like to mention an announcement made by the FBI in January this year. See FBI to track animal abuse. They have said that as there is overwhelming evidence that animal cruelty is a "precursor to violent crime". As such, they will track anyone who has been cruel to an animal in the same way they track burglary, arson and homicide. John Thompson, Deputy Executive Director of the National Sheriffs Association said "If someone is harming an animal, there is a good chance they are also harming a human" Recently, there have been several "school shooters" in the US. Every one had previously killed an animal. Chicago Police found that 65% of people arrested for domestic violence had previously hurt animals. Amongst serial killers, 99% had killed animals before embarking on murder sprees. The "night stalker" Richard Ramirez, and "The Boston Strangler" are two examples. If the FBI are correct, animal harm is behaviour that should, under no circumstances, be cultivated. I do not see how any right minded person could disagree with the FBI.

This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisations IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

This email has been received from an external party and

has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [2002 Act Review](#)
Subject: corrections
Date: 15 February 2016 23:54:28

Further to my last e mail, 14/2/16 01.24. I would like to make two corrections. I have referred to Dr Toni Marshall, and it is Dr Toni Shepard. Claire Marshall is the rural correspondent for the BBC. Thereafter, when I did refer to Dr Shepard, I spelt her name Sheppard. Please accept my apologies.

This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisations IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

This email has been received from an external party and

has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
