

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

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 March 2016 15:26
To: Central Enquiry Unit
Subject: FW: for the personal attention of Lord Bonomy (re foxhunting)

Hello,

Grateful if you could forward the following email on to the appropriate policy official.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

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

From: sandra busell [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 March 2016 15:21
To: SG Communications
Subject: for the personal attention of Lord Bonomy (re foxhunting)

Dear Lord Bonomy,

I understand that you are reviewing the efficacy of the Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act, 2002.

I should like to bring three matters of fact to your attention:

1. Foxes do not need to be killed to "control" them, as, if left alone by humans, they control their own numbers.
2. Foxhunters have created artificial earths, in order to encourage foxes to breed.
It is obvious that they would not do this if the fox was considered to be an animal that needed to be controlled. They did this to ensure they had have enough foxes to hunt.
3. They also transported foxes from one part of the country to another, where they would then release them - again to try to ensure that they have enough foxes to hunt.

Most foxhunters deny the above, but a few have been known to admit it.

Evidence re the above can be obtained from a number of sources, including the HSA and the LACS.

I hope you will take the above into consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Sandra Busell



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: [sandra busell](mailto:sandra.busell)
To: [2002 Act Review](#)
Subject: wild mammals (scotland) act 2002
Date: 04 April 2016 11:35:32

Dear Lord Bonomy,

Further to my previous email, when I first read about the review, it said submissions had to be in by a date early in April, I think it was the 6th. I had been reflecting over the weekend that I should have added more information and only this morning I have seen on the website that the final date was the 31st March. However, it does say that you will consider if "further investigation is appropriate" and so I am adding this in the hope that if it is too late to be taken into consideration in the initial stage, you will consider it and hopefully investigate it further before coming to any decision.

I am writing to inform you about what happened in the run up to the Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002.

I submitted evidence at the time very similar to what I sent you, making the three important points that (I am including them again here, to save you time looking for my previous email and so that you have the information complete in the one email):

1. Foxes don't need to be controlled as, if left alone by humans, they control their own numbers.
2. Foxhunters have created artificial earths for foxes to encourage them to breed.
3. Foxhunters have transported foxes from one part of the country to another, then released them, to try to ensure that they have enough foxes to hunt.

Concerned that Mike Watson may not have been informed of these facts - and they are facts, not just opinions - I wrote to him stating the above. Apparently, my letter never reached him. There was someone from an animal charity working in his office at the time to help him with his workload; this included sifting through mail. I was told that, as he was receiving so much mail over this issue, too much for him to cope with, mail was not being passed on to him which contained information that he had already been made aware of and that, as he had had many discussions with the then-director of the charity (the SSPV, now known as OneKind), who had made these facts known to him there was no need to pass on my letter. Presumably any other letters containing the same information did not reach him either, for the same reason.

I was therefore dismayed and shocked when I found out how the Bill had been worded and that it obviously had not taken these facts into consideration and that it was obvious that, with the Bill worded as it was, foxes would not be protected from unnecessary suffering.

When I finally managed to speak to Mike Watson directly and asked him why he had ignored these facts, he told me that he had not known that, if left alone by humans, foxes control their own numbers and that, if he had been made aware of this, he would have worded the Bill differently. Unfortunately, it was too late, as by then the Bill had gone through.

All these years I have been left wondering if there really was any genuine intention to make the facts known and to protect foxes or was the whole thing just a sham. Was Mike Watson informed by the charity's then director of these facts and, if so, why did he deny that he had been told and why did he ignore these facts?

I hope that you will agree that this is an unacceptable way to leave things and that you see that there is a need to investigate this and, hopefully, get to the bottom of it. I have tried, but in vain.

Sorry for the length of this email; I appreciate you will be very busy, but I feel this is perhaps the only chance that there will be for this issue re how the Bill came to be worded as it was to be investigated and, hopefully, for the truth to emerge and so I felt it was important to make you aware of this. I only wish now that I had done so in my original email.

If there is anything you want to ask me or any other way I can be of assistance, please don't hesitate to contact me. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Sandra Busell

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.
