

From: [Deirdre Balaam](#)
To: [2002 Act Review](#)
Subject: Review of the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002
Date: 30 March 2016 19:23:31

Rt Hon Lord Iain Bonomy
Review of the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002
Wildlife Management Team
Natural Resources Division
Directorate for Environment and Forestry
The Scottish Government
1-C North
Victoria Quay
Edinburgh EH6 6QQ

Dear Lord Bonomy

I am increasingly concerned at the apparent attitude prevailing, in certain circles, that animal life in Scotland is not being - in reality - worthy of protection. Many fine words issue forth from here and there, but there are instances where this so-called protection is something that affects 'other people' on 'other occasions', and not the one particular issue where protection has not been adhered to. I call that evasion, and a quiet nod to those menacing or killing wildlife that they can get on with it. One such instance is the barbaric practice of flushing out foxes (if not hares, and other creatures) by, say, dogs. The flushed animal is then shot; a mangling spectacle may be required beforehand.

Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002 is a fine aim. I would feel proud of this Act if it genuinely did what it purports to do. Lethal control of foxes is neither necessary nor justified. I had thought that the 'advance of civilisation' would have been so far ahead by now that the usual answer to any problem (Terrorise/Kill It) would have been far behind us. But no. There are still those low dunderheads who wish to hold us back from advanced thinking and action.

There are also dunderheads, low or high I cannot say, who legislate for the protection of wild animals but leave so many loopholes that such protection is a joke. Can the Act be respected by those who wish to see it diligently and properly carried out, if the same legislation is being scoffed at by those who do not give a hoot for protection of wildlife? Can the Act be respected if the police in some instances support its infringement/infringers? Does it amount to, in sum, the fact that we can all infringe any law provided those who should be upholding it look the other way? Is that what a law is about?

There are those who actively attempt to protect wildlife as it is being assaulted, and who become assaulted themselves (eg run over by a tractor). The tacit accepted network of wildlife hunters and police means that the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Act 2002 is not working. Perhaps those involved in the hunting, mauling and killing of wildlife and the police need more education on this issue?

I sure hope that the Review of this Act will produce a revised Act that will be respected by those who cause the need for such an Act. Hounds in particular should not be used (abused) to chase/attack/terrorise/kill/or otherwise abuse wildlife. At all. I am astonished that there are people who still have time and inclination for this savagery. Why must there be terror, blood and death, at the end of a delicious old gallop in the hitherto glorious countryside?

Yours sincerely

Deirdre Balaam



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.
