



Dear Sir,

In response for submissions to the review I simply wish to state:

- As a farmer I support the requirement for multiple dogs to be used to flush a fox to guns – they are essential to providing a comprehensive search for vermin predators.
- The hunt provide a rapid, comprehensive service that cannot be equated to keepers and lamping; who not only cost more to employ, but do not provide the same level of service.
- In areas not hunted (on neighbouring farms, I have seen evidence of poor shooting/ lamping where an animal has been partially hit due to poor keeping. Not a problem I have found with hunts.
- I fail to see the sudden requirement for legislative change, the current system works – there is still a requirement for fox control, and the current system provides that in a humane way.
- There is little if any evidence of hunt illegal activities. Contrary to this I have witnessed those opposed to hunting, creeping across fields worrying stock etc. with their behaviour. The hunt provides a service whilst acting within the law – I have seen no evidence to the contrary. I have seen edited short clips by the LACS group (League Against Cruel Sports) without primary corroborative evidence.
- This review seems prompted by political posturing in the Scotland/England powers, influence debate. I do not see the evidential need for change.

Yours faithfully

Matthew Stonehouse