[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 22 May 2014 09:24
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Sale of game

Good Morning All,

Agree with all the comments below and it just brings me back (as usual) to “conversion of the obdurate” which surely includes a focus on advocates who use the non-toxics e.g. wildfowling clubs. Hearing about their experiences, how they have addressed any issues with the non-toxics, how it hasn’t ended their shooting etc. Non-toxics clinics and demonstrations have worked well in other countries. And of course those wildfowlers can feed their wigeon to little Johnny (or Penelope) knowing how healthy it is... Sorry, couldn’t stop myself.

Best wishes,

[redacted]

PS I can see [redacted] was accidentally omitted from first email so included now.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 22 May 2014 07:43
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Sale of game

Thanks [redacted]

Thank you both for chasing this hare, but I struggle to draw anything more from it as regards wider risks to wildlife (or human health). Do others?

It doesn’t shed doubt on the belief that the non-compliance recorded by WWT, having purchased ducks from retail outlets for their study, stemmed from non-compliance among those who customarily supply ducks to the market - and that means the organised shoots and estates who produce a surplus to their own requirements.

It tends to support the view that people who "one might see as proper wildfowlers” do not sell to dealers and in the main in England and Wales get on with using alternatives to lead as they are required to do - although

I do not doubt that one or two have local arrangements etc. Some wildfowling clubs proscribe sale. The rest is speculation.

Reducing the risk to wildfowl, as a (arguably the top but nor only) priority under the wildlife heading, means finding ways to convert the obdurate. These we know are people who don't think there's a problem and don't think there is any downside risk to themselves from breaking the law. They probably haven't yet accepted, in addition, that their failure to comply, whether or not they think there is a problem or any genuine risk of being penalised, will eventually force the conclusion that banning lead shot is the only way to go.

It is of course worth bearing in mind, to my certain knowledge, that some "serious shoots" have simply stopped the duck shooting because they have recognised the difficulty, whatever they do, of getting some of the guns to obey instructions in the current climate of opinion - which puts the organisers at risk if they sell the birds. In any case the duck shooting was a sideline to the main purpose of the shoot.

Even so thank you having a go at it.

Best regards as ever - further thoughts welcome.

[redacted]

On 20 May 2014, at 15:55, [redacted] wrote:

Thanks [redacted]

And for contextual info here's the text from the report – 15% of the BASC members surveyed supply birds (of all sorts) to game dealers, of these 5% did so regularly.

Best wishes,

[redacted]

3.3.5 Supplying birds to game dealers (Question 3)

Fifteen percent of all survey respondents (140/939) supplied birds to game dealers, with approximately one third of these doing so on a regular basis. The questionnaire did not specifically ask respondents to indicate which of the types of shooting in which they participated, were the sources of the birds they supplied to dealers. More than half of those who reported supplying birds to dealers (68%) were involved in shooting requiring the use of non-lead (Figure 3.4), almost exclusively inland duck shooting. Furthermore, none of those who reported supplying birds to dealers was involved only in shooting which required the use of non-lead shot.

<image002.png>

Figure 3.4 Percentage of suppliers of birds to game dealers (n=140) who are and are not required to use non-lead shot in some or all of their shooting.

[redacted]

M [redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 20 May 2014 14:00
To: [redacted]
Subject: Sale of game

Hello,
I've had a look at the compliance survey data and have cross-tabulated part of one question where we asked respondents their frequency of taking part in a number of shooting disciplines, and whether or not they sell any of their game. Note that this means that we can't tell what game they're selling, for example if someone is a rough shooter and a wildfowler and sells their pigeons but not their ducks then we're stuffed. However, I've extracted the following:

Frequency of wildfowling	Do you sell birds to game dealers?		
	Yes, regularly	Yes, sometimes	No
Once a week (n= 15)	*6.7	0.0	93.4
Once a fortnight (n= 17)	0.0	*5.9	94.2
Once a month (n= 23)	0.0	*4.3	95.6
Once a season (n= 73)	8.2	13.7	78.1
Not at all (n= 811)	4.9	8.8	86.3

*Individual shooters who sell birds to game dealers, but are also active in game shooting, inland duck shooting or rough shooting to the same or greater extent as wildfowling (i.e. not exclusively wildfowlers)

As you can see, for those people who reported wildfowling at least once a month, almost no one reported selling their game (there were single respondents per frequency class that did, but they were also active game shooters, inland duck shooters or rough shooters).

Does this answer your question [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit http://www.symanteccloud.com

This message is confidential and for the sole use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may not be disclosed, copied or distributed in any form unless it contains an express statement to the contrary.