

Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru | National Assembly for Wales
Y Pwyllgor Newid Hinsawdd, Amgylchedd a Materion Gwledig | Climate
Change, Environment and Rural Affairs Committee
Bil Anifeiliaid Gwyllt a Syrcasau (Cymru) | Wild Animals and Circuses (Wales)
Bill
WA 26
Ymateb gan : Unigolyn
Evidence from : Individual

Personal Views

I am a long standing resident of Wales. I have a huge interest in animal behaviour, conditioning and training, environmental impact to animals, husbandry, ethical uses and animal psychology. Over the last five years I have been attending Circus Mondao as a customer, myself, friends, and our children, we go as many times as a possible whilst they are in our area. I have attended also on a private level which has allowed me to partake in my own thorough investigations, learn all care plans, records, inspection requirements, and repairs, licensing applications and reports, veterinary records, health and safety inspections and reports and insurances. I have seen all guidance's regarding all welfare performance, training, and transportation, requirements of tour itinerary, including site plans, locations and licenses. I have read every welfare, Defra, animal activities license, and acts relevant. I have read all inspection reports for every inspection, and vets reports for both UK circuses with animals. I have been able to freely study the legislation and guidance and watch it in action, application, invention and its overall destruction, and nullification by animal rights activists. I attend circus for reasons of a passionate interest of animals, curious to find if the evidence provided by rights petitioners is true and exact (I find the opposite). I've attended to learn, educate myself and my two daughters and their friends on a good practice within welfare, and regulations, training and exhibition to ensure there are no areas in my own practices breaching welfare. I find the code of conduct automatically applied previous to some of the licenses existing today. I come from within an outdated traditional heavy horse, cultural heritage background. Also with farming (modern & historical), equine performance, falconry, search and rescue dog training, carriage driving, animal rescue ad rehabilitation industry experience for almost forty years in Wales and England. Mainly with a practical application, I have learnt all codes of practice to ensure I am ready for licensing in Wales, learning from the figureheads of practical application of legislative licensing and welfare promotion, the circus. This has been extremely beneficial to me in application at home in readiness. I've also been granted these same privileges by Peter Jolly Snr, and his family at Peter Jollys Circus, a circus originating in Wales, with the same freedoms of information given at Mondao.

I have learn so much from these circuses that my knowledge and practical applications of husbandry, training and record keeping is now virtually in line with the circuses and im extremely grateful to be in this position of readiness. I couldn't pay for such a valuable

experience, and a broad base of knowledge anywhere outside of circus. It is not available in such a superb format anywhere else.

Upsettingly over these years during the annual tours of Wales, I have been witness to several acts of misrepresentation of public views, countless attacks against circus by a few extremist individuals. The acts of vigilantes in the animal rights industry are influenced heavily by the continued use of emotive language, outdated photographs and information feed by flooding media with false images and misleading statements of negative welfare contradictory to my own eyes on evidence, and legislative inspection reports. In England, as seen via media there is an increase of incited hatred by protestors and animal rights activists using the smokescreen of media to state that violence and harassment is acceptable, and now justifiable due to supporting legislative ban. I myself have had a protestors young children pushed in front of my moving 4x4 to stop me entering site. This also happened to numerous attending public. Families of circus have lived in dear of this harassment for decades. There are too many incidents by a very small number of people to include all evidence. Although one incident this summer of livestock endangerment, and release sticks in my mind. Also XXXXXX celebrating destruction of property as seen on her page "Wales says 'no' to the use of ALL animals in circus", notable the tearing down of advertising posters photographed and shared publically. XXXXXX collection of posters, and vouchers she has collected from shops in Cardigan. Public view posted to "Wales say 'no' to all animals in circus. XXXXX post to same Facebook apologising on the 14th May 2018 for not being able to do much due to police presence at Jollys Circus. Calls to boycott business that allow circus on their properties being encouraged by XXXXX to same page 19th May 2018. I would like noted that most posts had no likes, or support shown by comments, and the majority of all the protests sites against circus have a very limited following and very little sharing, liking or support. This year's protest in Dwygyfychi, Circus Mondao had four protestors assembling on one day only, although the circus on that day was nearly sold out. I was there, dated Sunday 14th July 2019. 16 people were interested, 4 attended, 15 shared it. The normal day of choice to protest being a Sunday, when it causes as much as disruption to the public, and staff and animals as it is the normal day of the week to leave one site for another, and is busy on site. This disproportionate side of this bill is enormous, especially considering the recorded support for this circus in Wales, evidenced in its own financial records.

- Discrimination of 'ban' within circus industry alone, not general state members EU+UK trading in any other capacity ie. Santa sleighs, camel racing etc.
- Discrimination against circus gaining profit as a travelling circus whereas non-circus animal industry may continue to profit from use of some species of animal.
- I find it discriminatory to the circus industry that 'travelling and performing 'wild' captive bred, and reared animals in circus` is found to be ethically wrong in the travelling circus aspect, against travelling and performing same species with other service providers is deemed acceptable ie. Agricultural shows, racing, demonstrations, film and entertainment industry.

- Not at any point has DEFRA found the conditions of travel to be detrimental to the animals in transit, circus have to follow stringent animal movement control laws. Again DEFRA have no issues with welfare or compliance.
- I find to uphold this ban on an ethical basis is ethically biased against a small long standing traditional community, whose family members can trace their history within the circus to its origins in the 1700s.
- I find the ban ethically incorrect in restricting an established, regulated and licensed business under Article 56 to be reducing trade within circus industry.
- I feel it is unethical to discriminate animals in circus whilst so many other animal industries are found to be untargeted by this bill, and in their ethics.
- Consultation limited to only the select few that got to know about it, so not overall majority, but the majority of a select few.
- Outdated propaganda, and an uneducated opinions, facts etc use as a grounding for banning using ethics.

ie. Cages, Elephants + Big Cats, forced training and cruelty.
All Emotive and not factual based evidence

- I feel to uphold the ban on these principles outrageous, as it is nullifying all relevant peer reviewed data.
- Harassment of the animals, and people within circus has been immense. I have read many animal rights activists media (social propaganda) and the hatred to the circus cultural minority is being fuelled by the English and Scottish band, as they are now stating they have justification for the criminal actions they are continually undertaking. Many citing they agree with the violence and intend to cause harm, to release animals, endangering livestock. This can be seen all over social media. I wish it to be taken into account the thousands of social media users who attend these circuses, and do not agree with these actions. The circus families are existing in a situation of fear at present. So again we punish the victims of society and give power to the perpetrators.
- No other industry is judged on the actions of prior individual behaviours, this is discrimination.
- I feel the definition of a wild animal in the UK needs to be re-addressed, and re written. All the animals in the circus in UK are found domesticated in almost all other countries, and many other industries.

- The banning using ethics as its basis is unethical in itself. Ethics is philosophical argument, which does not imply facts in its application – it has NO right or wrong answer, each individual creating personal conclusion. Is this sensible to create a ban to provide a stepping stone for the animal rights industry to use to ban anything they wish to using ethics alone, and disregard all collected official evidence? I feel this is an incredibly risky thing to do.
- Animal welfare is inspected before licenses each year are issued. No issues of welfare found, this is a huge indication that the proposal of this bill is a failure, using governments own inspections, legislation, and circus compliance data. Whereas the proposed bill based on ethics, using welfare issues as its basis has been proven by the above to be incorrect welfare data provided by anti-circus.
- I believe the Animal Welfare Act 2006 will be breached as the circuses will be instructed by law to remove animals from their established herds, and home environments. Causing huge stress to the animals, some of which have been hand reared by the circus staff. Animals are sentient beings, and have the right to live, and be loved, meeting their emotional needs in the environment they live in.
- The circuses have been financially responsible for the inspections at a great cost. I find it insulting this can then be used as inadmissible evidence, and ignored by animal rights, although proven to be unutterably cooperative by circus, and the circuses wanting legislation to continue to grow to protect the animals' welfare, and their established business. The tax payed is not liable.
- I am in complete agreement with Circus Mondao's consultation response, and wish it to be seen as my own.
- This bill in its entirety is disproportionate, discriminatory, and will cause distress, and harm to animals and humans.
- Please refer to Dr Marthe Kiley-Worthingtons study. Professor Ted Friend of the Texas Ad M university's studies, and Dr Emmanuel Birmelin's studies.
- This is disproportionate in the time all devolved governments have taken to bring the bill forward, after years of debating it has now waited until the last minute to be pushed through, giving no opportunity to delay due to sunset clauses, on the bill, and the English tempory regulations running out. This could be construed as constructively ensuring the proposals and amendments have no time to be investigated.
- I employe assembly to review and implement the licensing laws to be used in Wales that have been so successful in England.

- Licensing in Wales as in England would ensure the ethos of animal welfare is maintained.
- As the ethos of this bill is welfare grounds as a component I ask for all welfare data to be admissible, and not to be dismissed.
- I ask for the animal rights propaganda to be removed as evidence, and only factual, peer reviewed evidence to be used.
- As an animal industry animal owner I wish to see fair legislation and the laws to evolve, and to develop in our beautiful Wales. I do not wish to be ruled by propaganda, false representation, and a discriminative UK parliament or assembly. Im already ashamed to state im a UK citizen, and as a North Wales resident for the majority of my life, I really don't wish to feel the same about Wales due to our governance and methods.
- I find it discriminatory that the circus industry as a whole is judged by the actions of a few misguided individuals, and being used through media to promote animal rights agendas to promote negativity throughout said agendas.
- I feel it unethical and unlawful to proceed with this bill as figures (that I can find) show for less than a majority of the population of Wales was petitioned or responded. Many many names on the petition are not based in Wales, so are NOT a fair representation of the people of Wales. This can also be said of the consultation response.
- I feel it unethical to continue to use the statement from the British Veterinary Association as against circus evidence, as in the statement it acknowledges circus as able to provide animal welfare needs at the same level as any other industry, and the stamen containing 'sentience` that the only negative welfare concern is applicable to every animal in existence. To use this statement as an argument to promote this ban provides its own evidence as controversial, and inadmissible as it creates discrimination breaches.
- I wish it be acknowledged, and be investigated the fact that the RSPCA's vice chairman has resigned from post due to her animal right extremist support. XXXXXI has been a major player within its agenda above actual welfare. Every time I have tried to get help in emergency situation from the RSPCA they have; 1) refused to attend. 2) Been ill-prepared and unexperienced to be able to adopt any active approach 3) Exacerbated the welfare issue to the point of causing unnecessary distress, and more pain, injury, and time suffered to the animals concerned. 4) Arranged to attend, and failed to attend. Then to add insult to this if you phone the RSPCA for help, even if it's not given the caller the receives a phone call from the

RSPCA finding team asking if you'd like to donate after your recent experiences, I find this disgraceful.

- I am concerned due to the ban being upheld in Scotland and England, that the ban may be being already a done deal for the dear of Wales not coming into line with the ban elsewhere. I have always felt proud of Wales's stance of independence, and wish that, Wales coming into line with the rest of the UK is not deemed as a fit reasoning to uphold this ban.
- The circuses involved have tours of several months that travel and perform successfully with high attendances within Wales. Mondao have again, for what has become an annual tour, had a fabulous tour, providing services of arts and entertainments to locals and tourists on land rented from local farmers, councils and showgrounds, supporting local businesses by financially supporting their circus families/community lives by shopping in local community, using local vets, farriers, farm supplies, using local services etc. It is not cheap to maintain a circus and its animal, the success of the circus depends on its customers, whom keep coming year after year in many cases.

I propose this bill is a failure in the extreme, please reconsider this proposal.

Animal Welfare Act 2006

Perceived Infringements

Section 4

1 a, b, c, d – Unfair, unjust, creating criminality by actions to comply with ban

2 a, b, c, d – Unfair, unjust, creating criminality by actions to comply with ban

3 a, b, c, i, ii, d, e – Unfair, unjust

Section 9

1 – Enforced criminal action by ban

2 a, b, c, d, e – Unfair, unjust, needs and sentience ignored by opinions of humans

3 a, b – Unfair, unjust, discriminatory to a legitimate licensed business

Section 10

1 a) b) Needs addressing as to whom is liable for the distress caused by enforcing the bill

Section 12

1 Needs addressing

2 a) Needs met under various strict licensing not supported by bill

b) As above, unfair unjust

c) Will fail to implement proven legitimate licensing and effective inspections

3 a, b, c, d, e, f – Needs addressing

4/5 – Breached by bill

6 – General population uneducated of this bills existence

7 – Biased evidence followed by emotive speech creating inadmissible specified evidence

Section 13

1 – Licensed in England until date of commencement of ban

2 a, b – As above, unfair, Unjust

3 – Licensed, unfair, unjust

4/5 – Licensed, as above

6 - Enforced criminality by bill

7 – Please enforce proven evidence based legislative licensing in existence

8 a) – needs replacement, in process of consultation

9 – Do not believe the majority of public have any knowledge of the bill

Section 16

4 – No recommended transition period agreed, only as short as possible requested. Unfair to animals and humans as there is no way of measuring timespan for habituation to a new lifestyle and environment, no compensation, or grants offered to secure welfare during transition.

Treaty of Functioning of the EU
Taken from Consolidated Versions
Perceived Infringements

Article 9 – Discrimination and failure to comply

Article 10 - Discrimination

Article 13 – Discrimination of cultural communities, regional heritage and traditional cultural heritage

Article 19.1 and 19.2 – Prejudice and discrimination

Article 49 – Unfair, discriminatory, unjust, not adhered to

Article 50 – Unfair, discriminatory, unjust, not adhered to

Article 53 – Unfair, discriminatory, unjust, not adhered to

Article 56 – Unfair, discriminatory, unlawful, and disproportional

Article 67.3 – Criminal activities by protestors and animal rights activists' not lawfully dealt with, cultural racism, discrimination by authorities not supporting the victim or prosecuting the perpetrators

Article 102, a, b + c – Cultural and trading minority being abused by dominant positions, not being compensated

Article 105 – Unfair, not applied to this proposal/act

Article 106 1, 2, 3 – Applications of articles not adhered to, trade will be affected

Article 115 – Use of ethics nullifying legislative procedures

Article 137.1 a, b, c, e, j, k – Failure to support

Article 145 – Unjust, discriminatory, active devaluation of skilled employed persons

Article 146, 1+2 – Discrimination of employed persons, business, and active discouragement of established business

Article 149 – Not acting in accordance to support their actions in field of employment, restrictions upon types of employment

Article 151 – Not adhered to, circus cultural, and social needs not met by dominant authorities, unfair

Article 156 – Social policy field, employment adhered to

Article 167 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 –

- 1) Completely discriminatory of traditional cultural heritage
- 2) Unjust, unfair, disregarded, discrimination
- 3) Non-compliance of article
- 4) Non-compliance, opposite reaction
- 5) Disregard of objectives, no incentive measures or harmonisation

Article 168.1 – This bill does not adhere to protecting the mental health suffered by, and the continuation to suffer to harassment of petitioners, on a continued basis and historically. It could be construed that English and Welsh and Scottish parliament are committing emotional abuse towards circus communities, and the years of incessant interrogation of the circus communities, as racial hatred. I believe it to be torturous mentally and physically, to continue to pursue the circus in the manner. Discrimination, I believe nothing has been achieved to protect the circus industry.

Article 169.1 - Circus animal industry economics being ignored, irresponsible, unjust, discriminatory

Article 169.2 b) - No measure in place to support the present or future economics of circus industry and protect the cultural minorities economy

Article 169.3 – Refusal in England to support and continue protective licencing legislation, instead adopt a ban

Article 169.4 – Failure to comply as above

Article 174 – Restrictions of a travelling industry, that utilises the resources of rural communities, paying into those areas

Article 179 1, 2, 3 – Not adhered to, nullified by use of ethics

Article 180 a, b, c – Invalidated by ban, nullified by use of ethics

Article 181 1, 2 – Nullified by use of ethics

Article 182 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 – Nullified by use of ethics

Article 183 – Nullified by use of ethics

Article 184 – Disregarded within this bill

Article 185 – Disregarded within this bill

Article 186 – Disregarded within this bill

Article 187 – Disregarded within this bill

Article 188 – Disregarded within this bill

Article 191 1) 3) 1. – Not protecting the damage to human health, mental and physical in the bill

3) Unfair addressing and protection of the potential benefits and costs of actions or lack of action. Ignoring and nullifying scientific and technical data

Article 195 i,

a) Reducing available environment, banning a business that multitudes of tourists attending

b) Unjust, preventing the exchange of good practice, destruction not promotion

Article 196 1, a) no support given to circuses needing protection from animal rights vigilantes

b) Not happened

c) Not happened

2. Not supported

Article 197 – 1) Non effective, nothing implemented

2) Unjust, ignoring factual peer reviewed evidence above nonfactual, non-scientific incorrected propaganda 'facts'. Ignoring scientific data

Article 198 – Discriminatory against social and cultural development

Article 199 – 1) Non compliance

2) Non compliance

3) Not adhered to

Article 202 – Obstruction of movement of an established trade

Article 206 – Unfair, discriminatory restrictions placed upon

Article 207 – 2) Not adhered to

4) a. Prejudiced

b. Social, risk of serious disruptions

Article 226 – Please invoke

Article 228 – Please invoke

Article 238 3. A) Majority of figures used not compromising of 65% of population

Personal Conclusion

I believe that it is highly unethical to proceed with such a discriminatory, disproportionate, unlawful act of banning of 'wild` animals in circus. I believe it is already being used as a 'stepping stone` by activists to set the precedent to enable a ban on any other animal industry, or pet animal in human contact. This can already be seen in Linda Joyce-Jones live status petition in assembly to ban the use of all animal in circus and entertainment.

This bill is high risk, immoral, illegal, and will give power within Wales to the destructive and contended agendas of the animal welfare industries that are no longer welfare based industries, but animal rights industries masquerading as welfare.

UK Equality Act 2006
Perceived Infringements

Part One

- 1) 1. Bill fails this, creating massive inequalities in its outcome
 2. Bill not adhering to its duties
 3. Race by definition of nationality, UK circus began in UK
-
- 2) Ignorance of knowledge of discrimination

Part Two - Chapter Two - Prohibited Conduct

13. Direct discrimination

- 1) Applies to bill
- 5) Racism applies to this bill through circus being a traditional national origin cultural heritage, with its descendants still found in existing animal circus.

19. Indirect Discrimination

- 1) Bill contravenes this in its discriminative application.
 - 2) a. Bill contravenes this
 - b. Bill puts the persons at a disadvantage
 - c. Bill puts or would put B at that disadvantage
- and

d. A cannot show it to be a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim

3) Relevant protected characteristics are **RACE**

Discrimination Supplementary

23.1 Ignored by this bill

24.1 Needs application to this bill

.2 Needs application within this bill

25.6 Race discrimination is –

a. Discrimination within Sec 13 because of race ie for example circus cultural national minority

b. Discriminations within Sec 19 where relevant protected characteristics is race, circus is traditional national cultural minority

26 Harassment

1. a) This bill violate this

b) i) This bill violate this

ii) This bill violate this

4) Not taken into consideration

5) Implementation needed due to race

Conclusion (Personal)

I believe bringing forwards this bill is highly discriminatory, and is in breach of the Equality Act 2010.

European Convention Human Rights

Perceived Infringement

Article 1

Animal rights petitioners asking committee to breach using this bill

Article 3

Animal rights campaigners, protesters, and UK government in breach of this for years, acting relentlessly against circus people. Stage 1 evidence 2 sessions proves this in petitioners' content of word usage. Emotive words to produce maximum impact to listening audience, and suppress positive thoughts. Ignoring circuses good names, compliance and constructive help to implement, and improve supported licensing, generating much of the inspection guidelines themselves. Emotive words used to create a false image and modus operandi of the circus actions, welfare and training ignorance of scientific data, and people own opinions or evidence to suit their agendas.

Article 5

Security removed and not supported by this bill. Regularly breached by protestors. Families including young children live in fear. Circus clients are intimidated by protestors.

Article 13

Needs implementing if ban proceeds.

Article 14

Ban entirely discriminatory. Animal rights agendas and activists acting discriminatory, abusively, and relentlessly persecuting circus, its people and animals, and all human contact with animals, including protestors driven by media content manipulated by tactical persuasion methodology.

Protocols, Convention Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

Article 1

Protestors actively encouraged to protest and cause harm to others and their property. Damage, verbal and physical abuse to individuals, business, homes and animals in their care. Causing huge psychological injuries to circus people, animals and customers of circus subjected to the protestors actions, verbal and physical

Article 2

This ban restricts education of others, public adults, and children. Restricts freedom of thought, choice of education within banned activities, parents including myself choosing to attend to educate their children visually, and verbally, to learn good practice of animal husbandry, welfare and legislation. The exchange of information through 'educators' and 'students' within the circus industry will be restricted by the opinion of a select view, imposing As views that B is wrong

Protocol 12

Article 1 - Breach, Unlawful

Personal Conclusion

This bill is discriminatory, racist towards traditional national cultural heritage, and illegal in its application

Human Rights Act 1988

Perceived Infringements

Article 3 – Breached by animal rights campaigners, groups and individuals, English, and Scottish governing bodies, Unfair, Unjust

Article 8 – Breached by animal rights campaigners and protestors

Article 14 – Bill is entirely discriminatory. Petitioners of bill discriminatory in actions to apply ban

Article 17 – UNFAIR, UNJUST in its actions

Part 11. 1st Protocol

Article 1 – UNJUST, UNFAIR – Protestors damaging property and police, and other authority failing to protect property.

Article 2 – Depriving public of educational aspect of circus animals and these animals, art, and performance educational properties, ie education of physical movement and interactions, restriction on learning the trade, husbandry, welfare, sentience, history, and the future placement of these animals.

Article 13 – This will need implementing if bill proceeds

2) 1a) Unfair, unjust

d) Unfair

4) Will be unfair to implement retrospective criminal offences

Personal Conclusion

Bill entirely discriminatory, illegal. Animal rights petitioners entirely discriminatory, misleading, criminal in its actions.