
More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Automodellista - 2010/03/09 14:42

Hi guys, thought you might be interested in the latest update on the legislation being brought in. Must say I agree with everyone having insurance. Shouldn't we all have it regardless of dog temperament? what if a dog becomes ill???

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/8556195.stm

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by mariemisty - 2010/03/09 14:48

I was swearing at the tv over this this morning. The comments of why should responsible dog owners be forced to do this because of irresponsible owners just made my blood boil... And where was the stuff on welfare? Going to do this because of the number of bites? What about the number of abandoned dogs?

Post edited by: mariemisty, at: 2010/03/09 14:48

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Automodellista - 2010/03/09 14:49

I think we should tie irresponsible owners to railings and leave them, see how that turns out!

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by mariemisty - 2010/03/09 14:50

yay, do you want help?

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Automodellista - 2010/03/09 14:58

Could do with a fair chunk of strong rope round here. . . everyone thinks a lil staffie is a killing machine, winds me up!

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by samjoneslittlelegs - 2010/03/09 15:47

They have been interviewing people on the tv about this and they are all pretty much saying the same - if the government cannot enforce the car insurance policies then how do they think they can enforce pet insurance.

The responsible pet owners already have their pets insured. The owners of the pets (dogs) the government are targeting will not insure them, in the same way they are nonchalant about car insurance, car tax and many other laws.

Sorry if this is an unpopular opinion but I do think that this needs a lot more thought. It would be a little tiny step towards better control but would, by no means, be definitive.

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by robsamandkeo - 2010/03/09 15:52

Then they should have the same power of removal they have for cars !!! where do you sit with your hand if the dog is not insured sam ?? Ive said before im all for it but it needs to go further.

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by mariemisty - 2010/03/09 16:00

yup, im with Rob. Dogs should be chipped before they leave the breeder and if the details are not changed last registered owner gets the bills. The laws surrounding the breeding of dogs should also be tightened.

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by lucieqk - 2010/03/09 16:16

Yey! DVLA for dogs! But as with cars, responsible owners will already have chip & insurance. Irresponsible owners will ignore it. The owners causing the problems now will continue to cause problems unless they regulate it properly. We can hope.

And I hope this isn't just their idea of giving the economy a boost, instead they actually police it thoroughly...

With widespread compulsory insurance common knowledge I hope people don't begin taunting dogs in order to get a pay out.

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by lucieqk - 2010/03/09 16:18

mariemisty wrote:

I was swearing at the tv over this this morning. The comments of why should responsible dog owners be forced to do this because of irresponsible owners just made my blood boil... And where was the stuff on welfare? Going to do this because of the number of bites? What about the number of abandoned dogs?

Post edited by: mariemisty, at: 2010/03/09 14:48

Yeah I did wonder too Martie, the hype on the news doesn't seem to mention anything about mistreatment or dog welfare? Or are we missing something?!

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by samjoneslittlelegs - 2010/03/09 16:33

robsamandkeo wrote:

where do you sit with your hand if the dog is not insured sam ??

mmmmmm, not sure. I guess, initially, go see a solicitor and seek professional legal advise, and then pursue it as a private thing.

As I said this is just a little tiny bit of a step forward but there needs to be so much more done to make it effective and policeable.

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Frev - 2010/03/09 16:58

Its just some dick in an office trying to get some points scored before he is kicked out of power after the general election.

People who will abide by these rules already have pet insurance, those who will not abide by the rules (soon to be a possibility of becoming a law) will just see it as something else to complain about and not get.

Also has the government factored in the increase in either having to pay for pet insurance for those on benefits, or assuming they man up and don't pay extra out for it, the increased cost of rescuing the dogs who are set loose by the dole bothering wastes of oxygen who claim to be dog owners!

We took Leo back to visit the rescue centre we picked him up from and they told us of someone who wanted to bring a dog back because the collar they had bought was too big! My answer was why doesn't he exchange the collar or why did you let the mouth breathing 'tard have a dog in the first place. They couldn't believe how much Leo was costing us, and one of them might have mentioned he had "always suffered with his ears" something which didn't appear on his paperwork!

Right here endeth todays rant

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by robsamandkeo - 2010/03/09 17:32

I suppose then that would make ME that dick in the office frev, I petitioned for this and a little more some time ago, never thought much would come to be honest, but why should responsible owners pay out all the time for the idiots, IF you were hit in your car tomorrow by an uninsured driver you would have a recourse as the law is on your side as long as you have the required insurances, as such there is a pot you claim from, I agree Laws still get flouted but for every uninsured driver that gets away 10 now get caught and its getting better, with dogs will be the same, its been around for a long time with horses and I dont hear the complaints, Its an unfortunate society we all live in, nobody will take responsibility for their own actions and as such its always someone elses fault, its happened here on JAWT already..... ask Donna, she has a lovely tale to tell, and vet bill to boot.....this is not designed to discriminate against any one person just dissuade idiots from irresponsible dog ownership, and if they dont follow a responsible route offer a law which will be enforceable and aid removal of a dog, we all know the dangerous dogs act never worked, this is now owner/dog specific.

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Donna - 2010/03/09 17:54

Best not to get Donna started on that tale...

I`m all for it, horses need passports so why dont dogs need chips?

My take on the insurance being pushed well to be honest 3rd party is an ok stepping stone - but it has to be a stepping stone - I would prefer to see full insurance policies in place, I know people will freak at the extra cost but it costs less to insure Kobi than it does to feed him. If I couldnt afford to feed and insure a dog I wouldnt have one - seemples - that saying I am and always have been a responsible dog owner. If a claim was put against my insurance from a 3rd party point of view would I refuse? heck no, that`s what it`s there for!!!!

If more dogs had proper insurance we would surely see less "ill" dogs tied up to railings or handed into pounds simply because their owners couldnt afford the bills to nurse them back to health?? I have another tale on that - from last week ;) - but will wait till next week to spill that one. Surely this will only help the rescue centres dealing with truly abandoned dogs or ones kicked out through ill health??

I still go back to my comments on cars - eloquently as has been pointed out previously :dry: or not - we have insurance, tax etc for them - so why not have insurance, chips for dogs?

I hope this gets pushed as far as it needs to.
I for one am backing it.

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Frev - 2010/03/09 18:00

robsamandkeo wrote:

I suppose then that would make ME that dick in the office frev, I petitioned for this and a little more some time ago, never thought much would come to be honest, but why should responsible owners pay out all the time for the idiots, IF you were hit in your car tomorrow by an uninsured driver you would have a recourse as the law is on your side as long as you have the required insurances, as such there is a pot you claim from, I agree Laws still get flouted but for every uninsured driver that gets away 10 now get caught and its getting better, with dogs will be the same, its been around for a long time with horses and I dont hear the complaints, Its an unfortunate society we all live in, nobody will take responsibility for their own actions and as such its always someone elses fault, its happened here on JAWT already..... ask Donna, she has a lovely tale to tell, and vet bill to boot.....this is not designed to discriminate against any one person just dissuade idiots from irresponsible dog ownership, and if they dont follow a responsible route offer a law which will be enforceable and aid removal of a dog, we all know the dangerous dogs act never worked, this is now owner/dog specific.

When your hit by an uninsured driver you have to claim from your insurance company which damages your ncb (unless you use one of about three who dont), and as for the pot I have experience allbeit second hand of that pot being a very tricky one to access.

The main reason I cant quote complaints about the horse thing is that I dont have them or frequent a horse forum.

As for the dick in the office, petitioning for something and someone deeming it worthy of action are two very separate issues.

As for being against it, I am not however I dont honest believe hand on heart that this will be policed properly for many years to come as it will be rushed through rather than being a slightly longer drawn out process, and the misinformation that is spread about various breeds. Take for example the kita, how many times have you heard them refered to as devil dogs etc in the papers

Post edited by: Frev, at: 2010/03/09 18:02

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Sarah - 2010/03/09 18:12

I agree with Dog insurance wholeheartedly, but, as has been said, it just won't be enforced... Any responsible owner has insurance, the ones who this is aimed at mainly, won't give a damn..

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by robsamandkeo - 2010/03/09 18:13

When your hit by an uninsured driver you have to claim from your insurance company which damages your ncb (unless you use one of about three who dont), and as for the pot I have experience allbeit second hand of that pot being a very tricky one to access.

This in itself highlights it Frev, agree or not insured or not, somebody finally got a payout because a/ there was a registration mark(id chip) which when checked out, highlighted the lack of insurance ! now you had too fight for it fair enough, but that answers a previous point raised about baiting dogs to get a payout, if its difficult to acheive then it serves a second purpose and dissuades this course of action,

Now all through this were using cars as an everyday example we can all relate to, so lets take them out of the equasion.... were no longer talking about tin and rubber..... were now talking about a real living thing, something close to our hearts, do you still feel the same way ?? maybe if that living thing was a child and was bitten by an unruly dog causing it massive injuries needing help for the rest of its life. how do you fix that.

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Frev - 2010/03/09 18:44

robsamandkeo wrote:

Now all through this were using cars as an everyday example we can all relate to, so lets take them out of the equation.... were no longer talking about tin and rubber..... were now talking about a real living thing, something close to our hearts, do you still feel the same way ?? maybe if that living thing was a child and was bitten by an unruly dog causing it massive injuries needing help for the rest of its life. how do you fix that.

I still think your misunderstanding me here, I have dog insurance, and if you haven't followed the story of Leo on the board due to the rehoming center not being as forthcoming with the details we would like and a vet practice that was not very happy dealing with larger breeds of dogs, we have just paid out over £2.5kish on Leo's left ear (and now lack of it).

Everyone I know who owns a dog had dog insurance, however the people they are targeting will simply claim they cant afford it or just not give a toss about getting it. That does not help pay for the care of an injured child anymore than the current system would. Having a lot of contact with police officers in my area to see just how let down they feel by the fines system that is currently in place it is maybe easier for me to be openly jaded with my point of view on this.

16 Oct 2009 : Column 1200W

Bridget Prentice: At the end of the 2008-09 financial year there was a total of £545 million outstanding in unpaid financial penalties across England and Wales. Her Majesty's Courts Service systems do not identify the number of individuals to which the outstanding balance relates. The outstanding balance has risen through the application of a strict policy that only allows fines to be written off in certain circumstances. The outstanding balance includes fines imposed a number of years ago during the period when fines could not be cancelled (2004-06) and fines which are being paid by instalments.

The national payment rate for financial penalties at the end of the 2008-09 financial year was 85 per cent. and 71 per cent. excluding the value of administrative cancellations.

HMCS is currently implementing the 'Criminal Compliance and Enforcement Services-A Blueprint for 2008 to 2012' which was launched in July 2008 and is currently being implemented by all of the HMCS regions. The blueprint sets out HMCS's strategic objective which is for a cheaper, faster and more proportionate system that primarily focuses on 'first time' compliance while continuing to apply the principles of rigorous enforcement to the hard core of defaulters.

I would go so far as to say the 15% of the fines that are outstanding a large proportion will have come from the "hard core of defaulters", and this I would say is the same group that will be the first ones failing to pay their fines in court for damages caused by a dog with no insurance.

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by robsamandkeo - 2010/03/09 19:17

granted but those figures have no real relavance,they are calculated accross a broad spectrum and as you so pointed out 15% attributable to none payment from a hardcore criminal minority, I already stated that people will always flout laws, its the world we all unfortunately live in, however 15% is almost acceptable odds in my book, that gives me another responsible owner like yourself an 85% chance of being able to claim for my dogs injuries in the event of an attack or even an attack upon one of my children, and fro the 15% disregarding the laws then there should be a power of removal of any dog instantly, no questions no excuses witha period allowed to fix any misunderstanding, if the dog is chipped, and the policy relates to both the dog description and the chip(its quite easy technology at present to copy)then its quite easy to enforce, lets be clear the police do not stop and check absolutly everyone in the street just people that arouse their suspicions but its difficult to hide a dog if your up to no good, I understand your insured and this does not affect you, but would you have had all that money to hand to help Leo out over and over again, this highlights the welfare bonuses to the scheme also, we had exactly the same scenario with keo when we first got him, our bill was in excess of 2 grand also, money we couldnt as a family afford to keep writing off, in these circumstances there is only really ever on real loser and thats the dog, surely compulsory insurance for the in between population would mean a much improved standard of healthcare for many more dogs than get it now.

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Donna - 2010/03/09 21:06

my point exactly!! and an ease on the burden of rescue centres allowing them to deal with "normal" rescues!

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by wantakeeta! - 2010/03/09 21:26

Is this compulsory pet health insurance or an extra insurance aswell as pet insurance?

I have no problem with pet health insurance, I never insured Scruff simply because I didn't know better at the time, I learnt the hard way when he was diagnosed as diabetic.

Its not a mistake I will repeat, next dog WILL be insured;)

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by endpetselling - 2010/03/09 22:16

I am totally for it. It shouldn't just be on dangerous dogs, I've seen little dogs who really go for you. Insurance should be for every dog. With this new legislation if someone wants to buy a dog they will also need to factor in the total cost of looking after it, just like people do when bringing a kid into this world. They will also think twice from buying from puppy mills and other irresponsible breeders so that they can minimise the risk that their pet will have a genetic defect and chuck out the poor dog on the street.

As for micro chipping, I think that it should have been done ages ago. This will hopefully force a person to seriously think twice when abandoning their dog. If they abandon their kids on the street, the kid could speak and tell the police but a dog/cat cant.

My only concern now is would people this just force a person to not adopt any dogs classed as dangerous dogs?

Plus is there a way we can push this legislation to be passed on all dogs/cat because irresponsible dogs owners will be irresponsible. If a person wants to chuck their pet, they will do regardless of breed. In my local dog home, there are various breeds of dogs of all ages coming in.

Furthermore, is there anyway for the average Joe to remove the micro-chip at home before the owners throw the poor dog out?

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by sarah.so - 2010/03/09 22:21

Ooooooh this is getting a little heated... i havnt even looked at the link to comment - but think i may have to now!

my personal opinion is and this is purely from the dogs point of view & welfare is that all dogs MUST be insured, then if the person cant afford the vet bills then the dog wouldnt suffer.

mmmmmm, not sure. I guess, initially, go see a solicitor and seek professional legal advice, and then pursue it as a private thing.

dont know if you are aware Sam, but if that person has home insurance where you assessed & subsequently were attacked by the dog, then you will be able to make a claim against them as the liability part of the home insurance will cover usually up to a million ;) because it happened on the property and the owner will be liable - with whom the liability will cover - does that make sense how i wrote that????

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by wantakeeta! - 2010/03/09 22:24

Makes sense to me Sarah, well I think it does!

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Donna - 2010/03/10 08:37

how will it make people stop going to puppy mills? I see this as a seperate issue...still needs to be addressed!! but seperately.

responsible owners who will insure and microchip wouldnt dream of goign to puppy mills.

unfortunately there are lots of "responsible" places (as seen in the public eyes anyway :angry:) that are supplied by said puppy mills - and they know where they are buying from!!

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by robsamandkeo - 2010/03/10 09:50

There are unfortunately lots of different ways around microchipping, tatooin is by far the most effective but not necessarily the most humane, these however can also be altered, its very easy to re implant a second chip as they tend to migrate down the dogs body, however with the new scanners its not as difficult anymore to find the original chip, and yes they can be removed, you really dont want to know how I can leave that up to your imagination, although I wouldnt think your average idiot would want to pay out £170 for a scanner to find the chip site on the dog, the chip is not implanted deeply meerly between a skin membrane and the muscle tissues of the animal. this is getting to in depth, it will never be foolproof, its there to protect the majority form the majority, I tried to explain before although not very well, there will always be a minority in every walk of life who refuse to conform, but if the majority conform surlely your odds are greatly reduced if in a fight or a welfare situation, also as said before, they need to be registered form birth with a complete tranfer of ownership with a legally binding cert, if a vendor buys form a puppy farm or sells an un licenced dog then they will fall into the minority who will then be answerable to the courts !

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Donna - 2010/03/10 09:57

Keyko was tattooed and I'm looking to get Kobi done soon also.

Breeders can have puppies tattooed at £7 each - is it really that much to ask?

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by mariemisty - 2010/03/10 10:09

People dont always know they are buying from a puppy farm. There is a scam in my local area where about 8 of them go to wales buy lots of pups and then sell them as if they have bred them. The authorities and KC know about this but is anything done? Not a bloody chance.

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Donna - 2010/03/10 10:21

just look at those big puppy warehouses!!! how that could have been allowed to open just mystifies me - where do think the thousands of puppies are coming from??? with no certs or anything and some of them looking really ill into the bargain!

rule 1 - see mum and dad when thinking of a puppy!!

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by mariemisty - 2010/03/10 10:27

yup, although you have to admit if you went to Karens she wouldnt be able to show you the daddy would she? No pet shop should be allowed to sell dogs i think those ones in Leeds and Manchester are just evil. Think its dogs4us

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Donna - 2010/03/10 10:34

Admittedly but she can show you the pedigree papers of existing dogs with traceability back to the male GSD's used in Germany as the sires.

yes that's the vile place, who say they have pedigree papers - but they dont - they leave with dogs4us certificate and people who dont know better believe they are pedigrees.

some poor puppies have been witnessed with no water in their bowls and in filthy conditions. oh and alone in cages!!! at no more than a few weeks old the poor mites.

and families wandering around "ooohing and aaaaaaahhhing" at the cuteness of the babies..

but no cameras are allowed in there funnily enough.

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by mariemisty - 2010/03/10 10:36

i would love to see them stop me taking pics or you...would be interesting wouldnt it. I think its an evil, evil place that shouldnt be allowed to exist.

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by klemmelk - 2010/03/10 13:57

I had Jasmine microchipped the week after we brought her home.

After two incidents ; firstly someone taking photo's from their car then driving off, then a week later a dodgy bloke stopped on the bypass walked over to me, asking if she was spayed straight off. Told him we had already had her spayed, so couldn't have puppies.

Having had several bangy things in my face and being shot at whilst dressed in uniform dog thieves had better come prepared to use said bangy things.

I then had her DNA registered with KC. If anyone stole her and bred from her any puppies would be legally mine and it's a potential route back to the thieves.

Obviously we never went down the breeding route.

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Donna - 2010/03/10 14:06

I've had some weirdos stopping me (worse when you have 2) and asking about using one or the other for breeding. Somebody tried to give me money for Keyko one day in the local park!! I was gobsmacked! and they were nearly face smacked...

I've been followed home too, but just kept walking to another park then next time I got my phone out and took a pic of their car, they soon drove off.

Keyko was DNA registered at petback also and on their medalert scheme.

Again, in the pipelines for the Kobester.

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by klemmelk - 2010/03/10 14:25

The worry was that these miscreants would come back when Michelle and Rachael were walking the dog or my friend who walks her at lunchtime.

Then Jassy grew and grew.... no chance now when with us:laugh:

Steal my car, my wallet.... steal my dog(s):angry: :angry: :angry:

Michelle :roll: her eyes when I go 'off on one', I'm a teddy bear honest..) Except for the dogs, don't even try scumbags...:laugh:

Post edited by: klemmelk, at: 2010/03/10 14:28

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Donna - 2010/03/10 18:39

well I am not a teddy bear so imagine my response to the ****head who wanted to buy Keyko!!! I just told everybody who asked after that incident that she was speyed anyway...

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by sarah.so - 2010/03/10 18:40

when Thor was a pup we had some lads looking over our garden fence at him - now our house backs onto a large field - they had no reason to be there, when i reported to the police & said that i was worried about my dog - they laughed and said that dog napping didnt happen around here!:angry:

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by samjoneslittlelegs - 2010/03/10 19:15

I have had the same questions too, especially now with the Simba Bear stamping his way around the estate and walkways!!!!

Not sure about the comments about bringing children into the world and the planning ahead for them :unsure: :unsure:

:unsure: :unsure: :unsure: :unsure:

Sorry but I dont think the unplanned teenage pregnancies were factored into the arguement. The kind of people who will not register, insure or microchip their dogs are exactly the same people who are having children indiscriminaty and allowing them to run wild with no respect for their parents, the law or common decency.

Maybe there shound be a competency test for having children as well as having dogs/pets if you fail one you dont get to have the other either. (Purely my personal opinion and in now way should this be taken as the opinion of the trust)

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Mad Liz - 2010/03/11 08:36

A case of shutting the stable door after the horse has bolted. All very well knowing that you'll get an insurance payout after you've been bitten, but it completely fails to try to ensure that you don't get bitten in the first place.

I personally think that it is necessary to come up with a scheme that attempts to ensure that only competent people have dogs to begin with.

It should, IMHO, be a requirement of dog ownership that an owner should have to undergo training in dog management (say a weekend run by one of the dog charities). This would cover basic dog training, feeding, insurance etc.

If one wanted something like a Rottweiler, Doberman, Akita, Staffie etc then one sould undergo more extensive training.

This could be enforced in several ways:

- vets could withhold all but emergency treatment for dogs whose owners failed to produce a certificate of competent dog ownership;
- the certificate could be required to be shown when buying dog food (no different to producing ID to buy alcohol etc)
- pet insurers would require the certificate before providing insurance.

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by sarah.so - 2010/03/11 08:56

- vets could withhold all but emergency treatment for dogs whose owners failed to produce a certificate of competent dog ownership;
- the certificate could be required to be shown when buying dog food (no different to producing ID to buy alcohol etc)
- pet insurers would require the certificate before providing insurance.

but again in all of these the dog would suffer nobody else..

with hold vetinary treatment - dog suffers....
no certificate = no food.- dog suffers

i think there is enough animal cruelty in the world with out adding to it!

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by Donna - 2010/03/11 09:01

withholding treatment will only lead to more illness.

pet shops are not going to with hold selling food are they? not exactly good for business....and I`m sorry but families with working parents etc...how do you rely on one person buying food, doing vet runs...

and anyway - why single out certain dogs owners for extensive training??

I`ve seen more irresponsible terrier owners than that of akitas, rottis etc

blame the deed NOT the breed!!

=====

Re:More on the new dog legislation

Posted by samjoneslittlelegs - 2010/03/16 20:21

Just seen the news and now the whole insurance thing is being shown to be yet another really bad idea as a stand alone policy!!

There has also been an admission that the DDA is also a farce!!

Such a sorry state of affairs to be in when the only ones to truly suffer are the dogs themselves. When will the politicians learn that they have absolutely no idea of what is needed to ensure the safety and wellbeing of the animals and the end of the persecution by generalising breeds characteristics.

Sorry, my personal opinion only. :blush: :blush:

=====