The Committee will meet at 1.30pm in Easterbrook Hall, Dumfries.

1. **Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Bill:** The Committee will take evidence at Stage 1 from—

   The Earl of Dalhousie - Scottish Landowners’ Federation  
   Mr Ian Melrose - National Farmers’ Union of Scotland  
   Ralph Cobham - Borders’ Foundation for Rural Sustainability  
   Dr Bob Crabtree on behalf of the Macaulay Land Use Research Institute.

2. **Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Bill:** The Committee will consider their conclusions on the evidence received in the preceding agenda item.

Richard Davies  
Clerk to the Committee

---

**The following papers are relevant to this meeting:**

**Agenda item 1: Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Bill.**

- Brief supplementary notes of evidence and names of witnesses and their advisers are attached. These include:
  - Scottish Landowners Federation  
  - National Farmers’ Union of Scotland  
  - Borders Foundation on Rural Sustainability — A full copy of the original report by the Borders Foundation for Rural Sustainability is also attached for Members. This contains appendices which were not contained in the photocopied evidence pack distributed in September.
  - Members are asked to bring the research report prepared by Macaulay Land Use Research Institute, *Economic Impacts of a Ban on Hunting with Dogs in Scotland.*
  - A letter from the Scottish Executive along with a summary of the Macaulay report is also attached.
• Members are asked to bring with them copies of the Bill (SP Bill 10) and the explanatory notes and other accompanying documents (SP Bill 10 – EN) and the original evidence previously circulated (and available on the committee web page)
PROTECTION OF WILD MAMMALS (SCOTLAND) BILL

Summarised views of the Scottish Landowners’ Federation

Rural Scotland depends on effective land management for its economic, environmental and social prosperity. Conservation is a key component of this.

But conservation is not the same as protection.

The proposed legislation will consequently have far-reaching consequences for the land manager, whether landowner, farmer or crofter.

Freedom is essential for the land manager to exercise his or her own judgement towards methods of management and pest control, including hunting with dogs, which are legal and appropriate to local circumstances.

The Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Bill places unwarranted limitations on the control of rabbits, hares, deer and foxes, substantially shifting the balance of interest away from land managers.

A disproportional degree of restriction is placed on people who collectively share responsibility for ensuring the maintenance and balance of countryside and landscapes.

Farming, forestry and field sports would be directly affected by curtailment of activity important to management of enterprises vital to the rural economy.

An indirect effect would arise from reduced use of specialist pest control and managers who rely on the use of hounds and terriers.

The work of land managers is essential to the maintenance of biodiversity; in many instances a surplus of game which can be harvested is essential to continued land management.

The SLF opposes restriction on the use of terriers underground. Use of the technique in management of foxes is recognised and effective. It is of considerable value where no other practical legal alternative exists.

As drafted the Bill will limit to one dog those engaged in field sports and pest control whereas experience shows that more than one at any one time is of most value to efficient countryside management.

Implicit restrictions on landowners, farmers and crofters must raise serious doubts over the practical and legal validity of legislation surrounded at the same time by an intolerable degree of ambiguity and dubiety.

There is enormous potential for creating unnecessary confusion over what is legal and illegal activity in the countryside.
Summary of Submission from NFUS on the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Bill

Summary of views

The Union’s views are as follows:

1. As drafted, the Bill lacks legal certainty. This will lead to confusion among farmers and crofters who require to control pests for the protection of crops and livestock as well as game birds.

2. A licensing procedure to provide for exceptions involves unnecessary and expensive bureaucracy.

3. The powers of arrest, search and seizure are disproportionate to the nature of the offence envisaged and present an unreasonable burden for the police.

4. The penalties proposed are excessive. The suggested defence is vague.

5. The proposal for a disqualification order is bureaucratic and excessive. Involvement of the High Court in an appeal is not warranted.

6. Farmers need a pest control regime which allows them to act quickly to tackle a problem without cumbersome bureaucratic control and within a clearly defined legal framework. The use of dogs for flushing foxes out of rough country and woodland is critical in many parts of Scotland, especially in livestock areas.

Background

7. The National Farmers Union of Scotland represents some 12,000 farmers, crofters and growers in Scotland.

8. Pest control is an essential element of farm and estate management. When the gin trap was banned, the use of hounds and terriers in fox dens was the only practical alternative. Again terriers are the only way of tackling foxes in cairns and rocks. Scotland has had a massive afforestation programme in the last thirty years resulting in a dramatic increase in the fox population.

9. Dogs are essential for flushing foxes from below ground. Where a newly cubbed vixen is killed, terriers are the quickest method of despatching the cubs, a point reiterated in the oral evidence from the SSPCA. Some fox dens in Scotland’s mountain regions extend over an acre. The use of dogs below ground in these situations is the only effective measure to flush foxes. Other methods such as lamping are ineffective over this distance on a hill.

10. The control of foxes to protect lambs, game and other wildlife is vital and, particularly in the Highland areas, is mostly carried out by using terriers at fox dens or calling in one of the professional fox clubs with hounds to drive foxes out of forestry plantations to standing guns.

11. This control of the very specific balance of predator and prey that exists in many areas of Scotland benefits the rural economy, environment and biodiversity. Any reduction in fox hunting will change the ecological balance of areas such as the western Highlands. An increase in the fox population will affect several fragile species such as the black grouse, capercallie, mountain hares and red squirrels.

12. Fox control is critical to the survival of Scotland’s sheep industry. A normal hill farm’s 75 to 80 per cent lamb production can be reduced to 50 per cent where fox predation is bad. Such a low level of lamb production on a hill farm means that there would be insufficient replacement ewe hoggs to allow reasonable genetic selection, with the result that the ewe flock will get poorer, older and ultimately will not survive. The latest hill farm income figures were released on 30 November 2000 – the 2000/01 forecast for the average income of a sheep farm in Less Favoured Areas is just £700, a 50 per cent lambing means that the economics of the hill sheep farm are completely unsustainable. Losses of this dimension will inevitably lead to the complete collapse of the hill sheep industry.

The Union’s comments on the Bill, as drafted, are as follows:

13. Section 1.

The Bill’s principal offence is contravention of the stated prohibition. The contravention must be shown to be deliberate. Permitting another person to enter land or use a dog to hunt in contravention of the prohibition involves knowledge and agreement on the part of landowner or occupier and dog owner or keeper. Proof of necessary intent to hunt in contravention of the prohibition is obscure. These three elements of proof demonstrate the lack of legal certainty and also ambiguity in both interpretation and implementation - for both landowners, dog keepers and prosecution authorities alike.

14. Section 2.

- The Bill at least recognises the need to control numbers of species for welfare purposes and also to protect livestock, fowl or game birds.
• However, the licensing procedure to provide for exceptions to the contravention involves unnecessary and expensive bureaucracy. It is overly prescriptive.
• No definition is given for “under close control”.
• Restricting the flushing of a wild mammal from cover to “cover above ground” will seriously compromise effective control of foxes.
• The granting of a licence for a period of up to one year on payment of a fee, will be regarded as another tax on sheep farmers and environmental managers.
• The provision for protection of livestock using a single dog (s.2 (7)) is restrictive and impractical.
• There is confusion as to whether there is a prohibition on using more than one dog at the same time. If the intention is that there should be a limitation to a single dog, this may make it more likely that the mammal will run in the wrong direction. There are many techniques that require the use of more than one dog without the dogs being allowed to run wild. It would also make it difficult to train a young dog who needs to see by example.
• The requirement that the mammal, once flushed from cover, must be shot as soon as possible presents difficulties. Presumably an offence would be committed if the shooter missed or if the animal were to run in a direction in which it would be impractical or dangerous to shoot. If several animals were flushed at the same time, one individual could not shoot them all.

15. Section 3.

Restriction on these exceptions to using a dog above ground is unacceptable for the reasons already stated. The disapplication of subsection (1) (b) is confusing and anomalous. It is unlikely that a fox or hare would have been in captivity and require to be located and retrieved.


The extensive powers of arrest, search and seizure are disproportionate to the nature of the offence envisaged in the Bill. They could pose the threat of vexatious interference for land managers and keepers of dogs. They could also present the police with an unreasonable, and possibly expensive, extra burden.

17. Section 5.

The proposed penalties of a £5,000 fine and/or 6 months imprisonment are excessive and disproportionate. The suggested defence of reasonable belief is vague, especially in the light of the confused and ambiguous provisions for exceptions in Sections 2 and 3.


The proposal for a disqualification order is bureaucratic, excessive and involves yet more expense. Involvement of the High Court in an appeal procedure is not warranted.

19. Section 7.

The inclusion of “search” or “course” in the term “to limit” would appear to make it irrelevant whether or not the wild mammal is caught or killed.

Conclusion

• Farmers need a pest control regime which is practical and effective and which gives them flexibility to act quickly to tackle a problem without cumbersome bureaucracy and within a clearly defined legal framework.
• The Bill, as presently drafted, denies farmers that legal certainty and, if, implemented would deprive them of effective control measures.
• In view of current prominence given to considerations involving the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), farmers may be disposed to attack this measure to protect their property.
• Farmers want to secure an effective means of control of the fox population, not extermination. Without such control, there is a serious risk of population explosion, which would further increase the vulnerability of livestock to predation and the sustainability of a large and important section of Scottish agriculture.
A. HUNTING

Introduction

A.1 This paper summarises the main findings, which emerged from the surveys undertaken by Scott Wilson Resource Consultants and Scottish Agricultural Colleges designed to identify the socio-economic and environmental contributions made in 1998/99 by 7 Hunts and their followers, operating in the Borders Region. The surveys formed part of a comprehensive, on-going Study of the Region’s Countryside Management Industry.

A.2 The main findings are based upon 4 surveys, designed, undertaken, analysed and cross-checked by the consultants. These involved Postal Questionnaires which generated very high Response Rates (RR): 7 Hunts: RR 100%; 406 Subscribers: RR approx 53%. Telephone Interviews with: 61 Non-Mounted Followers: RR 100%; 54 Local Trade & Service Organisations: RR > 94%.

Social & Recreational Activities

A.3 The single most important social/recreational contribution, revealed by the surveys, was that in 1998/99 hunting provided between 18,500 and 26,500 recreational activity days in the Borders.

A.4 Associated contributions in 1998/99 amounted to:
- the provision of 424 Meets and 53 main social/recreational events. The latter covered a wide range of activities, including Point-to-Points, Sponsored Rides and many evening-time social gatherings;
- the involvement of 717 members of the Hunt Supporters Clubs, many of whom were part of a core of 405 volunteers, responsible for running the events as well as for undertaking the 1,995 tasks involved in running efficient sporting and recreational operations;
- the provision of an important service, involving the collection of ‘fallen’ (dead livestock) from farms and transporting them to the Hunt Kennels. In 1998/99, 3,260 farm animals were collected from 329 farms;
- participation by 406 Mounted Subscribers on between 9,000 and 12,000 recreational activity days;
- the involvement of Non-Mounted Participants, who followed the Hunts either by car or on foot/quad-bike/motor-bike for a total of between 9,500 and 14,500 recreational activity days.
- The provision of access for all participants to between 62% and 65% (294,500 – 307,000 ha) of the Region’s countryside, covering all of the five main landscape types.

A.5 The telephone surveys revealed that the recreational experiences were generally considered by the participants to be both unique and of high quality.

Expenditure Contributions

A.6 All forms of expenditure generated by hunting activities in 1998/99 were estimated to total between £4 million and £5.5 million. The composition of these contributions to the Borders’ Region economy is detailed in the main report. A further key finding was that the average annual direct expenditure incurred per Mounted Subscriber varied between £14,500 (the Duke of Buccleuch Hunt) and £2,600 (the Liddesdale Hunt), with the median being over £9,000.

Employment Contributions

A.7 In round terms, the levels of employment sustained by hunting activities in 1998/99 were estimated to be between 127-156 FTEs ie 255-325 Jobs. In the context of sustaining rural livelihoods, the telephone interviews revealed that it is the vulnerability of Jobs rather than of FTEs that concerns the stakeholders.

Trades Impacts

A.8 The surveys identified that approximately 650 businesses, located within the Borders, were involved in servicing hunting activities. The corresponding number of externally located businesses was 400.

A.9 Through telephone interviews with 54 of the main local trade and service organisations, it was established that over 25% considered that their businesses would be seriously at risk in the event of a ban on hunting. The provision of winter season trade is important.
A.10 It was estimated that losses of some 15-16 FTEs (21 Jobs) would be experienced in the case of the 54 local businesses involved in these interviews.

A.11 Economic leakages were found to occur, due to the high expenditures of Mounted Subscribers on purchases of insurance, new saddlery and tack, new trailers, as well as clothes and boots outside the Borders Region. 

**Countryside Management**

A.12 Country sports (including hunting though predominantly shooting and fishing) are the dominant motive for the creation of new landscape and habitat features.

A.13 The Farm Deadstock Removal Service provides direct benefits in terms of waste disposal and environmental management. It is available to all farms within the areas covered by the Hunts.

A.14 Hunting is a factor in the management and creation of woodlands, scrub and hedgerows.

**Farm diversification**

A.15 Equestrian and hunting related activities, covering the supply of hay, straw and feed and the letting of grazing to horse owners, featured in the top ten on-farm income-generating diversification activities.

A.16 For the 60% of farmers who propose to diversify over the next three years, equestrian activities dominated the list of the most promising forms of diversification.

**B. SHOOTING**

B.1 Shooting makes an important contribution to ‘the countryside management industry’. It contributes significantly to on-farm, income generating diversification making-up five of the top ten diversification activities. It is a major factor in motivating the creation of new landscape and habitat features. (NB Grouse shooting, deer stalking and falconry research are still on-going)

B.2 Preliminary results, of a questionnaire survey undertaken of all of the 135 main lowland game shooting providers in the Borders indicated that the direct economic contributions for the total population of providers were as follows:

- direct expenditure of between £3.5 million and £4.8 million in providing approximately 34,600 gun days of formal and informal shooting (game birds, wildfowl and rough shooting quarry)
- the provision of full-time, part-time and casual, seasonal direct employment for between 1,139 and 1,580 people (excluding the allied trades and services), which represent between 226 and 315 full-time equivalents.

B.3 Direct expenditure by shooting participants was estimated to total a further £3.0 million to £4.7 million.

**C. RURAL SUSTAINABILITY**

C.1 Fox hunting is evidently a sustainable form of land use, which stands-up to a not insignificant list of commonly applied ‘sustainability indicators’ across the broad spectrum of the main aims of the Government’s Strategy for Sustainable Development (DETR 1999, ‘A Better Quality of Life’):

- it does not deplete the resources on which it depends
- it does not conflict with land management or wildlife conservation objectives
- it contributes to communities through the provision of employment and high quality recreation
- it is self-financing
- it contributes to the local economy
- it recycles waste
- it is a factor in the creation and management of woodland cover and hedgerows, thereby in the enhancement of local biodiversity
- it is a rural cultural tradition enjoyed by individuals from all backgrounds.

C.2 In the main, these indicators also apply in the case of lowground game shooting.
Borders Foundation for Rural Sustainability

Presentation of Evidence to the Rural Affairs Committee on the Implications of the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Bill
8th December 2000

Witnesses and Advisors
Principal Witness; Ralph Cobham (Consultant Rural Economist and Resource Planner)
Advisors; Bruce Cowe (BFRS Chair) and Denise Walton (BFRS Co-ordinator)

Biographies of Witnesses and Advisors

Bruce Cowe MBE, FRAgS – Chair BFRS
Fifth generation Berwickshire farmer
Past president of the Borders Region NFU
Deeply involved in the introduction of FWAG to Scotland; First chair of the pioneering Borders FWAG; First chair of FWAG Scotland
Has served on the Board of the Countryside Commission for Scotland, The Nature Conservancy Council for Scotland
Served on the main board of Scottish Natural Heritage and involved in the development of TIBRE (Targetted Inputs for a Better Rural Environment)
Recent board member of Forward Scotland

Denise Walton MSc MIEEM – Co-ordinator BFRS
Farmer and practising Landscape Ecologist (involving landscape and ecological assessments and restoration for clients in both the private and public sectors)
Borders Forest Trust: Trustee
Scottish Wildlife Trust: Member of Council, Past chair and now Vice-chair Berwickshire Wildlife Group; Proposer and Project Co-ordinator Berwickshire Hedgerow Restoration Project
Scottish Borders Enterprise: Member Landbased Advisory Committee
Lectured in Ecology, Nature Conservation and Sustainable Resource Use (Borders College)
Involved in the development of sustainable rural diversification through membership of the Borders Farm Diversification Action Group

Ralph Cobham BA, AgrB, Dip Agric Econ, MSc, FBIAC, FLI – Consultant
Rural Economist and Rural Planner

Dear Richard

PROTECTION OF WILD MAMMALS (SCOTLAND) BILL
MACAULAY LAND USE RESEARCH INSTITUTE REPORT INTO THE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF A BAN ON HUNTING WITH DOGS IN SCOTLAND

Following the introduction of the above Private Members Bill, the Executive commissioned the Macaulay Land Use Research Institute to carry out research into the economic impacts of a ban on hunting with dogs. The intention of the study was to provide factual and impartial information to help inform the debate. The Report was published on 26 June and the findings were made available to members of the Rural Affairs Committee. Bob Crabtree, the author of that report is due to give evidence to the Committee on 8 December.

Since it was published, there has been some debate about the robustness of some of the figures contained in the report, particularly those relating to the number of job losses. Other organisations have produced reports with a range of estimates and have challenged the Macaulay figures. This prompted the Institute to revisit some of the results and conduct further investigative work which has altered the figures in the report relating to the impacts on mounted hunts and followers. I attach a 3 page paper prepared by Macaulay in preparation for the Committee hearing. I thought that the Committee would find it useful to have this in advance. Dr Crabtree will be happy to answer any questions the Committee might have on 8 December.

Yours Sincerely

D P ATKINSON
Economic Impacts of a Ban on Hunting with Dogs

Summary of research for the Scottish Executive undertaken by the Macaulay Land Use Research Institute.

The Institute was commissioned by the Executive to investigate the impact on the *Scottish economy* of a ban on hunting with dogs. Three sectors were investigated:

- Scottish hill packs
- Gamekeeping on Scottish sporting estates.
- Mounted hunts

Information was obtained from members of the Scottish Hill Packs Association, members of the Scottish Landowners’ Federation, and the 10 mounted hunts in Scotland together with their subscribers.

**Impact on Scottish hill packs**

There are five hill pack members of the Scottish Hill Packs Association. They use hounds and terriers to assist shooting of foxes and other vermin. In 1998/99 there were 182 subscribers and 873 foxes were killed. Activities would cease under the Bill.

**Impacts**

- Reduction in expenditure £46,000 per year
- Loss of 10 FTE jobs.

**Impacts on sporting estates**

We interviewed a sample of the Scottish Landowners Federation (SLF) members as those most likely to be affected. There was considerable uncertainty amongst estate owners as to how a ban would affect their sporting operations. Some considered that they would need to increase pest control activity (and expenditure) to compensate for restrictions; others predicted a decline in sporting output and employment in the longer term.

**Impacts**

- Reduction in expenditure of £1.97m per year
- Loss of 114 FTE jobs

The estimates must be interpreted with caution given the uncertainty surrounding the interpretation of the Bill. In addition, the SLF landowner population will understate to some extent the total Scottish sporting sector. There would also be economic impacts associated with any reduction in sporting activity as the expenditure of participants is reduced¹.

¹ This impact was not included in the remit for the study.
Impacts on mounted hunts and followers

Representatives of the 10 Scottish mounted hunts were interviewed to obtain information on the impact of a ban.

The hunts were asked to provide lists of active\textsuperscript{2} subscribers so that a random sample could be interviewed in order to assess the impact on subscribers’ expenditure and employment. We identified 357 households resident in Scotland that contained one or more hunt subscribers (633 household members hunted in total). A sample of these households was interviewed to calculate the net effect of a ban on hunting with dogs on their expenditure patterns and any changes in staffing. Subscribers would on average reduce expenditure on inputs by £10,740 and on labour by £1,490 per year.

In our original report, these expenditures were converted to a loss of £3.83m of expenditure for the Scottish economy. Since the report was published, other organisations have produced reports with a range of estimates and our estimates have been challenged. In preparation for appearance before the Committee, we recontacted the hunts and this has brought to light some inconsistencies in the original subscriber dataset. The hunts have a variety of different membership systems and some of the information provided in response to our original requests was either incomplete or was misinterpreted\textsuperscript{3}. In response to our recent contacts, the hunts have identified an additional 63-84 households not previously included, making a total of 420-441.

Using this estimate of the number of hunt members we have recalculated the impacts on expenditure and employment. The change in subscriber expenditure is increased from £3.83m to £4.5-4.73m. The impacts are summarised below:

\textit{Impacts}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Reduction in expenditure in Scotland by hunts: £0.26m per year
  \item Reduction in expenditure in Scotland by hunt subscribers: £4.5-£4.73m per year
  \item Reduced employment (full-time equivalent jobs) by
    \begin{itemize}
      \item Hunt subscribers 85-103
      \item Hunts 19-20
      \item Suppliers to households 66-69
    \end{itemize}

  \begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
    \hline
    Direct impact & 170-192 \\
    \hline
    Indirect effects in the economy & 18-19 \\
    Induced effects in the economy & 16-17 \\
    Impact of re-injected household expenditure & (-)20-21 \\
    \hline
    Total impact & 183-208 \\
    \hline
  \end{tabular}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{2} Subscribers who did not hunt were excluded; it was assumed that their expenditures would be unaffected by a ban.

\textsuperscript{3} In some cases subscribers not wishing to be interviewed were omitted from the lists provided to us; in others there was a misunderstanding about the fact that complete membership lists were required. One hunt that did not have subscribers considers that the number of active followers was originally understated.
The impact of changes in the activities of hunts, subscribing households and their suppliers is 170-192 FTE jobs. Further effects though the economy would produce a small number of additional job losses to give 183-208 FTEs in total\(^4\). Of this, 139-160 FTEs would be lost in the short-term; the rest represents a longer-term adjustment. Around 90 full-time employees and 190 part-time employees would be made redundant. The main employment effects are on those with specialised skills connected with keeping horses and hunting. Impacts elsewhere in the rural economy would be very small.

Five of the 10 hunts are located in three administrative districts of the Borders but the calculation of impacts on the Borders economy is problematic. Many subscribers to these hunts do not live in the Borders but travel to hunt there. Their impact on the Borders economy is less than if they were residents. Depending on whether these ‘commuting’ subscribers are or are not included as impacting on the Borders economy we calculate that between 35 and 57% of the Scottish impact was located in the Borders. This leads to a direct employment loss in the Borders of between 65 and 124 FTEs.

**Summary**

The Scottish employment effects of a ban on the sectors examined are estimated as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees of:</th>
<th>Full-time equivalent jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mounted hunts, subscribers and suppliers</td>
<td>183-208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting estates and suppliers</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill packs and suppliers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) This compares with our original estimate of 160-172 FTEs.
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Ian Melrose

Ian was educated at Peebles High School and Edinburgh University, where he graduated in Law.

He has had spells working in Austria and Greece for the British Council. He returned to Edinburgh University for a two year spell at the Centre for European Governmental Studies, attached to the Faculty of Law, before entering a solicitor’s office in Edinburgh.
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CHAIRMAN OF SLF NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Earl of Dalhousie (52), Chairman of the Natural Resources Committee of the SLF, succeeded to the title on the death of his father in July 1999. A longstanding member of the SLF, one of many interests which include financial management and investment, he manages the family estate from his home at Brechin Castle.

Lord Dalhousie is Chairman of Jamestown Investments Limited, Scottish Woodlands Limited, Dunedin Smaller Companies Investments Trust plc, and Brechin Castle Centre Limited.

He is president of the Caledonian Club and the British Deer Society, Vice-Chairman of the Game Conservancy Trust, a governor of the London Goodenough Trust of Overseas Graduates and Chairman of the Scottish Committee of the Mental Health Foundation.

Educated at Ampleforth College, he served in the Coldstream Guards for 4 years before joining Hambros Bank Limited of which he became a Director in 1981. A year later he left to become a founder and Executive Director of the new investment bank Enskilda Securities, leaving in 1987 to co-found Jamestown Investments, a financial advisory business.

The Earl of Dalhousie is married with 3 children.