

Bill 27

From: Bett Nielsen [bett@gnomehaven.net]
Sent: Sunday, September 23, 2018 9:15 PM
Subject: Bill 27

Please add my name to the list of people that oppose the way Bill 27 is written.

I am not against the SPCA. I am not proponent of dog fights, or other forms of cruelty. I believe that animal welfare is our duty to those animals in our care.

I am a member of the CKC. I have been showing and breeding Papillons since 1986. Contrary to some of the misinformation flying around social media, I have spent far more money than I could ever think of making selling puppies or winning prizes. I do not cull puppies. My breed is shown with natural ears and tails. I've never been in the practice of removing dew claws. When I sell puppies or place adult dogs, I will always take my dogs back. I'll rehome them if possible or they will live out their lives with me.

My concern with Bill 27 is the erosion of my rights as the owner of my dogs. I am not a pet parent, or custodian. I am an owner. If the SPCA needs to plug a loophole to prosecute someone when the owner cannot be found, better wording can be added without diminishing my rights as an owner.

My concern with Bill 27 is the lack of transparency if a complaint is lodged. My concern is that I would be assumed guilty unless I could prove otherwise and I would never be given the name of my accuser.

My concern with Bill 27 is that I can be told to bring my dogs to the door for an inspection without knowing why.

My concern with Bill 27 is that the SPCA officers can open my gate and walk to my door, demand to see my dogs all on an anonymous complaint.

My concern with Bill 27 is that those SPCA officers may be spreading a deadly virus to my newborn puppies or my immune compromised seniors.

Please do not pass this bill as written. Please revisit it and correct the poor wording. Please protect my rights and allow me to continue to enjoy my dogs without fear.

Bett Nielsen
Gnomehaven Papillons

From: Bett Nielsen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: September 24, 2018 9:00 AM
To: Office of the Legislative Counsel; info@kevinmurphy.ca
Cc: markfurey.mla@eastlink.ca; info@claredigby.ca; lunenburgmla@eastlink.ca;
keith@irvingmla.ca; brendan@brendanmaguire.ca; info@chrisdentremont.com;
mlabradjohns@gmail.com; lenorezannmla@bellaliant.com;
claudiachendermla@gmail.com
Subject: Bill 27

Sept 24, 2018

<Insert MLA Member's Name>

Province House

1726 Hollis Street
Halifax, N.S. B3J 2Y3

Re: Proposed Amendments to the Nova Scotia Animal Protection Act – Bill 27

Dear *Mr. Murphy*:

As a citizen and a responsible purebred dog breeder, I would like to add my voice to that of the Canadian Kennel Club (CKC) and request that the Nova Scotia government seek consultation from additional stakeholders, to develop legislation that is well crafted and fair. It is essential that the CKC have the opportunity to weigh in on significant law amendments that directly affect thousands of CKC members and their purebred dogs. We ask that you please consider the following:

- There has been No stakeholder input from local kennel clubs or the Canadian Kennel Club— a recognized Canadian authority and advocate for the health and welfare of purebred dogs—despite the fact that such changes would directly affect thousands of CKC members and their purebred dogs.

- The use of the word “ Custodian” versus “ Owner:

The definition of “Custodian” includes six options as descriptions of custodian. The option that is most concerning is c) any person who has possession of the animal.

This change will strip owners of the rights that come with ownership.

- Proposed Section 20 (2) [Current act Section 23(8bc)]: In the current act, this section falls under the heading “When an animal is found in distress”. In the proposed bill, this heading has been removed entirely. Doing so removes all need for probable cause for an animal being in distress. Inspectors will be able to go onto private property without probable cause, require dog owners to open their doors and present any animal from within the

home for inspection at any time. Without the heading of "When animal is found in distress," it provides fewer rights as a dog owner than non-dog owning citizens.

- Proposed Section 20(7) [current act Section 23(10)]: Relates to an inspector being able to stop a moving vehicle. This content used to fall under the heading "When Animal is found in distress" and in proposed act, it does not. Therefore, inspectors could pull residents over on the highway randomly for no probable cause. We ask that this content be placed back under the heading "When Animal is found in distress," and indicate that an inspector must have probable cause believing an animal is in distress prior to requiring a vehicle to stop.
- Proposed Section 20(8): New. This section indicates (with no mention of needing probable cause of an animal being in distress) that an inspector may enter on or pass over any land or water enclosed or not, without liability and without the owner's right to object. For private property owners, this section is very concerning. This section could be taken to mean that an inspector can be on a resident's private property without the requirement of needing probable cause.

I personally support the above statements and hope the Canadian Kennel Club—the canine authority in Canada and representative of over 20,000 individual members and more than 600 Breed Clubs—will have the opportunity to be a part of a consultation process, to ensure the bill is satisfactory to all.

Sincerely,

Bett Nielsen
Gnomehaven Papillons