
From: Dawn Tufts <dawnjim.tufts@ns.sympatico.ca>
Sent: September 17, 2018 12:26 AM
To: Office of the Legislative Counsel
Subject: Proposed Bill 27 - Animal Protection Act to have tabled for further review
Attachments: Bill 27 Animal Protection Act.pdf

Importance: High

Good day,

As I am unable to attend in person to speak to the above proposed Bill 27 before you, am addressing my concerns below. Upon reading thru the Bill, it would appear there are various clauses within, that need further review and clarification, and ask that it not be approved without same.

While I/we strongly support responsible dog/cat ownership, there are items contained within this proposed Bill that appear to be a broad brush and could lend to some inconsistencies in execution. I've been an animal lover all my life, and have resided in Halifax for 40+ years. I'm also on the executive of three dog clubs, all whom support the initiatives as set out by the Canadian Kennel Club for responsible owners, breeders, etc. And feel one of the keys in responsible ownership lies in Education, of which the local clubs and CKC, work to diligently promote.

Our dogs bring us great joy with their companionship and the activities we participate in, and are part of our family. With some of the proposed amendments it lends the ability for inspectors to enter premises at any time for an undefined apparent reason, and to perform tests. The tests are not defined either, and as such could be harmful to an animal that may have an existing health condition.

This bill expands on the responsibilities of Provincial Inspectors, but does not clearly outline the qualifications of same. Given the scope of this position, to best serve the welfare of the animals and not potential malcontent of complaints or individuals, there should be well well-defined qualifications as part of the Act.

Some items of concern:

Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals

Sec 7 (5) Board of Directors of Society appointed by Minister who are employee in the civil service of the Province. Given the scope of their responsibilities, it should define potential candidate's qualifications and aptitude for same.

Animal Welfare Inspections

11 (1) – Chief Inspectors and inspectors are responsible.... – does not detail qualifications for these positions (as above)

12 (2) Appointment of Chief Inspector... as above in (Sec 7 (5) – no qualifications listed. Only minimum as prescribed by the regulations. What is the minimum.

16 (2) speak to delegating power conferred without details of qualifications for same.

20 (a) at reasonable hour enter premises. While includes caveat "other than a private dwelling" many kennels, boarding facilities, grooming shops are located within a private dwelling. Where is the line here?

(b) conduct tests... Which tests, and for purpose. This needs to be more defined, as some tests could be harmful to a pet's health condition.

(c) seize an animal for tests... as above. And if the animal is not in distress, where is the legality in seizing same.

(d) seize an animal >>> defined by the Act. While agree if in mistreated/abused an appropriate action should be taken. This is worded in broad sense, and left to interpretation.

Protecting the Welfare of Animals

27 on Cosmetic Surgery - believe this was covered under the Veterinarian association.

28 (2) this is same verbiage as in Animal Welfare Inspections (20) , but without the differentiation of private dwelling.

These are only a few of the items that have need of clarification or amended definitions. And ask that the Bill not be approved further today. And to have further review and input from the multiple stakeholders, all who have the best interest of their pets.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely
Dawn Tufts