

---

**From:** Danielle P. Craig <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** September 17, 2018 8:17 AM  
**To:** Office of the Legislative Counsel; margaretmillermla@bellaliant.net  
**Subject:** Opposing Bill 27 - Amendment to Animal Protection Act

Ms Miller, and to whom it may concern,

I am a resident of East Hants and have concerns regarding the language in the proposed amendment of the Animal Protection Act, Bill 27. I am also opposing the ban on tail docking for working dogs.

The language in this bill appears to give "inspectors" an unprecedented amount of power regarding entry of property and seizure of animals, as well as power to make medical decisions ("take samples"), regardless of medical training.

The use of the word "any" in subsection 20(1) is too broad for use in a legislative Act. It allows for a lack of accountability by the inspector or peace officer. Seizure of animals should be based on facts and objective information gathered by the inspector, not from subjective information that the language in this subsection can and will allow.

I propose instead refining the language in this proposed Bill in such a way that it demands more accountability from inspectors, & more objectively gathered data be presented before an animal can be seized or sampled from. I propose that instead of being allowed to seize any animal at any time for any reason, the owner, if asked, must instead present the animal to a vet for full physical examination within a pre-determined time frame (24-48 hours), and then present the written report to a peace officer or inspector within a week of the examination. If the examination is not completed or the report not presented, THEN the inspector or officer may apply to seize the animal if there is reason.

I also propose a veterinarian having to be consulted prior to any sample taking from any animal.

In addition to my concerns with subsection 20(1), I also oppose the ban of tail docking for working breeds (hunting, herding). Tail docking was introduced years ago as a means to protect our working breeds from pain later in life as they are at risk for crushing by livestock, tearing/breaking in brush or gates, etc. Some individuals in Scotland (those who work with these dogs everyday) are actually working to reintroduce this practice due to increase in tail injuries in working dogs.

Having had to call the SPCA before after witnessing an individual beating their dog, I do believe the society plays an important role in protecting the welfare of our animals, and I appreciate that this act is trying to allow them more freedom to intervene when necessary, however I firmly believe that there is too much room for interpretation with the use of the word "any", and would urge this to be revised. As a responsible dog owner, it concerns me to know I have only to be the subject of someone's displeasure to potentially have my dog seized due to the loose wording of this proposed amendment.

Sincerely,  
Danielle Perron Craig  
Jonathan Craig  
Nine Mile River, NS