

From: Kristianne Delorme <[REDACTED]>
Sent: September 24, 2018 4:49 AM
To: Office of the Legislative Counsel
Subject: Bill 27

Re: cropping and docking below and the refusal of a veterinarian in BC to revoke client privledges because. Procedure not performed at their clinic:

This is absolutely NOT okay. This is ignorant and stupid. If the veterinarian does not want to crop ears then by all means dont crop them. Nobody is forcing the vet to perform a surgery they do not want to do.

Asking an EXISTING client to leave their practice because of a procedure that was not done at their clinic is Wrong. Period.

This freakshow surrounding ear cropping is astounding. It is just ear cropping. ear cropped puppies are fine right after surgery. They play. They run around. They eat. It is in no way cruel.

This veterinarian is in the wrong. Also, speaking on the "doctor" comment above, this bullshit is equivalent of a doctor not wanting to give you a breast reduction surgery that you want (for a variety of reasons including pain, esthetics, or other personal reasons) because you had an abortion from another doctor and they don't agree with abortion.

If you do not like ear cropping, FINE! Dont ear crop. Dont like abortion? FINE! Dont get an abortion! Nobody is forcing you to!

Stop shoving your opinion down the throat of people who want this procedure done by a licenced veterinarian in a safe environment.

It's simply NOT your choice, so time to shut up and stop forcing people to do ad you please

Also, ;

<Sept 22, 2018>

Dear speaker
Province House
1726 Hollis Street
Halifax, N.S. B3J 2Y3

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

Dear MLA speaker;

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,

Kristianne J Delorme

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

Kristi Delorme, NCSO, OSO


Cilka Great Danes
www.cilkadan.es.com