

From: Christine Graham <[REDACTED]>
Sent: September 23, 2018 8:57 PM
To: Office of the Legislative Counsel
Subject: Fwd: Bill 27

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Christine Graham <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sun, Sep 16, 2018 at 10:49 PM
Subject: Bill 27
To: <keithcolwell@eastlink.ca>

Good evening Mr. Colwell,

I am writing you tonight about my deep concerns over the passing of Bill 27.

Firstly, upon reading the bill, I find it very disconcerting that a vague (and practically non-existent) definitions of the administrative parameters that lead up to what is considered just cause for a SPCA officer to execute the extreme policing powers of search and seizure by having the legal authority to enter my business or home without challenge* (even with a warrant in accordance with section 8 of the CCRF*) can conclude with taking of an animal or test an animal that I am the owner/ custodian of.

Secondly, I am a business owner on the Eastern Shore. In the last few years, I was the target of a person's vendetta. This involved a very bitter and public custody battle involving a dog owner and their tribulations with the court system that I was unwillingly dragged into. Consequently, their random, non-investigated complaints, drew immediate scrutiny on my business on SM and by officials at HRM due to the bad publicity. More recently, I was the victim of chronic barking complaints and repetitive follow up harassment by HRM By-Law inspectors, who all inevitably came to the same conclusion: The individual was disgruntled because they did not properly research the potential noise generated in a zone that permits dog kennels and other business that generate similar industrial background noise.

So my concern is obvious and ultimately bad for my business:

Would I be subjected to constant harassment by General Inspectors if all it takes is for some random person with a grudge or gripe to start submitting formal bogus complaints ?
Historically, it has been HRM's fallback response on such matters to lamely state " Sorry - but that is the system"

Hence, this is why it is critical that the entire process it takes for an inspector to show up at your door and have the power to essentially over-ride your charter rights, be open for public debate and explained in great detail. It is as much the Province's responsibility to protect and respect a person's livelihood and reputation - and to keep that in balance - as it is to approach this issue with the same level of zeal and concern that they have now found to protect the rights of the animal in this all-encompassing Bill.

Otherwise they may find themselves in court for harassment, abuse of authority, and/ or CCRF challenges.

Another area of concern for me is the broad reaching and "trendy" health initiatives listed. I have been dog show competitor and a breeder of dogs for over 25 years. This bill is also over-reacting to satisfy PC "humane boundaries" on procedures that have been traditionally medically accepted with the breed of dog I specialize in. Specifically, medical

procedures that ultimately benefit the long-term health of the animal. For example - by not allowing dewclaws to be removed, you are adding the possibility of injury to the dog. They can catch on fixed objects and tear off. This is extremely painful to the animal when it happens, Also, it can fester, making it very difficult to heal. Removal of these claws shortly after birth eliminates this potential injury. Also, debarking is sometimes the only recourse for an owner to help with a problem behaviour *and necessary to satisfy HRM noise By-laws.*

I realize that the Veterinary College does not agree with these practices and I respect their viewpoint from the short term, immediate medical standpoint with respect to humane medical practices. But as a SME on breeding and raising dogs for over 30 years, I feel that a better solution is to leave this up to the owner of the dog in consultation with their veterinarian to make this decision.

In conclusion, I believe that there should have been consultation and a public administrative review in order to obtain other expert opinions and view points on such broad spectrum Bill.

In view of these aforementioned points, and the fact that there is no detailed explanation of how a General Inspector goes about the processes of executing any aspect of the provisions of the act, it is my opinion as a SME in this field (that - I might add- has been sought out by HRM on such matters in the past), that this bill requires much more public discussion, scrutiny and editing.

Regards

Christine Graham
Wyndenfog Kennels