Bill 27

From: Todd Horn <[redacted]>
Sent: September 23, 2018 12:30 AM
To: Office of the Legislative Counsel
Cc: mlabradjohns@gmail.com
Subject: Please say NO to Bill 27

I am writing with serious concern about Bill 27, the proposed new Animal Protection Act.

Instead of sounding like it is focused on animal welfare, it certainly is worded to be seeming more focused on infringing on people's rights.

There seems to be no strong reference to probable cause, to some proof of wrong doing, before the SPCA are allowed to walk all over one's property (and there is no regard to bio safety written in there at all either). Guilty until proven innocent is how this bill reads. It doesn't matter if some neighbor just has a personal beef with you and is making things up... nope, one complaint, however unfounded, and anonymous, and the spca all of a sudden has more rights than the police to come on your property and demand to enter premises, or demand you bring out your pets for them to examine.

And what training do those spca inspectors have in animal health ? From what I have heard, not much or any in many cases. So how can they be judge and jury on whether a dog is limping because of abuse, or because of a virus or a young dog condition such as pano ? They can, according to this proposed protection act, seize that family pet, because of their suspicion of what may be causing limping to use an example. My example, by the way, is from a personal experience many years ago with the SPCA coming to our door because of a nearby neighbor complaint.... we had limping dogs ... and our children and I had been playing with some agility equipment with another of our dogs and this neighbor saw that... assumed that we were injuring our dogs, abusing them. The limping ones had papiloma virus and had been to a vet and certainly were not jumping the little small jumps our other dogs were when playing with our kids... no the limping dogs had been only leaving the house to go to pee in our fenced backyard (because the warts on their feet hurt). So obviously the neighbor had been looking into our backyard. .. and the incident, while cleared up after many interrogating questions (what vet, what virus, etc etc...) and seeing the well groomed and well fed, and friendly dogs ... left my children nervous and scared that maybe these people could have taken their pets. (We at the time assured them that no, that could not happen... but this change in the proposed protection act, sure as heck sounds like they could now remove our pets under that...). So, yes they say there is an appeal process... so after they have traumatized our pets, and our children and whole family, THEN we can argue to try and get back our dog... no guarantees though.... ? Remember this was all completely unsubstantiated heresay that we must have done something bad to our dogs because some were limping.

This is just one example of how wrong this could all go, and how much hurt and problems it could cause, for the animals and owners, and families.

And where is the concern (by the government), for the biosafety of people's properties and animals ? The SPCA inspectors travel all over.... where does this "protection " act state they MUST change their clothes and they MUST use safe footwear covers before going across pastures, and onto yards ? It seems to not be in there. How is it a Protection Act, when the animals it is supposed to PROTECT, are now being way more likely to be exposed to pathogens by SPCA inspectors who visit many properties in one day. Most illnesses in animals are transferable to ground, to other animals from clothing, footwear touching the property, hands

WAY before anyone knows there IS a sick animal. How many veterinarians and agricultural officials have been asked and weighed in on these factors and had these serious concerns heard ? My horse can be exposed to Strangles because some neighbor decided maybe there was no water in their bucket for a moment ??? Strangles KILLS horses, and in a very horrifying and terrible way. But that is not abuse ? that the SPCA inspectors can carry that in on their clothes and footwear, because they are allowed to travel across our properties, one after the other with no regard to bio safety ??

The fines are extreme for first offense when it could be a neighbor that is wanting to stir up trouble for someone .. and the accusations could be very hard to prove ... right or wrong... so who will be ensuring that some innocent person is NOT being wrongfully convicted and expected to pay such stiff fines(or heaven forbid, jail time)... that would have a serious impact on their finances and future for the average Nova Scotian ? And who pays their lawyer fees for this unsubstantiated claim ? The process of proof of wrong doing just seems to be way too lacking for the power that is being given to spca inspectors that are uncertified in animal health.

The term custodian instead of owner .... hmmm, so I am responsible for my animals, but I don't own them ? Of course I own them. I am their owner... they cannot speak for themselves, they are completely under our care and management, and animals do get bought and sold ... you have to have ownership to sell anything, be it animal or inanimate object.

My land... my property and I have to allow it to be invaded, I can be spied on, I have no chance to prove I am innocent before you take my pet ???

Doesn't this all just sound really wrong to you ?

Don't you think there has to be REAL cause for concern before this is allowed, and that NEEDS to be written in the act ... because that is what gets followed ?

Our family loves all animals, and of course we want laws that protect animal welfare, and that penalize for true abuse of animals, but ... this, this is not an animal protection act, it is an invasion of private property and rights, and gives too much power to untrained in animal health, uncertified staff of the spca ... and no, I do not think this act is going to help at all in deterring, or penalizing those that truly do abuse animals and need stopped. There has to be something much better and less geared to have the possibility and ability to punish those that are doing nothing wrong !

Thank-you for listening. My children also thank-you for working to be sure that their rights and their family pets are safe.

Nancy Horn