
From: Lynn Pulsifer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: September 24, 2018 9:28 AM
To: Office of the Legislative Counsel
Subject: Re: Bill 27

I am writing with regards to Bill 27. I am a CKC member and breeder of purebred dogs. While no one would wish to hamper the SPCA in carrying out their inspections this bill has some murky areas that need to be clarified. Why would it be possible for an SPCA inspector to come on a persons property without just cause and demand to see their pets ? The absence of without just cause in the wording could open all kinds venues for abuse. I, personally, know of at least 2 people who have been harassed by the SPCA in this province without reason other than someone wanted to make trouble for them. Also the term "custodian" is objectional as it, too, is open to interpretation. People own their pets and have rights and responsibilities to these animals. Some people do not deserve pets and should be penalized while others are exemplary pet owners and there are many in between these two extremes. Custodian implies that whoever has the animal at the moment is solely responsible. I own my dogs and I am responsible for them and their actions.

These inspectors need to have training for a job like this, not just be animal lovers. There is a very vocal opposition to having any changes made to this bill as currently proposed. These people have slandered, mocked and threatened people wishing to have the wording clarified. They are focusing on the cropping and docking issue which perhaps should have its own, separate section and not be lumped in with the role of the SPCA. This bill seems draconian and a violation of people's charter of rights. Why should pet owners be treated with less regard than criminals such as drug dealers, murderers and thieves ? The police cannot just turn up at someone's residence and demand to search it without just cause so why would the SPCA have more power than the police in this province ?

I am hoping that this afternoon the Legislature will rule in favour of clarifying this bill, this time making any committees public and having people from all concerned be part of it. It is odd that no one knows who the CKC member or dog trainers on the previous committee are, why ? If the CKC is involved surely the local CKC rep would be consulted on who should be on the committee ? This bill has been very poorly drafted and needs to be revisited.

Lynn Pulsifer
CKC Member
Regional Director, Bull Terrier Club of Canada
Member Bull Terrier Club of America