

5. Either let us have SELF (ie veterinary) regulation, or leave it to the Gov't - the suggested changes all look rather expensive to implement, I personally see them as a solution looking for a problem, and I suspect I will be on the hook to pay for all this. If the veterinarians in Ontario require this much bureaucracy to protect the public from us, let the tax payers pay.

7. See last comment

12. Perhaps taking the view that ALL veterinarians are protecting the public, rather than the College is protecting the public from vets might be easier to swallow...

14. Why in the name of ANYthing considered Holy would I want the fox in charge of the hen house??? No more General meeting, less power to have a say, and now the College (gets put in charge of remuneration and expenses, etc. You call this "self" regulation?

19. Leave the technicians out of this. The College is supposed to be VETERINARIANS regulating VETERINARIANS - (hence "self regulation"???) We don't need to regulate technical staff, they have their OWN association for that, and they can pay for it. Also, what happens when you end up in a Dr. vs RVT dispute?? BAD plan, all round.

20. Don't do it

23. Leave it alone

25. Keep Big Brother away from me. I always do more than the required CE annually. I report the minimum because I detest the implication that I need somebody to hold my hand and decide for me what I should spend my time, money and effort on. Keep making it more difficult to report, and you will consistently get that I spend months at a time on VIN, and it is all related to my many obvious weaknesses. Leave me alone, and I will spend that reporting time doing a) my job b) looking at ways to improve my knowledge, competency, or business skill.

27. Mandatory mediation? No appeal to reports/inquiries? Can you state the 2nd last sentence in English, rather than Legalese, and tell me how remediation is preferable to discipline if public protection is truly at risk?

29. SCRAP this! What happened to collegiality? Not only is the College taking an anti-Vet approach, but now we are supposed to snitch on each other? We aren't allowed to tell the public that there is a concern about another vet, but we are obliged to tell the College? (Would telling the public not be far more effective at directly protecting them?) So, if my competition down the street decides to complain about my alcoholism (I don't drink), everything I do comes under scrutiny... investigators that are paid to find things that are wrong come looking... the rumour mill starts: "THAT vet is under investigation!" And my competition reaps the rewards. Might as well just complain about everybody in my practice area first, to get the jump on it. Oh, and that will guarantee that the investigators are busy and so undoubtably the CVO will need MORE of them, costing me more money.... Yeah. Great. Sounds wonderful. NOT.

31. EVERYthing through the committee - ONE (non-vet) believes something that has the potential to ruin somebody else's life, so they appoint somebody that a committee UNDER their authority needs to "approve" (read "rubber stamp") and then it is guilty until proven innocent? NO.

33. How about, just for a change, we follow the principles of Natural Justice, here? A policeman cannot walk into my business and demand to see anything and everything, unless there are declarations made of rights. You may NOT take pictures or videos of my practice, my clients, my patients, or my conversations. They are CONFIDENTIAL - or is the CVO above accountability for this as well? What happens if a picture of an unwilling client makes it into social media through a leak? Who is accountable for the breach? Who defines "reasonable"? Oh, right, the College. I have no say. Is it reasonable for an inspector to observe a puppy visit if the concern is about an enucleation surgery? Do we have to wait for the next enucleation so a "reasonable" opportunity exists? Do my staff need to answer questions about my personal habits if there is a concern about my surgical technique? This is WAY too intrusive, and against the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I will fight this tooth and nail if it ever becomes an issue in my life. And I will hold accountable the investigator first, the Registrar second, and everybody involved in trying to make this law as I go by.

35. State within the legislation that the College is responsible to pay ALL expenses incurred by the suspended member (direct and indirect) in the event that the member successfully defends against the allegations leading to the suspension. Better yet, use the existing Court system already in place to protect the public.

37. This appears to be leverage to once again show that all vets are guilty until proven innocent. The basic info ONLY if this is implemented - Name, date, place. The allegations etc should NOT be made public BEFORE the hearing. If somebody is that interested, let them show up.

39. I would think it might be important the VETERINARIANS trust that "self" regulation works effectively, too... once again, the viewpoint appears to be taken that vets are all to be mistrusted, and the public needs to be protected from us. I truly do resent this pervasive implication.

41. Leave what is law as Law. I don't want regulators that are apparently strongly biased against me setting the rules and limits for indemnity. I don't want them weakening the provisions of confidentiality to better serve investigators that they want to have greater power. I don't see any "compelling" or "reasonable" reason to change these rules, unless the "agility" provided allows the College to squirm out of responsibility for actions it may take.

43. If you wish to be a SELF REGULATING profession, it seems that perhaps the professionals BEING regulated SHOULD have some say in the decision making???? In practicality there is no confusion - vets have long since known that they have no say in regulating THEMSELVES, and whether there is a meeting of "licences" since we are no longer "members" even, or not it makes no difference. Congratulations on achieving apathy to this level.

45. If a member - oh, sorry, licensee - is "unsupportive" of an investigator, and subsequently exonerated, the College should pay the member an equal or greater amount as recompense. If it is found that Human rights/freedoms are being infringed upon, the individual and the College should be legally accountable. Define "unsupportive" - not talking without legal counsel?? Preventing an investigator access to an area where he might be put at risk? Dogs/cattle/horses can be unpredictable, after all.

46. Just read the rest of the comments. It is a solution that didn't have a problem; it increases the ability of the College to do whatever it pleases; it appears to consistently take the viewpoint that all veterinarians are guilty until proven innocent, in contravention of all principles of natural justice and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It looks cumbersome, it is fraught with vague language like "agility" "reasonable" and "effective", and it looks like it would be expensive to implement. The only part of "self" in "self-regulation" that appears to remain is "self-paying" - and that with NO control on amount, and NO recourse for disagreement with things like this horrific document.

47. "Agile" isn't a word that comes to mind at the same as "legislation" - regulations are not something that are supposed to be able to bend whichever way somebody wants to take them. They are supposed to be stable, simple, and fair. People have the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty, even veterinarians. I find it difficult to say the words "reasonable" "collegial" "transparent" or "fair" in the same breath as "CVO". If the College holds itself separate from veterinary members (or licensees), then it isn't self-regulation no matter how many times you call it that. There should be majority agreement on a) the NEED to change anything and b) the major changes, based on a referendum of ALL members before anything gets changed at all.