

February 16, 2022

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you in opposition to the Companion Animal Bill.

First, the bill proposes to create a costly state board to provide services already provided by the Minnesota Board of Animal Health. It wants to separate the services provided to companion animals from animals serving a more specific agricultural use. As a veterinarian, it is impossible to separate the needs of animal, owners, and producers, regardless of the species or primary purpose of the animal. There is significant overlap between these two categories, including several diseases important to both animal and human health.

Secondly, crucial relationships between the Board of Animal Health and the University of Minnesota, Minnesota Department of Health, Department of Agriculture, other state and federal agencies and animal production organizations exist that provide additional reach and cooperation with the board.

In addition, the organizations supporting this bill have a history of actions that have not always been in the best interest of animals. Allowing the CAB to accept funds from outside sources with special interests, allowing them to make policy and reducing the veterinary expertise on a board making such policies is questionable, at best.

As a veterinarian educated at the University and practicing veterinary medicine for companion animals in Minnesota for over 30 years. I strongly oppose the Companion Animal Bill and its attempts to "fix" a problem that does not exist.

Sincerely,
Kate An Hunter, DVM
Inver Grove Heights, MN
kateanhunter@aol.com