

**Cynthia Kardell
Solicitor
94 Copeland Road
Beecroft NSW 2119
A.B.N. 40 573 229 547
Telephone (02) 9484 6895
Email ckardell@iprimus.com.au**

1 March 2004

Letherbarrow
Lawyers
Level 2, 1 McLaren Street,
North Sydney NSW 2059.
By facsimile only (02) 9922 1722

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: Complaint against Dr T Lonsdale

I refer to your facsimile letter received 27 February 2004 and advise as follows.

Your client's letter dated 8 January 2004 informed my client that the AVA investigation had been "**stimulated**" by his email entitled "Excuses & Falsehoods" in the "**context of concerns raised by AVA members over a number of years in relation to [his] public statements about the Association and about the veterinary profession more generally**".

That is, by its own admission, the AVA did not consider any of the alleged complaints, past and present, warranted an investigation. But when they were considered as a whole, the AVA decided that the current complaint took on a greater significance and warranted a formal investigation and the identity of the complainants.

Because the past concerns were a part of your client's current considerations, the AVA must provide full details of all the past concerns so that my client can know the full nature and extent of your client's current complaint.

Or to put it another way, the AVA did not consider the current complaint of itself, warranted an investigation. Therefore the AVA Board must abandon the current inquiry, if it is not willing to provide full details of those past concerns which have influenced its decision to investigate on this occasion and not on others.

But having said that, the Board cannot now investigate the past complaints, which were at the time considered to be insufficient to warrant investigation. To do so, would by any measure, be considered harsh, unjust and unreasonable. The AVA

Board must abandon its current complaint because it cannot stand without the past complaints; and the time is long gone, when the past complaints could be fairly investigated.

I note your instruction that the Board is fully aware of the nature and extent of my client's objection and nonetheless, has decided to proceed with the meeting on Tuesday 2 March 2004.

I note also your advice that the proposed meeting is not a hearing, but a discussion. With respect, it can hardly be a discussion when my client's membership may, as a result, be cancelled.

I am surprised that the President of the AVA and its CEO would be offended. My client has objected to decisions made by an officer or officers of the AVA. It is not a personal matter. I feel sure that both persons would endorse the view that in their formal capacity, they are to ensure that they will be held accountable to the membership for their decisions on behalf of the organisation. That process may be confronting, but it does not warrant or explain why either officer would personally take offence.

Perhaps members of the AVA Board are unaware of the range and scope of my client's contribution for which he is now being nominated for the College Award of the Australian College of Veterinary Scientists. Dr Lonsdale's website www.rawmeatybones.com and 2001 book Raw Meaty Bones contain much of value and I recommend them to the Board.

I continue to be of the view that my client should not attend the meeting on Tuesday 2 March 2004 and I have advised him accordingly. The AVA Board has decided to go ahead with the meeting, in the knowledge that it has abused its position, and denied my client a fair hearing and itself, the opportunity to be fully informed of my client's case. A decision to expel my client in these circumstances can only be seen for what it is, and will say more about the Board's intentions than about my client.

I am instructed my client remains willing to attend for a meeting at a time of mutual convenience, in order that the parties may find a way forward.

I look forward to the opportunity to resolve my client's issues in a more conciliatory manner.

Yours faithfully,

Cynthia Kardell