

6. Re: Letter From R.L. Pfeifer dated October 3, 1972
Impoundment of a Dog by the S.P.C.A.

Appearing on the Agenda for the October 30, 1972 Council Meeting is a letter from R.L. Pfeifer protesting the manner in which his dog was impounded by the S.P.C.A.

The Chief Licence Inspector investigated the complaint and reports as follows:

"It appears that Mr. A.J. Chaloner, Pound Inspector, was carrying out his duties as required by the S.P.C.A. contract and was enforcing the regulations pursuant to the Dog Tax and Pound By-Law.

The dog was not enticed or impounded from the complainant's property and it was clearly at large. This statement is supported by the following explanation of events as described by Mr. Chaloner:

On October 3, 1972, I was in the area of Moscrop School answering complaints. I picked up a dog at large at Darwin and Moscrop and proceeded to turn south along Alderwood Crescent to patrol the street. I saw a grey and white Terrier X at the western end of the crescent running across the property of 4252 Alderwood Crescent. By the time I reached the western end of the crescent the dog had left that property and was on the corner property at Alderwood and Moscrop. As I parked the truck across from 4252 Alderwood Crescent the dog ran out onto the street and I proceeded to impound it.

Had the dog remained on the property, I would have approached the residents to ascertain the owners of said dog, and issued a warning notice."

It should be noted that the S.P.C.A. is not remunerated for its services on the basis of the number of dogs that are impounded. Furthermore, the contract with the S.P.C.A. which was renewed on October 1, 1972 does not allow for the type of impoundment which is described in the complainant's letter. In fact, inspectors who are clearly guilty of such practices would be subject to censure and possible disciplinary action.

I should add that since the S.P.C.A. increased its patrols, the number of dogs impounded has increased dramatically and dog licence sales have also shown a marked increase. Several people have indeed called in appreciation of the increased activity of the S.P.C.A.

We cannot recommend that the complainant be given a refund because the S.P.C.A., in our opinion, was properly engaged in the enforcement of the Dog Tax and Pound By-Law when the complainant's dog was impounded on October 3, 1972.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

THAT the complainant not be given a refund; and

THAT a copy of this report be sent to R.L. Pfeifer; and

THAT a copy of this report be sent to R.A. Hosegood, Secretary-Manager of the Vancouver S.P.C.A.