

**MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE LABRADOR BREED COUNCIL HELD AT THE KENNEL CLUB, CLARGES STREET, PICCADILLY, LONDON ON THURSDAY 15<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2010**

Present:-

Mr Richard Stafford	Chairman, Labrador Retriever Club
Mrs Sussie Wiles	Secretary/Treasurer, Yellow Labrador Club
Mrs Erica Jayes	Cotswold & Wyevev Labrador Retriever Club
Mr Karl Gawthorpe	Cotswold & Wyevev Labrador Retriever Club
Mrs Janet Cole	East Anglia Labrador Retriever Club
Mr Keith Wallington	East Anglia Labrador Retriever Club
Mrs Joy Venturi Rose	Kent, Surrey and Sussex Labrador Retriever Club
Mrs Alison Scutcher	Kent, Surrey and Sussex Labrador Retriever Club
Mrs Ronwein Phillips	Labrador Retriever Club of Wales
Mrs Penny Carpanini	Labrador Retriever Club of Wales
Mrs Marion Hopkinson	Midland Counties Labrador Retriever Club
Mrs Jackie Hodge	Midland Counties Labrador Retriever Club
Mrs Maureen D'Arcy	North West Labrador Retriever Club
Mr Andrew Stevens	North West Labrador Retriever Club
Mrs Lynda Heron	Northumberland & Durham Labrador Retriever Club
Mrs Pat Gill	Three Ridings Labrador Retriever Club
Mr Barry Rooth	Three Ridings Labrador Retriever Club
Mr Gordon Fox	West of England Labrador Retriever Club
Mr Geoff Hatfield	West of England Labrador Retriever Club
Mrs Fiona Braddon	Yellow Labrador Club

The Chairman opened the meeting and welcomed the delegates.

**Apologies for absence**

Mr Arwyn Ellis	Labrador Retriever Club
Mrs Mary Hughes	Labrador Club of Northern Ireland
Mrs Helen Steven	Labrador Club of Scotland
Mrs Caroline Campbell	Labrador Club of Scotland
Mr Ken Roberts	Northumberland and Durham Labrador Retriever Club

**To approve the minutes of the last Annual General Meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> April 2009**

The minutes of the last AGM were approved with all in favour. Proposed by Mr Gordon Fox (WELRC) and seconded by Mrs Janet Cole (EALRC).

**Matters arising**

There were no matters arising

**To receive and adopt the Statement of Accounts for the period ending 31<sup>st</sup> December 2009.**

Copies of the Statement of Accounts for the period ending 31<sup>st</sup> December 2009 were circulated at the meeting.

Mr Andrew Stevens (NWLRC) had a query about expenses that couldn't be answered in the meeting.

The Secretary is to contact the Auditor for the explanation, then to email all the breed club secretaries with the answer.

Mr Gordon Fox (WELRC) asked why the income was £1,950.11 when subscriptions were £150.00 per club, which should make £1,950.00.

The Accounts were not adopted at this meeting.

**To elect a Chairman**

Mr Richard Stafford JP was proposed by Mrs Pat Gill (TRLRC) and seconded by Mrs Sussie Wiles (YLRC) with all in favour. It was also pointed out that it was agreed last year that the Chairman had been elected for a period of two years (this was brought to the attention of the meeting by Mr Barry Rooth (TRLRC))

**To elect a Secretary/Treasurer**

Mrs Sussie Wiles was proposed by Mrs Marion Hopkinson (MCLRC) and seconded by Mrs Joy Venturi-Rose (KSSLRC) with all in favour.

**Secretary's Honorarium for Administration**

Secretary's Honorarium for Administrations of £200-00 were approved proposed by Mrs Pat Gill (3RLRC) and seconded by Mrs Marion Hopkinson (MCLRC) with all in favour.

**To agree the subscription for 2010**

After some discussion it was agreed to increase the subscriptions to the Labrador Breed Council to be £200.00. Proposed by Mr Karl Gwthorpe (CWLRC) and seconded by Mrs Marion Hopkinson (MCLRC) 10 votes for and 1 Abstention.

The reason for the increase in subscriptions was due to travelling expenses to the breed council meeting and also to pay for the sub committees meetings that are held throughout the year.

It was proposed by Alison Scutcher (KSSLRC) that the payment of expenses be made in the year they occurred. This means that two years reimbursements would be paid in 2010 to bring them up to date. It has long caused difficulties for Breed Club Treasurers when dealing for expenses relating to a closed accounting period. Seconded by Maureen D'Arcy (NWLRC) all in favour

The AGM closed at 2pm.

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL MEETING OF THE LABRADOR BREED COUNCIL HELD IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE KENNEL CLUB AFTER THE A.G.M ON 15<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2010.**

**1. To approve the minutes of the General Meeting of the Labrador Breed Council held after the A.G.M on 16<sup>th</sup> April 2009**

The minutes of the last meeting were approved proposed by Mrs Maureen D'Arcy (NWLRC) and seconded by Mr Barry Rooth (TRLRC) with all in favour.

**2. Matters arising**

Mrs Maureen D'Arcy (NWLRC) asked when do the minutes from the breed council meeting gets upload onto the website.

Mrs Fiona Braddon (YLRC) explained that she as been asked to just do a short version of the minutes to be uploaded onto the web site, but she didn't feel that it was her job to do a shorten version, So had been unable to upload the minutes for some years.

It was proposed that the full version of the minutes should be included onto the breed council web site by Mrs Lynda Heron (N&DLRC) and seconded by Mrs Joy Venturi-Rose (KSSLRC) all in favour.

Mrs Maureen D'Arcy (NWLRC) also asked about the progress of the Puppy Web Site.

Mrs Fiona Braddon (YLRC) explained that she had been searching for a website name that would be the best for this item, but she informed the meeting that she had found this very difficult due to a lot of the names already owned by people. It was suggested by Mrs Penny Carpanini (LRCOW) would it be possible to find out who owns these names and try and buy one from them, Mrs Fiona Braddon told the meeting that she had done this already and they were asking a lot of money for these some were a lot of money. But informed the meeting that she had now bought a web site name with the words Labrador and Puppy in the title and she will send the website address out to all secretaries. She also asked that she will require all the Secretaries to send all the Puppy Co-ordinators details so she can start to build the web site.

Mrs Pat Gill (TRLRC) asked would anybody else be able to have access to help Mrs Braddon with the web sites. The meeting was informed that this could be possible for other people to access the site, but it was agreed that it would be better if it was just left to a few people, So it was agreed that the 2 people to have access to the web sites would be Mrs Fiona Braddon and also Mr Andrew Stevens (NWLRC) seeing as he had helped over the last year with the site.

Mr Geoff Hatfield (WELRC) asked how other clubs have done with the Midland Counties LRC proposal re any member of any breed club using either a stud dog or brood bitch to purposely produce a cross breed, e.g. Labradoodle, shall be subject to a Special General Meeting of the club to consider their exclusion from the club.

Northumberland and Durham and placed this on their last AGM but found that the majority were not happy with this to be placed in their code of ethics.

North West Labrador Club said they are placing this on this years AGM to see how the members accept it.

(1)

### **3. Breed Council Liaison Council Report**

Mrs Shelagh Walton (our Breed Liaison Council Representative) was invited into the meeting to report on the last meeting of the Breed Liaison Council. Please find attached.

Mrs Walton advised the meeting that anything that we require to be placed on the next Agenda will need to be with her no later than the 20<sup>th</sup> August 2010.

Mrs Penny Carpanini (LCOW) asked that all the clubs look in depth to the proposal by the Shetland Sheepdog re publication of all test recorded on everything. She felt that it might stop people having their dogs tested.

Mrs Pat Gill gave thanks to Mrs Shelagh Walton for attending the meeting and giving her report.

### **4. Breed Council Health Sub-committee report**

Mrs Joy Vebturi-Rose handed out minutes of the meeting held on the 12.4.10, then she read them out to the meeting and items were discussed.

It was noted that Mrs J Cole apologies were not on the minutes. Mrs Cole asked if these could be added.

Mrs Hopkinson informed the meeting that communication towards her had not been very good at all. She had called Mrs J Hodge the day before to be informed that the meeting was being held on the 10/4/10 at Mrs Cole's start time 12pm. So Mrs Hopkinson made her way down to the meeting to be greeted by Mr Cole at the door to be informed that the meeting had been cancelled.

Mrs Hopkinson had not received any other communication from the sub committee to inform her of this.

Mrs Cole also was not informed that the meeting on the 15/4/10 was cancelled.

The Chairman asked for Mrs Hopkinson's apology to be added to the apologies for this meeting. He also stated that that in the future it is to be made sure that every endeavour is made to ensure that all members of the sub committee are contacted if any changes are made to the confirmed dates and venues.

Proposals from Breed Clubs

### **5. The Yellow Labrador Club propose:-**

**A small sub-group (no more than 8 people) is formed to process the findings of the different meetings held regarding the KC change in Breed Standard and the possible changes we would like to add to this New Standard. The findings then to be presented to the Kennel Club. Several meetings re Breed Standard. The four meetings need co-ordinating and the findings presented to KC. It was agreed to circulate 3 sets of minutes to Breed Clubs and ask them to feed back to B/C secretary**

6. Northumberland and Durham LRC propose the following for the committee to consider:
- a) **Changes to the Breed Standard. N & D held a workshop to discuss this (minutes attached for you to read). The proposed changes we would like to recommend are highlighted.** It was agreed that this item would be covered by item 5 above.
  - b) **Accredited Breeders Scheme – We propose that where accolades are indicated (e.g Stud Book No., Breed Club Membership and litters bred) there MUST be of the breed in question.** After a small discussion within the meeting with people thinking that this would be a good idea, a vote was taken 7 for and 2 against. Proposal Carried.
  - c) **Accredited Breeders Scheme – we propose that if membership of a Breed Club is indicated the Breed Club should be stated and relevant to the breed applied for.** A Discussion took place and the feeling that this was a good proposal, A vote took place 9 for and 1 against. It was agreed that the Breed Council Secretary would write to the Kennel Club re this item. Proposal Carried.
  - d) **Health Schemes – That ALL (recognised) health tests be printed on KC pedigrees in the form of a table with the words TESTED/UNTESTED indicated and the results printed.**  
If point d) is not acceptable the second proposal would be:
  - e) **Health Schemes – That all recommended ACS health tests be printed on KC pedigrees in the form of a table with the words TESTED/UNTESTED indicated and the results printed.** It was felt after a discussion that these two items (D&E) needs to be re visited and possible re worded by the proposing club.
  - f) **In addition to the proposal that the Government Report “A Healthier Future for Pedigree Dogs” be discussed. This committee feels this may have wide spread implications and suggest a sub committee be formed to look at the proposals in depth, the implications on the Labrador and future breeding. (E.g restriction on studs to name one point). With the sub committee coming up with recommendations to be taken forward.** A discussion took place re this and a vote took place, 5 for 5 against, Chairperson had casting vote and voted No so the proposal was turned down.
7. Northumberland and Durham LRC’s discussion points: –
- a. **Should we consider making health testing compulsory for all dogs and bitches who are bred from? And by that I mean only pups from tested parents can be registered with the KC. This may one day become law and if we were ahead of this it could stand us in good stead.**
  - b. **If yes then which health tests, including DNA tests, do the council think we should use.**

- c. **If we agree to health test then there needs to be some way of adding new tests to the list, or removing them if we find that we have bred out the problem in the future.**
- d. **It would seem that none of us really know the scale of problems within our breed and that in order to know which tests, as they are developed, top use we would need more information on so called problems. I wonder if there is any way we could ask vets, nationally, to provide us or the KC with information on health diseases that their clients have. Surely computers can extract this information on any patients that have any of the diseases we would want to know about. There would be no need to given patients details, just how many with each disease are out there at all vets around the country. Could this be done nationally? Maybe the BVA could tell us. Or ask Jeff Sansom?** A lengthy discussion took place over the 4 items listed above but it was felt that these at this point could not be voted on and would need to be revisited at some point in the future.

#### **8. North West LRC :-**

**We have had a good think and would like to offer the suggestions below as examples of our thinking, but would like the various breed clubs to have thought about it before the meeting so that a decision can be taken at this meeting and not deferred until next year. Our committee have given us the go ahead to modify, within reason, the wording as necessary and have authorised us on behalf of the Club to make the necessary changes. At present the first two criteria are very specific, however, the third is not and it is this that we are seeking clarification.**

**~ To have judged at venues with a proportion beyond the mean geographical area**

**There are two issues in this third part, the first is the term 'a proportion' and the second is 'mean geographic area' We propose that the wording be altered to state instead of 'a proportion' the words 'at least x% of which are' - the exact value of x to be discussed , but say for example 25% and**

**We propose that the words 'the mean geographic area' are replaced with 'Y miles of the Judges home address' - again the value of Y can be discussed, but should be sufficient to ensure that the Judge has travelled to see and go over different dogs.**

**An alternative for this could be 'Y miles of the Judges home address, and at least one of which is beyond Z miles' - this alternative makes it a two tier option, and could then allow the %age to altered upwards, if, Y is reduced.**

**For example it might be:**

**To have judged at venues at least 25% of which are beyond 150 miles of the Judges home address, or,**

**To have judged at venues at least 40% of which are beyond 100 miles of the judges home address and at least one of which is beyond 180 miles.**

**This would be easy to check, just put the post codes of the candidates home address (which could alter) and the venue address into say google maps or AA route planner and the result is obtained. It could be added to the forms for easy checking. This proposal if agreed would remove the issue of interpretation and give clarity to all.** A healthy discussion took place re this item, but everybody thought that it was making everything more complicated, and really the word geographical covered this and it was down to the clubs placing the judge forward to ensure that they meet the criteria at this point. A vote took place 1 for and 9 against. Proposal turned down.

**9. The Kent, Surrey and Sussex LRC propose the following:-**

**“ The Kennel Club continue to make Breed Clubs accountable for their actions and with this in mind we believe the Kennel Club should also be accountable. In view of the Kennel Club ignoring the recommendations of the Breed Council when it comes to approval of non breed specialist judges to give CC’s we propose that the Breed Council Secretary writes, in such instances, to the Kennel Club insisting that they give a full explanation as to why judges are passed when they have shown no interest in the breed, have not done a breed seminar, completed the JDP, judged a breed club open show or have indeed judged the breed rarely.”** This proposal was thought to be very good and all the feed back from all the clubs committee’s thought it was a very good idea to right to the Kennel Club and see what the reply. A vote was taken All was in Favour. Proposal Carried.

**10. The Labrador Retriever Club proposes:-**

**That any judge applying to be placed on the A3 list be required to submit a copy of a critique for a Labrador Breed Club they have judged with the other documentation. Reason: the Kennel Club in assessing judges in their judges development programme base their assessment on the detailed critiques written by the candidates not only will this bring the us into line with the KC but written critique often shows far more about the knowledge and understanding of the breed than the actual placings.** It was suggested that these are assessed when a candidate take the Advanced Breed Seminar, But then it was also suggested that they are only seen by a few people that are taking the seminar, So they felt that it would still be advantage for a critique be added with the application for the A3 list. A vote took place 7 For 2 Against 1 Abstention, Proposal Carried.

**11. Three Ridings LRC:-**

**Would like the opinion of the other breed clubs, as the entries are all going down, they feel at this moment it is going to be very difficult for up and coming judges to be able to get enough entries at a qualifying club, we feel that perhaps 90 entries or 70 dogs actually judged for example would help for the time being until**

**entries increase again.** After a discussion and it was also brought to the attention of the meeting that Cotswold and Wyevever had written to all the clubs secretaries to ask them if they could send their last 2 years open show entries and the number of exhibits present on the day so they could do an average of the entries over all. But they explained that they had only received back form 6 clubs. Everybody present said that they knew that entries were dropping at the moment, but it was also pointed out that more people would enter an open show to see if a judge is capable of judging than enter a Championship show. A vote was taken 5 for, 6 against, Proposal turned down.

#### **12. The Midlands Counties LRC**

**require a discussion on the implications to the breed on the Bateson Report with a view to agreeing a recommendation to the Kennel Club.** It was agreed that this does need some attention, but for it to go back to clubs and for them to discuss it more in depth, wasn't enough time for this meeting.

#### **13. The Labrador Club of Scotland propose:-**

- a. **that the Breed Council should propose to the Kennel Club that the Kennel Club should rule that there should be an interval of no less than 12 months between appointments of Judges awarding Working Trial Certificates (so) at Championship Working Trials.** It was agreed in the meeting that this needs to go back to the club to be re worded.
- b. **That the Breed Council expresses their concerns to the Kennel Club in writing that the Fit for Function: Fit for Life campaign should focus on all aspects of canine activities rather than focusing predominantly on show dogs. There should be a recognition that the largest proportion of registrations of Labrador Retrievers comes from non-show or from non – show breeding lines, and consequently the Fit for Function: Fit for Life campaign should embrace improvement to the Breed Standard as it applies to all Labrador Retrievers and not just one particular group of breeding lines.** It was felt that this is more of a statement/comment, but we did take a vote 6 for 2 against and 3 abstentions.
- c. **That the Breed Council should recommend to the Kennel Club that they should promote improvements in the interaction between Show and Field Trial enthusiasts/breeders by e.g promoting more joint activities between the two interest groups.** It was agreed that this would be a good idea but it was felt that it would never happen. A vote took place 3 for , 1 against and 6 abstentions, proposal carried.

#### **14. To present the results of the vote on nominations for joining the Judges lists starting 31<sup>st</sup> May 2010.**

The Chairman, Richard Stafford now urged all delegates to fill in the voting forms on A3 & A1 judges on behalf of their Clubs.

There was a "late addition" for the A3 (Breed specialist) list – Mrs L Oxley  
The votes were counted and the results as follows:-

**Names to be added to the A3 (breed specialist) list**

Mrs Margaret Woods 6 for 5 against 1 abstention (Passed)

Mr Ian Ganney 10 for 1 against 1 abstention (Passed)

Miss Mairi Brown 9 for 3 against (Passed)

Mrs Leigh Lesley 10 for 2 against (Passed)

**Names to be added to the A3 (non breed specialist) list**

Mrs Louise Oxley 6 for 5 against 1 abstention (Passed)

**Names to be added to the A1 List (breed specialist) list**

Mrs B Graham 6 for 3 against 2 abstention (Passed)

Mr E Parr 8 for 4 against (Passed)

Mr D Ericsson 5 for 5 against 2 abstentions (Not Passed)

Mrs L Miles 10 for 2 abstentions (Passed)

Miss K Powell 9 for 3 against (Passed)

**Names to be added to the A1 List (non breed specialist) list**

Mr C Atkinson 6 for 4 against 2 abstentions (Passed)

**15. Roll of Honour list**

Three names were removed from the Roll of Honours list

Mr A Greenhalgh, Mr A Kelly & Mr Price Beddows due to them passing away.

**16. Any other business –**

It was asked who was running breed seminars this year -:

Lab Club of Wales Novice in September

KSS LRC Advanced in August

Mid Counties LRC Novice in December

North West LRC Advanced in September

Midland Counties LRC – represent 3 colours with reference to Border Collie code of ethics

Northumberland & Durham LRC requested constitution of Breed Council and Request for clarification on 75/25 split. Breed Council Secretary to send out both to all clubs.

Breed Council Sec – New rule FT requirement for A3 applications – need clarification on document format. Is to try and get this information from the Kennel Club and let all clubs know.

**17. Date and venue of next meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for 14<sup>th</sup> April 2011 at The Kennel Club. AGM to start at 1.30 prompt.

