

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL MEETING OF THE LABRADOR BREED COUNCIL HELD IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE KENNEL CLUB AFTER THE AGM ON 12 APRIL 2012

1. To approve the minutes of the General Meeting of the Labrador Retriever Council held after the AGM on 14 April 2011.

CWLRC pointed out that in 2008 it was proposed the A3 list be updated twice a year and it had been agreed. At the last meeting it had only been updated in May after the AGM. KSS had queried that this had been changed to twice but at the time nothing was found in the minutes to substantiate this. 4 years had now elapsed and still this was not happening. People who had qualified after April could not accept appointments to judge but had to wait until the following year to be approved. While the Chair accepted the point he did point out that this could be done by the KC. Regarding item 7(d) and item 5 of 2008 do we keep the status quo or enforce 2008 Minute. The Council accepted point of order from the Chair and should therefore enforce 2008 proposal. Dates requested for updating A3 list were end of April and end of October each year. Lists must be in 4 weeks beforehand.

TRLRC raised the point of how much extra work this would be to the Secretary. Mrs Fiona Braddon said all the lists could be updated together.

Pages 1, 2, 3, 4 (with the exception of the above), 5 and 6 were approved. Proposed by MCLRC and seconded by LCW.

2. Matters Arising

LCS asked if an extended breed standard was ever done. Chair confirmed it hadn't but a sub-committee is looking at it. Mrs Marion Hopkinson, Mrs Erica Jayes, Mrs Penny Carpanini and possibly Richard Edwards will try to get together to work on it.

LRCW asked if there was space on the website to put a diary of judges Championship show judging appointments to save Championship Show Secretaries and lot of phoning around. At the moment only Michael Hewitt had an updated list for the year ahead.

3. Breeds Council Liaison Council Report

Mrs. Shelagh Walton, our Breed Liaison Council Representative, was invited into the meeting to report. A copy of her report was handed around, reported and discussed.

1. Proposal for introduction of CH class at breed club at open shows. Recommended to be put forward to Executive sub-committee. Doubtful to go through.
2. New seminar for new judges seeking inclusion on C list is proposed aimed at very new judges. This would be managed by the clubs and societies and breed clubs who would be responsible for recording attendance and delivered by KC accredited trainers. It was proposed the Kennel Club should set syllabus. The outcome of the proposal should be known in May.
3. Next Council meeting is on May 23rd and Mrs Walton noted the following items for BC attention:
 4.
 - a. Non-standard colour (it was agreed by the Breed Council to support this proposal to help with 'silver labradors'.
 - b. Working Gundog Certificate. It was agreed that Mrs Walton would support the proposal as set out provided that the amendment "and awarded in all sections of the assessment" be inserted after the words "obtained on game" and before the words "should enable the 'SH' to be removed" be agreed.

Do we want to support non-standard colours. There followed some discussion around registration and whether the liaison committee should support. All clubs agreed unenthusiastically.

Much discussion ensued regarding what seemed to be inequality in the field trial tests for working gundogs to achieve their CH certificates and those tests for SH CH gundogs to gain their SH certificates. Mrs Joy Venture Rose explained what was different in the field trial tests and this appeared to show that SH CH gundogs had to pass more encompassing tests. There was also some question as to the quality of the assessors. NDLC suggested that all elements of the tests should be completed by all gundogs to obtain their certificates and therefore we should support an amendment. MCLRC agreed. Mrs Shelagh Walton agreed to put this forward.

TRLRC queried which committees the Liaison Council Report goes to. Mrs Walton said it goes to various committees and tends to get lost. MCLRC thought perhaps we should have a committee with more teeth.

The Chairman thanked Mrs Walton for the Report.

Breed Council Health Sub-committee Report:

The EIC questionnaire had been circulated to all breed clubs and most of the Clubs went to their membership but there was very little feedback. Only 46 returns. No individual replies were received, just Clubs. There was some confusion as to where all the returns were and it

was agreed all the information should be collated and then emailed to everyone on the Council at a later date. EALC confirmed responses had been very sparse from its members despite all the info having been circulated.

As to DNA identification MCLRC asked if we wanted the KC to automatically add to registration documents or only at the request of the owner. EIC was not highly regarded at present. KSS suggested that each breed club committee must come up with a decision which should be fed back to the Secretary, Mrs Sussie Wiles. The results should then be passed to Mr. Gary Johnson of the KC.

Chairman suggested a deadline of a month, say 14 May 2012 as a cut off time.

Silver Labradors – Mrs Marion Hopkinson of MCLRC reported this was now “dead in the water” as DNA testing had proved it was a Labrador.

MCLRC reported that Dr Clements Dogs Trust has been given another 2 years funding to keep going but the Health Committee realises it is only going to get 4000 on its data base. The mate select was not well liked.

It was agreed and accepted that this team was committed to represent the health of this big breed and that we would like to see, and will campaign for puppies not to be registered from dogs with no health tests at all. There must be some discrimination. We must press hard, after all we are the biggest breed surely we should have some “clout” with the KC. KSS thought we decided we would write to the Chairman of the KC for penalties on dogs not hip scored and where the dog or bitch has been proven to be a carrier of PRA. They should be told to only mate to a clear tested animal if they want the progeny registered.

Breed Council should have a clearer area focusing on health on the website.

Discussion had on puppy plan from KC. It was felt we must input into pilot – it is thought pretty lethal. We do have concerns and it needs discussing with experienced breeders. Marcel tumour test, topic dermatitis and nasal hyperkeratosis are all worth studying and we need information on our Breed Council health part of the site. Should be grateful for anything on these conditions.

We have been alerted about the RSPCA BVA example puppy sales contract. (We have been using KC example). There is mention of inbreeding co-efficiency in the contract. There could be big problems ahead for us as breeders and any discussions should be held in conjunction with the KC and we should do as much as we can without meeting to find out where we have got to. We need help to understand ourselves re genetics. TRLRC said we could frighten the general public with too much information.

Chair asked if the Clubs have any information please get it out to the Secretary.

MCLRC asked if there could be a link directly to the Minutes via the website to enable people to link to the Minutes without trawling through. NDLRC – draft Minutes could be put on to ask for comments before they are passed. It was agreed to send a copy to Mrs Fiona Braddon YLC for her to place on the web site.

Proposals from Breed Clubs

Items 5 of Minutes and 6 on Agenda

LRCW and KSS agreed to link their proposals 5 and 6 regarding a change in the number of dogs prospective A3 judges would need to have hands on at breed shows. Both clubs gave their reason as falling number of entries.

The question went out to the Committee “how many clubs get 75 dogs present” the majority agreed only sometimes. Some discussion ensued around the suggestion that the criteria should amended to as LRCW suggested to 120 over two shows or as proposed by KSS of 150 over two shows”. MCLRC felt that that could mean a very uneven distribution with one of the shows falling well below the required level of 75 dogs attending, say 80 and 40. 40 dogs at a show simply is not enough for a prospective CH judge to claim as qualifying hands on experience. LCNI pointed out that they have no championship judges because they just do not get enough attending to qualify any Ireland based judges. KSS asked if the Breed Council Secretary could request all the breed clubs to collate actual physical numbers for 2 years at open shows we could then see if 75 was a reasonable number or not. NWLRC thought clubs might have an issue releasing this information. KSS said if clubs do not want to give information we could get the information from fosse date etc. anyway. NDLRC asked that the Secretary collate this information from the clubs as soon as possible and that the outcome is circulated to all clubs and decisions can be made on the future experience need for Championship judges. KSS suggested this information should just be used as an indication and weather conditions and anything extraordinary affecting attendance could be taken into account.

It was agreed for a vote on the split proposal.

Voting for item 5 of the Minutes of the General Meeting:

For	3
Against	8

Abstained 1
NOT CARRIED

Voting for item 6 of the General Meeting including the amendment of “attend open field trial and working test”.

For 8
Against 3
Abstained 2
CARRIED

Item 7

MIDLAND COUNTIES LRC proposed that Secretaries need to inform other secretaries regarding planned seminars. EALRC said their seminar was put on their website but perhaps this needs to be on the Breed Council site. NDLRC felt there was a danger in any one being able to put things on. Their seminar was fully subscribed with local members. MCLRC asked please could other clubs run seminars not just the usual ones. Chair suggested secretaries of each club to look at calendar before organising seminars and plan ahead. Agreed.

Item 8

(a) It was generally felt that the Council need to write to KC about what are seen as unreasonable and inconsistent demands on breeders by assessors regarding the upkeep and appearance of their premises. YLC reported that the assessors just answer the necessary questions on the KC forms and the KC act on those replies accordingly. It is not the assessors who set the actions. MCLRC accepted this point but still it did appear some assessors were over enthusiastic and made unreasonable demands.

Agreed KC need to give criteria.

(b) MCLRC said they get good entries and judges often put their shows on their CVs. They do internal assessments and think other clubs should do a similar assessment. The Chairman asked if all the clubs had enough people of championship standard to assess judges? LCNI confirm they did not have anyone who could do this. Everyone seemed to agree this was a good idea but some did not have enough qualifying people to assess.

MCLRC asked how about an appraisal rather than assessment. They should be inhouse but suggested if anyone were asked they could be made available. NDLRC thought it might be useful when judges were put forward to give tickets we look at our assessment when they

judged each club. It would be a useful reminder of who the judge was. CWLRC thought unless assessors gave tickets they would have no credibility. The Chairman thought that finding assessors who will travel to open shows is impossible. Three Ridings LRC suggested that club assessments should just be for information and kept inhouse. Midland Counties LRC said that had a template if needed. North West LRC asked if they gave feedback to the judge. Midland Counties said they did not.

Item 9. – Agreed

Item 10.

Northumberland & Durham LRC said that not all applicants fulfilled the criteria. CVs should be sent back to the clubs for them to sort out. The Chairman said all CVs must be checked by the clubs that they fulfil the criteria **before** they are sent through to the Breed Council. There is a check list on the web site. Karl Gawthorpe of Cotswold & Wyvern LRC said he was happy for CVs to be given to him and he will check before they go to Breed Council, that would be they will be twice checked before being submitted to the Council.

The completed voting papers were then collected. The results were as follows:

A3 Breed Specialist List:

Mrs L Danntinnes – Accepted
Miss N Farquharson – Accepted

A3 Non Breed Specialist:

Mr R Bott – Accepted
Mr E Webster - Not Accepted
Mrs W Minshull – Not Accepted

A1 Breed Specialist:

Ms T Dreyer – Accepted
Mr P Lammens – Accepted
Miss Tracey James – Accepted
Mrs M Gardner – Accepted
Mrs M McCulloch – Accepted

A1 Non Breed Specialist:

Mr Menaker – Accepted
Mr D Shield - Accepted

Item 12

Sussie Wiles of Yellow Labrador Club asked that Tony Pascoe be added and it was agreed.

Item 13

1. KSS proposed that the Breed Council discuss the Labrador coat and what might be described as standard. LRCW explained that foreign judges often penalised dogs for slight waving of the coat. There was a lot of discussion around what could perhaps be forgiven or whether judges must stick to the breed standard to the letter. The Council Secretary suggested that an amendment of "slight wave is acceptable". The KC set the standard but we could put forward our suggestions to the KC. We cannot alter the breed standard.

It was agreed to put forward "slight wave is permitted" to be included in the new extended breed standard which should be done this year.

2. LRCW - Does the Breed Council consider we should be taking action on the welfare issues of dog breeding and Sheila Crispin. Midland Counties LRC and LCNI had both written. Northumberland & Durham LRC said it was alleged that two bitches had been sent out in whelp to Pakistan and the puppies had been given KC registrations although they were not whelped in the UK. Some of the puppies had died of parvo and the price was upped because they were British registered. The KC had apparently contacted the breeder and were satisfied with his reply. Gary Johnson confirmed the KC are still dealing with it. It was agreed that Council should wait for the KC response.

3. Three Ridings LRC asked if it is this year there election of new representatives for the KC Breed Liaison Council. It was confirmed this is the case and the Chair asked all breed clubs for their suggestion to be received by 12th May 2012. Mrs Shelagh Walton (our current representative) is happy to carry on should we so wish her to.

4. Discover Dogs – John Jackson of Three Ridings LRC said that they need someone else to take over from next year. Some other club needs to finance it and if someone else takes it over the question of finance needs to be resolved. Until now John has been personally doing the printing. KSS said Earls Court do give £48 per day and Crufts pay £50 (half of which is food voucher). It doesn't cover costs. The general opinion was that the breed clubs should contribute as it is considered very important. There was a suggestion that this be financed through the Breed Council with increased subs and those clubs doing it can claim.

Proposed and agreed that each club increased subs to Breed Council. As to the amount of the increase, John Jackson suggested £50 per club into the fund and then claims for costs,

with receipts, can be submitted. The Chairman suggested that this gets taken back to clubs for discussion and for them to get back to LBC secretary by the end of May.

There was a vote of thanks to Eileen and John.

5. Sussie Wiles gave notice that next year she will not stand as Secretary/Treasurer.

6. The date of the next meeting will be 11 April 2013.