

Bulldog Breed Standard October 2009

AT THE BULLDOG BREED COUNCIL MEETING HELD THIS MORNING 29.09.09 ATTENDED BY 16 OF THE MEMBER CLUBS TO DISCUSS THE INTENDED PUBLICATION ON OCTOBER 1.2009 BY THE KENNEL CLUB OF ITS REVISED BULLDOG BREED STANDARD THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT WAS RELEASED FOR PUBLICATION IN THE DOG PRESS;

"THE BREED COUNCIL IS DISAPPOINTED WITH THE RESULT OF THE NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE KENNEL CLUB REGARDING THE STANDARD. WE ARE PARTICULARLY DISAPPOINTED BY THE STATEMENT EMANATING FROM THE KENNEL CLUB THAT THE HEALTH OF THE BREED HAS DETERIORATED WHEN IN FACT THE OPPOSITE IS CLEARLY THE CASE AS EVIDENCED BY THE SUCCESS OF THE BREED IN GROUP AND BEST IN SHOW COMPETITION AND THE HUGE RISE IN POPULARITY OF THE NATIONAL BREED.

CONTRARY TO THE RUMOURS, THE BREED COUNCIL WILL CONTINUE TO WORK WITH THE KENNEL CLUB TO PROMOTE THE HEALTH OF THE BULLDOG"

PRESS RELEASE March 2009

Four delegates from the Breed Council, Vicky Collins-Nattrass, Peter Janes MRCVS, Norman Davis and Chris Thomas, met with representatives of the Kennel Club on Tuesday 17th March to discuss the proposed changes to the Bulldog breed standard.

The sub-committee we met consisted of Dr. Ruth Barbour (chair), Prof. Crispin, Dr. Jeff. Sampson, Mr. Frank Cain, Mr. Bill Lambert and Mrs. Meg Purnell-Carpenter.

Before the meeting convened the chairman explained that no final decision would be made at this meeting regarding changes to the standard but this meeting was to give us an opportunity to put forward our case for reinstating wording to the standard that we felt to be fundamental.

The chairman also stated that as a result of our meeting their sub-committee would be better placed to explain our point of view to 'the powers that be'. I believe we were all a little surprised by this, as we had erroneously believed that the final decision regarding the standard would be made by the sub-committee we were meeting. We had hoped to have some indication, by the end of the meeting, what amendments to the interim standard would be acceptable, but this was not to be the case.

We proceeded with the meeting as planned and went through the standard item by item, discussing each of the changes made by the KC with a detailed explanation as to why we felt these unnecessary and how they would have no impact on the health of the bulldog.

The panel listened to our reasoning for the reinstatement of wording we felt imperative to the description of the bulldog and during the 2 ½ hour meeting the sub-committee asked questions on all aspects of the breed, especially health.

They wanted to know in depth how many bulldogs had gone through the health scheme and, of course, Vicky had all of these facts and figures at her fingertips, (I believe it is currently around 500). The chairman congratulated the Breed Council on its work in this area and this was seconded by the other panel members. Peter dispelled some of the myths surrounding the breed and its supposed health problems and Vicky was able to give the results of our own health survey which supported Peter's comments, which helped enormously.

Norman and I spoke on behalf of the alterations to the standard and we explained in detail why we felt it imperative that essential wording that has been removed from the standard be reinstated.

At the end of the meeting Dr Barbour thanked us for attending and also for the packs we had supplied for each member of the sub-committee containing line drawings, copies of the standard before and after change, etc. which we hope assisted in trying to explain why bulldoggers are so passionate when it comes to our breed standard.

Chris Thomas.

Press Officer Bulldog Breed Council. [now retired]

OCTOBER 1st 2009 The Kennel Club have now published their new standard for the bulldog which can be viewed on their website.

Bulldoggers worldwide have asked what were the proposals put forward to the Kennel Club by the delegates compared to what the Kennel Club have now decided to confirm and we give below an analysis of how much the sub committee tried to meet the Kennel Clubs proposals while protecting the fundamental characteristics of the breed.

The comments in red show what the breed council delegates requested and the result

Kennel Club Review of Breed Standard – Bulldog

In January 2009 the General Committee approved interim changes to the Breed Standard for your breed. This was part of the ongoing initiative to ensure that the Kennel Club was not encouraging exaggerations in breeds and to promote health and welfare as a prime objective for dog breeders and enthusiasts. Additionally, a new 'Introductory' paragraph was included on every Breed Standard, and all references within standards to the removal of dewclaws were deleted. These two elements of the Breed Standard review have not been subject to further consideration and will now be finalised.

During the six month consultation period the feedback from breed clubs has been carefully considered. In the light of this, the interim changes to the Bulldog Breed Standard have been amended and finalised as follows:

General Appearance Smooth-coated, fairly thick set, rather low in stature, broad, powerful and compact. Head, fairly large in proportion to size but no point so much in excess of others as to destroy the general symmetry, or make the dog appear deformed, or interfere with its powers of motion. Face relatively (we asked for the removal of 'relatively'. (rejected) short, muzzle broad,

blunt and inclined upwards (interim standard said 'slightly' upwards. They have removed slightly as requested and added- although not excessively so. Dogs showing respiratory distress highly undesirable. Body fairly short, well knit, limbs stout, well muscled and in hard condition with no tendency towards obesity. Hindquarters high and strong. Bitches not so grand or well developed as dogs.

Head and Skull Skull relatively large in circumference. Viewed from front appears high from corner of lower jaw to apex of skull; also broad and square. Cheeks well rounded and extended sideways beyond eyes. Viewed from side, head appears very high and moderately short from back to point of nose. Forehead flat with skin on and about head slightly loose and finely wrinkled -took out 'may be' slightly wrinkled, as requested, added - without excess, neither prominent nor overhanging face. Here we asked for the reinstatement of 'Projections of frontal bones prominent, broad, square and high, deep, wide indentation between eyes.' (rejected). From defined stop, a furrow (asked to include 'distinct' furrow (rejected) extending to middle of skull being traceable to apex. Face from front of cheek bone to nose, relatively short, skin may be slightly wrinkled. Muzzle short, broad, turned upwards and deep from corner of eye to corner of mouth. Nose and nostrils large, broad and black, under no circumstances liver colour, red or brown; (asked to reinstate 'top set back towards eyes' (rejected) Distance from inner corner of eye (or from centre of stop between eyes) to extreme tip of nose should not be less than distance from tip of the nose to edge of the underlip. Although this measurement had been removed from the interim standard we asked for it to be reinstated. The KC have altered the wording so as instead of the length given being the maximum length of the muzzle it is now the minimum with no length of muzzle limit. Nostrils large, wide and open, with well defined vertical straight line between. Flews (chops) thick, broad, and deep, covering lower jaws at sides asked to reinstate 'not in front' (rejected), but joining underlip in front (asked to reinstate 'and quite covering teeth (rejected) Replaced with. 'Teeth not visible'. Jaws broad, strong and square, lower jaw slightly (asked for 'slightly' to be removed (rejected) projecting in front of upper, with moderate turn up (asked to reinstate 'and turning up' as 'moderate' not appropriate (rejected). Over nose wrinkle (asked to change wrinkle to roll (rejected), if present, whole or broken, must never adversely affect or obscure eyes or nose. Pinched nostrils and heavy over nose roll are unacceptable and should be heavily penalised. Viewed from front, the various properties of the face must be equally balanced on either side of an imaginary line down centre.

Eyes Seen from front, situated low down in skull, well away from ears. Eyes and stop in same straight line, at right angles to furrow. Wide apart, but outer corners within the outline of cheeks. Round, of moderate size, neither sunken nor prominent, in colour very dark – almost black – showing no white when looking directly forward. Free from obvious eye problems.

Neck Moderate in length, thick, deep and strong. Well arched at back, with some (asked to remove 'some' rejected) loose skin about throat, forming slight (asked to remove 'slight' rejected) dewlap on each side. Asked to reinstate 'from lower jaw to chest' (rejected)

Forequarters Shoulders broad, sloping and deep, very powerful and muscular giving appearance of being 'tacked on' body. Brisket, (asked to reinstate 'capacious' rejected) round and deep. Well let down between forelegs. Ribs not flat-sided but well rounded. Forelegs very stout and strong, well developed, set wide apart, thick, muscular and straight, bones of legs large and straight, not bandy nor curved and short in proportion to hindlegs, but not so short as to make back appear long, or detract from dog's activity. Elbows low and standing well away from ribs. Pasterns short, straight and strong.

Body Chest wide, prominent and deep. Back short, strong, broad at shoulders (asked to reinstate 'comparatively narrower at loins (rejected). Slight fall to back close behind shoulders (lowest part) whence spine should rise to loins (top higher than top of shoulder), curving again more suddenly to tail, forming slight arch Asked to reinstate 'termed roach back' – a distinctive characteristic of the breed (rejected). Body well ribbed up behind with belly tucked up and not pendulous.

Hindquarters Legs large and muscular, slightly longer in proportion than forelegs. Hocks slightly bent, well let down; legs long and muscular from loins to hock. Stifles turned very slightly outwards away from body. **Asked in include 'hocks thereby made to approach each other and hind feet to turn very slightly outwards' (rejected)**

Gait/Movement Requested 'Controlled gait' This term was suggested as an alternative to 'Peculiarly heavy and constrained' by a member of the committee we met at the KC (it was still rejected) Appearing to walk with short, quick steps on tips of toes, hind feet not lifted high, appearing to skim ground, running with one or other shoulder rather advanced. Soundness of movement of the utmost importance.

We asked for 'Absent, inverted or extremely tight tails to be heavily penalised' to be added to the faults section at the end of the standard. Although applauded by the KC in several articles it was rejected.

The amendments to the standard will be effective from 1 October 2009 when they will be published in the October 2009 *Kennel Gazette* and on the Kennel Club website.

The modified Standard which the Breed Council delegates stated would meet the Breed Council's approval reads as follows:

General Appearance

Smooth-coated, fairly thick set, rather low in stature, broad, powerful and compact. Head, fairly large in proportion to size but no point so much in excess of others as to destroy the general symmetry, or make the dog appear deformed, or interfere with its powers of motion. Face short, muzzle broad, blunt and inclined upwards. Dogs showing respiratory distress highly undesirable. Body fairly short, well knit, limbs stout, well muscled and in hard condition with no tendency towards obesity. Hindquarters high and strong. Bitches not so grand or well developed as dogs.

Characteristics

Conveys impression of determination, strength and activity.

Temperament

Alert, bold, loyal, dependable, courageous, fierce in appearance, but possessed of affectionate nature.

Head and Skull

Skull relatively large in circumference. Viewed from front appears high from corner of lower jaw to apex of skull; also broad and square. Cheeks well rounded and extended sideways beyond eyes. Viewed from side, head appears very high and moderately short from back to point of nose. Forehead flat with skin on and about head slightly loose and finely wrinkled, neither prominent nor overhanging face. Projections of frontal bones prominent, broad, square and high, deep, wide indentation between. From defined stop, a distinct furrow extending to middle of skull being traceable to apex. Face from front of cheek bone to nose, relatively short, skin may be slightly wrinkled. Muzzle short, broad, turned upwards and deep from corner of eye to corner of mouth. Nose and nostrils large, broad and black, under no circumstances liver colour, red or brown. Top set back towards eyes. Distance from inner corner of eye (or from centre of stop between eyes) to extreme tip of nose not exceeding length from tip of the nose to edge of the underlip. Nostrils large wide and open, with well defined vertical straight line between. Flews (chops) thick, broad

and deep, covering lower jaws at sides not in front. Joining underlip in front and quite covering teeth. Jaws broad, strong and square, lower jaw projecting in front of upper and turning up. Over nose roll, if present, whole or broken, must never adversely affect or obscure eyes or nose. Viewed from front, the various properties of the face must be equally balanced on either side of an imaginary line down centre.

Eyes

Seen from front, situated low down in skull, well away from ears. Eyes and stop in same straight line, at right angles to furrow. Wide apart, but outer corners within the outline of cheeks. Round, of moderate size, neither sunken nor prominent, in colour very dark – almost black – showing no white when looking directly forward. Free from obvious eye problems.

Ears

Set high – i.e. front edge of each ear (as viewed from front) joins outline of skull at top corner of such outline, so as to place them as wide apart, as high and as far from eyes as possible. Small and thin. 'Rose ear' correct, i.e. folding inwards back, upper or front inner edge curving outwards and backwards, showing part of inside of burr.

Mouth

Jaws broad and square with six small front teeth between canines in an even row. Canines wide apart. Teeth large and strong, not seen when mouth closed. When viewed from front under jaw directly under upper jaw and parallel.

Neck

Moderate in length, thick, deep and strong. Well arched at back, with loose, thick and wrinkled skin about throat, forming dewlap on each side, from lower jaw to chest.

Forequarters

Shoulders broad, sloping and deep, very powerful and muscular giving appearance of being 'tacked on' body. Brisket capacious, round and deep. Well let down between forelegs. Ribs not flat-sided, but well rounded. Forelegs very stout and strong, well developed, set wide apart, thick, muscular and straight, bones of legs large and straight, not bandy nor curved and short in proportion to hindlegs, but not so short as to make back appear long, or detract from dog's activity. Elbows low and standing well away from ribs. Pasterns short, straight and strong.

Body

Chest wide, prominent and deep. Back short, strong, broad at shoulders comparatively narrower at loins. Slight fall to back close behind shoulders (lowest part) whence spine should rise to loins (top higher than top of shoulder), curving again more suddenly to tail, forming slight arch (termed a roach back) – a distinctive characteristic of breed. Body well ribbed up behind with belly tucked up and not pendulous.

Hindquarters

Legs large and muscular, slightly longer in proportion than forelegs. Hocks slightly bent, well let

down; legs long and muscular from loins to hock. Stifles turned very slightly outwards away from body. Hocks thereby made to approach each other and hind feet to turn outwards.

Feet

Fore, straight and turning very slightly outward; of medium size and moderately round. Hind, round and compact. Toes compact and thick, well split up, making knuckles prominent and high.

Tail

Set on low, jutting out rather straight and then turning downwards. Round, smooth and devoid of fringe or coarse hair. Moderate in length – rather short than long – thick at root, tapering quickly to a fine point. Downward carriage (not having a decided upward curve at end) and never carried above back

Gait/Movement

Controlled Gait Appearing to walk with short, quick steps on tips of toes, hind feet not lifted high, appearing to skim ground, running with one or other shoulder rather advanced. Soundness of movement of the utmost importance.

Coat

Fine texture, short, close and smooth (hard only from shortness and closeness, not wiry).

Colour

Whole or smut, (i.e. whole colour with black mask or muzzle). Only whole colours (which should be brilliant and pure of their sort) viz., brindles, reds with their various shades, fawns, fallows etc., white and pied (i.e. combination of white with any of the foregoing colours). Dudley , black and black with tan highly undesirable.

Size

Dogs: 25 kgs (55 lbs); bitches: 23 kgs (50 lbs).

Faults

Any departure from the foregoing points should be considered a fault and the seriousness with which the fault should be regarded should be in exact proportion to its degree and its effect upon the health and welfare of the dog. . To be heavily penalised :Pinched nostrils and heavy over nose roll ; Absent, inverted or extremely tight tails.

Note

Male animals should have two apparently normal testicles fully descended into the scrotum.

NOTE :This is not the Bulldog Breed Standard that has been published as the Standard on the Kennel Clubs Website

