

06 SEPT AC  
MINJ

**'Raw Meaty Bones'**

48. The Committee noted the College continued to receive enquiries concerning this issue from a limited number of individuals and while it was the Committee's view that there was no scientific argument to support their concerns, nevertheless it agreed that it might be helpful to include a short article in RCVS News which made the point that the profession should exercise some care when recommending and selling pet food. Equally, the Committee considered that such an article might send the wrong signal by suggesting that the concerns expressed were somehow valid and therefore it was left to the RCVS Officers whether such an article should be included in the next issue of RCVS News.

**Gordon Hockey**

---

**From:** Gordon Hockey  
**Sent:** 19 September 2006 16:47  
**To:** 'richard halliwell'  
**Cc:** Sue Whall; Edward Attwood  
**Subject:** RE: diet article.doc

Richard

You got the wrong file – it looks as if I deleted the correct draft and left this one to be sent to you. Graeme is trying to find my file on the back up tapes.

I agree with your views and we'll send you the right file shortly if we can find it – if not I will write it again.

Essentially we were giving a potted history of the matter and closing it down and just reminding vets that the sale/supply of pet foods may be on a purely retail basis or may, if advice is given, be part of his or her professional practice.

Gordon

Gordon Hockey  
 Head of Professional Conduct/Assistant Registrar  
 Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

Direct Line 020 7202 0718

---

**From:** richard halliwell [mailto:richard\_halliwell@btinternet.com]  
**sent:** 18 September 2006 19:54  
**To:** Edward Attwood  
**c:** Gordon Hockey; Sue Whall  
**subject:** Re: diet article.doc

Dear Ed et al,

I have to say that this is the worst, and most condescending article to have ever come out from the College in my memory!!! How did it come about???? Please don't do it.

If we have decided that we need to do something on the issue of diets, then this is surely not the way to do it. I would be happy to suggest something on these lines if you wish.

Vets think about it.....You are telling veterinary surgeons to remind clients that the amount of food that their pets eat needs to be taken into consideration!!! You are telling them to distinguish between normal foods and foods that are recommended for particular clinical conditions....as if they were not aware of this.

This will be major ammunition to those who view the College as a "nanny" institution.

Richard

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Edward Attwood  
**To:** richard halliwell  
**Sent:** Monday, September 18, 2006 4:53 PM  
**Subject:** FW: diet article.doc

Dear Richard,

I couldn't leave the pet food issue that easily!

I was wondering if you could cast an eye over the attached. We're planning to publish in RCVS News and it will go to AC next week, if approved.

Many thanks,

E

---

**From:** Edward Attwood

**To:** Gordon Hockey; Sue Whall

**Subject:** diet article.doc

We've made a small amendment to this one - should we run it past REWH while he is here...

E

**Gordon Hockey**

---

**From:** Gordon Hockey  
**Sent:** 31 October 2006 18:47  
**To:** Jane Hern  
**Subject:** RE: RCVS News  
**Attachments:** Pet Nutrition.doc

Jane

A starter – it doesn't feel quite right yet. Can you help? I will then ask Richard for his views.

Thanks

G

Gordon Hockey  
Head of Professional Conduct/Assistant Registrar  
Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

Direct Line 020 7202 0718

---

**From:** Jane Hern  
**ent:** 27 October 2006 09:57  
**To:** Gordon Hockey  
**subject:** RE: RCVS News

Could you do something which builds on the item reported in VT this week ?  
And perhaps talk to Freda about how the subject appears on our day 1 competencies and then lead into the more general stuff about how all vets need to be aware of their responsibilities in relation to nutrition – that their clients will assume that food they recommend or even just sell is endorsed in some way.....

jch

---

**From:** Gordon Hockey  
**ent:** 26 October 2006 22:49  
**To:** Ian Holloway  
**c:** Gordon Hockey; Jane Hern  
**subject:** RCVS News

Ian

I think this is the last article – not yet checked with the Home Office so potentially subject to some change.

Jane there was thought that we should do an article on the pet food issue, but there were mixed feelings on Advisory and Ian and I have second thoughts now. It was for decision by Officers. Would you like me to do a draft? I did have one but accidentally deleted it from my system and in such a way that no copy was retained on the back up tapes – much to my frustration!

Thanks

Gordon

**Gordon Hockey**

---

**From:** Lizzie Lockett  
**Sent:** 01 November 2006 16:10  
**To:** Gordon Hockey; Jane Hern  
**Cc:** Ian Holloway  
**Subject:** RE: Pet Nutrition.doc

Meanwhile I have had a fiddle with the paragraph order - how about this:

Over the last few years the RCVS has received considerable correspondence on pet nutrition. This interest perhaps mirrors a growing preoccupation with healthy eating at large, whether in the form of improved school dinners or initiatives to reduce trans-fats, salt and other additives in human diets.

During discussions with MPs and other individuals, questions have been raised about veterinary surgeons' responsibilities for pet nutrition. The Pet Food Manufacturers Association has recently gone public with a new website to provide better information, and individual pet food companies have called for more focus on pet nutrition at undergraduate level.

Meanwhile, an action group called Raw Meaty Bones has proclaimed its mission: *".. to draw attention to the harm that feeding processed pet food causes our pet dogs and cats, and the continuing refusal by the veterinary authorities to acknowledge this."*

It is therefore worth reminding members that while the responsibility for pet food sold out of practice premises may be limited to that of a retailer, if specific advice is given on pet nutrition, or particular products recommended, then this is part of professional practice. Veterinary surgeons should be aware that many clients buying pet food from them in either context will assume it carries some veterinary endorsement.

---

**From:** Gordon Hockey  
**Sent:** 01 November 2006 16:01  
**To:** Jane Hern; Lizzie Lockett  
**Cc:** Ian Holloway  
**Subject:** FW: Pet Nutrition.doc

Jane

It is better – I have suggested removal of one paragraph. (This is the first document.)

Also attached for Lizzie is my original draft. (This is the second document.)

Gordon

Gordon Hockey  
 Head of Professional Conduct/Assistant Registrar  
 Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

Direct Line 020 7202 0718

---

**From:** Jane Hern  
**Sent:** 01 November 2006 15:46  
**To:** Gordon Hockey; Lizzie Lockett  
**Subject:** Pet Nutrition.doc

G - not sure this is better than your offering !

perhaps Lizzie can help ??

jch

## Gordon Hockey

---

**From:** Gordon Hockey  
**Sent:** 01 November 2006 16:02  
**To:** Jane Hern; Lizzie Lockett  
**Cc:** Ian Holloway  
**Subject:** RE: Pet Nutrition.doc

I guess you'll work out which is which.

G

Gordon Hockey  
Head of Professional Conduct/Assistant Registrar  
Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

irect Line 020 7202 0718

---

**From:** Gordon Hockey  
**ent:** 01 November 2006 16:01  
**To:** Jane Hern; Lizzie Lockett  
**c:** Ian Holloway  
**subject:** FW: Pet Nutrition.doc

Jane

It is better – I have suggested removal of one paragraph. (This is the first document.)

Also attached for Lizzie is my original draft. (This is the second document.)

Gordon

Gordon Hockey  
Head of Professional Conduct/Assistant Registrar  
Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

Direct Line 020 7202 0718

---

**From:** Jane Hern  
**ent:** 01 November 2006 15:46  
**To:** Gordon Hockey; Lizzie Lockett  
**subject:** Pet Nutrition.doc

G - not sure this is better than your offering !

erhaps Lizzie can help ??

jch

**Gordon Hockey**

---

**From:** Ian Holloway  
**Sent:** 02 November 2006 15:42  
**To:** Lizzie Lockett; Jane Hern; Gordon Hockey  
**Cc:** Sue Whall  
**Subject:** RE: Pet Nutrition

ur position statement also says the following:

e would continue to encourage Mr Tom Lonsdale to seek scientific review of his first book *Raw Meaty ones* and his more recent book *Work Wonders*. Similarly, as Mr Lonsdale's assertions and those of his support group UK Raw Meaty Bones (UKRMB) remain largely anecdotal as to the superiority of natural food, we would, again, encourage them to provide sound statistical and scientific evidence to support their claims.

I think the additional proposed sentence for the article says virtually the same as above, albeit more concisely, and so doesn't say anything new; it was also intended to be a watered-down version of the statement that Richard wanted to insert (see below), which was particularly strong.

---

**From:** Lizzie Lockett  
**ent:** 02 November 2006 15:31  
**To:** Jane Hern; Gordon Hockey  
**c:** Ian Holloway; Sue Whall  
**subject:** RE: Pet Nutrition

I agree it looks overly negative when in our position statements on the RMB issue and other docs we say it is up to the vet to decide what nutrition to suggestion. Also something like this might induce the anti-vooodoo vet brigade to ask us to come out on our view on homoeopathy in terms of evidence, for example.

I would be much happier to leave the article as it is, or as a compromise include Jane's modification.

---

**From:** Jane Hern  
**ent:** 02 November 2006 15:25  
**To:** Gordon Hockey; Lizzie Lockett  
**c:** Ian Holloway; Sue Whall  
**subject:** RE: Pet Nutrition

o my mind this nails our colours to the mast and I'd rather not do that.

e'll end up showing what we put in RCVS News to RMB and they will accuse us of taking a line when we have spent considerable ink telling them that we are not in the business of expressing a view one way or the other.....

did try and play with this sentence in G's draft – see below

jch

---

**From:** Gordon Hockey  
**ent:** 02 November 2006 15:07  
**To:** Lizzie Lockett; Jane Hern  
**c:** Ian Holloway; Sue Whall  
**subject:** FW: Pet Nutrition

izzie and Jane

Richard has suggested as per his e-mail below. Ian and I think that something along the lines of what Richard has said would be good but have drafted something with the same meaning, but slightly gentler and with the recognition of future discussion in the scientific community.

Any thoughts for Ian to finalise? Advisory Committee left it to officers whether to publish or not.



uring extensive correspondence, and discussions at a number of meetings, we have indicated that there is o current evidence to support the allegation that processed pet food causes harm to cats and dogs. We have uggested that other views should be submitted for peer reviewed publication in the usual way ~~with scientific~~ ~~reliability should be discussed within the scientific community.~~

evertheless, It is worth reminding members .....

Thanks

Gordon

Gordon Hockey  
Head of Professional Conduct/Assistant Registrar  
Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

Direct Line 020 7202 0718

---

**From:** RICHARD HALLIWELL [mailto:richard\_halliwell@btopenworld.com]  
**ent:** 02 November 2006 13:25  
**To:** Gordon Hockey; richard halliwell  
**c:** Ian Holloway; Sue Whall  
**subject:** Re: Pet Nutrition

Dear Gordon,

Greetings from Grenada!

Thank you for forwarding this document, which is obviously a huge improvement on the last one. Advisory, according to the minute, were worried that we could be attaching an element of validity to their concerns in such a odocument, and I fear that the draft may just give somewhat that impression. I wonder whether after the bit about RMB, and at the start of the last paragraph, one could add something like: "Following detailed perusal of the extensive correspondance, and discussions at a number of meetings, the College has concluded that the concerns expressed are without substance (or maybe "are without validity"). Nonetheless....."

Just a thought...

Best regards,  
Richard

**Gordon Hockey** <g.hockey@rcvs.org.uk> wrote:

Richard

I have at last got round to this and attached is a version with huge help from Jane and Lizzie.

This I think is better. Are you happy for this to be published?

Also attached is a copy of the draft Advisory Committee minute on this and the committee was worried that anything said might give the wrong impression on this.

" 'Raw Meaty Bones' "

1. The Committee noted the College continued to receive enquiries concerning this issue from a limited number of individuals and while it was the Committee's view that there was no scientific argument to support their concerns, nevertheless it agreed that it might be helpful to include a short article in RCVS News which made the point that the profession should exercise some care when recommending and selling pet food. Equally, the Committee considered that such an article might send the wrong signal by suggesting that the concerns expressed were somehow valid and therefore it was left to the RCVS Officers whether such an article should be included in the next issue of RCVS News. "

We go to print on Friday so .will make a decision before then.

Gordon

Gordon Hockey  
Head of Professional Conduct/Assistant Registrar  
Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

Direct Line 020 7202 0718

**Gordon Hockey**

---

**From:** RICHARD HALLIWELL [richard\_halliwell@btopenworld.com]  
**Sent:** 02 November 2006 13:25  
**To:** Gordon Hockey; richard halliwell  
**Cc:** Ian Holloway; Sue Whall  
**Subject:** Re: Pet Nutrition

Dear Gordon,

Greetings from Grenada!

Thank you for forwarding this document, which is obviously a huge improvement on the last one. Advisory, according to the minute, were worried that we could be attaching an element of validity to their concerns in such a document, and I fear that the draft may just give somewhat that impression. I wonder whether after the bit about RMB, and at the start of the last paragraph, one could add something like: "Following detailed perusal of the extensive correspondance, and discussions at a number of meetings, the College has concluded that the concerns expressed are without substance (or maybe "are without validity"). Nonetheless....."

Just a thought...

Best regards,  
Richard

**Gordon Hockey** <g.hockey@rcvs.org.uk> wrote:

Richard

I have at last got round to this and attached is a version with huge help from Jane and Lizzie.

This I think is better. Are you happy for this to be published?

Also attached is a copy of the draft Advisory Committee minute on this and the committee was worried that anything said might give the wrong impression on this.

" 'Raw Meaty Bones' "

1. *The Committee noted the College continued to receive enquiries concerning this issue from a limited number of individuals and while it was the Committee's view that there was no scientific argument to support their concerns, nevertheless it agreed that it might be helpful to include a short article in RCVS News which made the point that the profession should exercise some care when recommending and selling pet food. Equally, the Committee considered that such an article might send the wrong signal by suggesting that the concerns expressed were somehow valid and therefore it was left to the RCVS Officers whether such an article should be included in the next issue of RCVS News. "*

We go to print on Friday so will make a decision before then.

Thanks

Gordon

Gordon Hockey  
Head of Professional Conduct/Assistant Registrar  
Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

Direct Line 020 7202 0718

**Extract from Advisory Committee minutes for September 2006**

**'Raw Meaty Bones'**

1. The Committee noted the College continued to receive enquiries concerning this issue from a limited number of individuals and while it was the Committee's view that there was no scientific argument to support their concerns, nevertheless it agreed that it might be helpful to include a short article in RCVS News which made the point that the profession should exercise some care when recommending and selling pet food. Equally, the Committee considered that such an article might send the wrong signal by suggesting that the concerns expressed were somehow valid and therefore it was left to the RCVS Officers whether such an article should be included in the next issue of RCVS News.

## **Pet Nutrition**

Over the last few, years the RCVS has received considerable correspondence on pet nutrition. This interest perhaps mirrors a growing preoccupation with healthy eating at large, whether in the form of improved school dinners or initiatives to reduce trans-fats, salt and other additives in human diets.

During discussions with MPs and other individuals, questions have been raised about veterinary surgeons' responsibilities for pet nutrition. The Pet Food Manufacturers Association has recently gone public with a new website to provide better information, and individual pet food companies have called for more focus on pet nutrition at undergraduate level.

Meanwhile, an action group called Raw Meaty Bones has proclaimed its mission: "*.. to draw attention to the harm that feeding processed pet food causes our pet dogs and cats, and the continuing refusal by the veterinary authorities to acknowledge this.*"

It is therefore worth reminding members that while the responsibility for pet food sold out of practice premises may be limited to that of a retailer, if specific advice is given on pet nutrition, or particular products recommended, then this is part of professional practice. Veterinary surgeons should be aware that many clients buying pet food from them in either context will assume it carries some veterinary endorsement.

Nov 2006

**Gordon Hockey**

---

**From:** Jane Hern  
**Sent:** 01 November 2006 16:57  
**To:** Gordon Hockey; Lizzie Lockett  
**Cc:** Ian Holloway  
**Subject:** RE: Pet Nutrition.doc

Happy with this team effort

jch

---

**From:** Gordon Hockey  
**ent:** 01 November 2006 16:21  
**To:** Lizzie Lockett; Jane Hern  
**c:** Ian Holloway  
**subject:** RE: Pet Nutrition.doc

izzie

ooks good – I would like to check it with Richard Halliwell first so will get back to all in due course.

Thanks

G

Gordon Hockey  
Head of Professional Conduct/Assistant Registrar  
Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

irect Line 020 7202 0718

---

**From:** Lizzie Lockett  
**ent:** 01 November 2006 16:10  
**To:** Gordon Hockey; Jane Hern  
**c:** Ian Holloway  
**subject:** RE: Pet Nutrition.doc

Meanwhile I have had a fiddle with the paragraph order - how about this:

ver the last few, years the RCVS has received considerable correspondence on pet nutrition. This interest perhaps  
irrors a growing preoccupation with healthy eating at large, whether in the form of improved school dinners or  
initiatives to reduce trans-fats, salt and other additives in human diets.

uring discussions with MPs and other individuals, questions have been raised about veterinary surgeons'  
responsibilities for pet nutrition. The Pet Food Manufacturers Association has recently gone public with a new website  
to provide better information, and individual pet food companies have called for more focus on pet nutrition at  
ndergraduate level.

eanwhile, an action group called Raw Meaty Bones has proclaimed its mission: "*.. to draw attention to the harm that  
eeding processed pet food causes our pet dogs and cats, and the continuing refusal by the veterinary authorities to  
acknowledge this.*"

t is therefore worth reminding members that while the responsibility for pet food sold out of practice premises may be  
imited to that of a retailer, if specific advice is given on pet nutrition, or particular products recommended, then this is  
part of professional practice. Veterinary surgeons should be aware that many clients buying pet food from them in  
ither context will assume it carries some veterinary endorsement.

**Gordon Hockey**

---

**From:** Gordon Hockey  
**Sent:** 01 November 2006 16:21  
**To:** Lizzie Lockett; Jane Hern  
**Cc:** Ian Holloway  
**Subject:** RE: Pet Nutrition.doc

izzie

ooks good – I would like to check it with Richard Halliwell first so will get back to all in due course.

Thanks

G

Gordon Hockey  
Head of Professional Conduct/Assistant Registrar  
Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

irect Line 020 7202 0718

---

**From:** Lizzie Lockett  
**ent:** 01 November 2006 16:10  
**To:** Gordon Hockey; Jane Hern  
**c:** Ian Holloway  
**subject:** RE: Pet Nutrition.doc

Meanwhile I have had a fiddle with the paragraph order - how about this:

ver the last few, years the RCVS has received considerable correspondence on pet nutrition. This interest perhaps  
irrors a growing preoccupation with healthy eating at large, whether in the form of improved school dinners or  
nitiatives to reduce trans-fats, salt and other additives in human diets.

uring discussions with MPs and other individuals, questions have been raised about veterinary surgeons'  
responsibilities for pet nutrition. The Pet Food Manufacturers Association has recently gone public with a new website  
to provide better information, and individual pet food companies have called for more focus on pet nutrition at  
ndergraduate level.

eanwhile, an action group called Raw Meaty Bones has proclaimed its mission: *".. to draw attention to the harm that  
eeding processed pet food causes our pet dogs and cats, and the continuing refusal by the veterinary authorities to  
acknowledge this."*

t is therefore worth reminding members that while the responsibility for pet food sold out of practice premises may be  
imited to that of a retailer, if specific advice is given on pet nutrition, or particular products recommended, then this is  
part of professional practice. Veterinary surgeons should be aware that many clients buying pet food from them in  
ither context will assume it carries some veterinary endorsement.

---

**From:** Gordon Hockey  
**ent:** 01 November 2006 16:01  
**To:** Jane Hern; Lizzie Lockett  
**c:** Ian Holloway  
**subject:** FW: Pet Nutrition.doc

Jane

It is better – I have suggested removal of one paragraph. (This is the first document.)

Also attached for Lizzie is my original draft. (This is the second document.)

Gordon

Gordon Hockey  
Head of Professional Conduct/Assistant Registrar  
Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

Direct Line 020 7202 0718

---

**From:** Jane Hern  
**ent:** 01 November 2006 15:46  
**To:** Gordon Hockey; Lizzie Lockett  
**subject:** Pet Nutrition.doc

G - not sure this is better than your offering !  
erhaps Lizzie can help ??  
jch



## PET NUTRITION

Over the last few years we have received considerable correspondence on pet nutrition. This interest perhaps mirrors a growing preoccupation with healthy eating at large, whether in the form of improved school dinners or initiatives to reduce trans-fats, salt and other additives in human diets.

During discussions with MPs and other individuals, questions have been raised about veterinary surgeons' responsibilities for pet nutrition. The Pet Food Manufacturers Association has recently launched a new website to provide better information, and individual pet food companies have called for more focus on pet nutrition at undergraduate level.

Meanwhile, an action group called UKRMB (United Kingdom Raw Meaty Bones) has proclaimed its mission: *"... to draw attention to the harm that feeding processed pet food causes our*

*pet dogs and cats, and the continuing refusal by the veterinary authorities to acknowledge this."*

We have indicated to this group and others that there is no current evidence to support the allegation that processed pet food causes harm to cats and dogs. We have also suggested that other views should be submitted for peer-reviewed publication in the usual way.

Nevertheless, it is worth reminding members that while the responsibility for pet food sold out of practice premises may be limited to that of a retailer, if specific advice is given on pet nutrition, or particular products recommended, then this is part of professional practice. Veterinary surgeons should be aware that many



*There is a growing interest in pet nutrition.*

clients buying pet food from them in either context will assume it carries some veterinary endorsement.