

Correspondence re Biography and Statement re RCVS Council Election 2017

23 January 2017

Morning Tom,

I have heard back from the Registrar regarding your biography and statement on the Candidate Form. Regrettably, we are unable to accept them in their present style as both contain links to websites – both the guidance notes and the FAQs make it clear that links are not permitted and that there is also a limited word count (200 for the bio, 300 for the statement and cannot be amalgamated as we have a specific lay out and space to adhere to for print purposes). Also, company names are not permitted. There is the option to include a website address in the Information section of the Candidate Form, which you have completed.

If you could re-submit amended versions of both parts of the form (bio and statement) that would be grand.

Many thanks,

Yours,

Dawn.

Dawn Wiggins

PA/Secretary to Director of Legal Services/Registrar

27 January 2017

Morning Dawn,

Thanks for the message.

Please pass on the comments below.

Regarding the inclusion of links I am aware of the rules regarding the print version of the docs. (Unfortunately I temporarily forgot and included www.rawmeatybones.com in the text). However I thought it was a RCVS agreed convention that links are fine in the online version - indeed desirable and should be encouraged in this digital age.

For examples please see my last two years' docs:

<http://www.rawmeatybones.com/RCVS/2016/Dr%20Thomas%20Lonsdale%20-%20RCVS.htm>

and

http://www.rawmeatybones.com/RCVS/webpage_complete/Mr%20Thomas%20Lonsdale%20-%20RCVS.htm

About the word count my computer running Microsoft Word clearly indicates the Bio to be 199 words and the Statement 300 words. Please let me know if there is an alternative more accurate word counting system.

Regarding company names, I am unable to find any reference in the FAQ or Guidance Notes. Those organisations mentioned in the Statement are simply copied and pasted (with minor word count reduction) from the \$multi-billion Class Action court filing at:

<http://www.rawmeatybones.com/pdf/Class%20Action%20Doc.pdf>

Surely it's better to stick to accurate reporting of court documents rather than leave RCVS members guessing -- with all the potential misunderstandings that may entail. If the RCVS administration has an alternative view perhaps the Registrar would like to provide the Membership with an explanation.

I hope that the RCVS will adhere to past agreements and value transparent, frank statements of fact.

I have changed www.rawmeatybones.com in the Statement to read [website](#) as per the attached. Otherwise I believe that the document should remain unchanged.

Thanks in advance.

Cheers,

Tom

30 January 2017

Morning Tom,

I have relayed your reply to the Registrar and have been asked to let you know that, as previously directed, company names must still be removed from the documentation as well as the links to the different sites:

- We can use the biography wording as it is, so long as the links to sites and videos are removed;
- We cannot currently use the statement as it stands as this contains both company names and links within it – this means that any reference to Mars, Nestle, etc., will need to be deleted, as well as all links within the statement. However, if you wished to make a general reference to a class action in the USA, for example, “involving household names” or another general phrase that would be acceptable but, again, without links.

I would be grateful if you could please let me have your amended documentation by 5pm (GMT) tomorrow, 31 January 2017.

Many thanks,

Dawn.

31 January 2107

Morning Dawn,

Thanks for message. Unfortunately I'm off on a rare four day break so don't know if I'll get emails until the weekend.

However, I'm reluctant to accept the Registrar's rulings without any explanation.

For the last two years it's been perfectly OK to include links -- in keeping with modern electronic communication standards. That the new Registrar rules that this is somehow wrong or unacceptable without any supporting evidence strikes me as retrograde and without merit.

Please advise if the CEO and President are *au fait* with this ruling. If they support the ruling, please supply reasons that can be communicated to the membership.

=====

Regarding the inclusion of company names, again I think it appropriate that the membership should know who is making arbitrary rulings. There is nothing in the regulations or guidance notes that says people or organisations can't be named.

Please confirm that the CEO and President are aware of and in agreement with any ruling on this matter. If they are comfortable with the ban (a ban not mentioned in any written document) then please provide their reasoning.

For twenty years I've contested RCVS elections on matters of principle. Seems to me principles are what should inform our political discourse and I hope that the RCVS Executive will be happy to live by basic principles.

If things work out I'll get your reply in Nelsons Bay.

Gotta dash.

Cheers,

Tom

7 February 2017

Morning Tom,

Hope you had a good break in Nelson's Bay.

I've attached the final version of your statement: as previously discussed, the links have been removed from the text, as well as the company names – with the slight amendment to the first

sentence of the statement to include the term 'household names' instead (highlighted). Besides those, there have been no other changes.

The President is aware that links are not being allowed in this process (we do include the website address at the top of the form) but he has not seen nor agreed the statement as it is a conflict of interest as he is also standing in this current election. However, the CEO, Registrar and Assistant Registrar have all seen the statement and the changes were approved.

One other thing, unless you have any objection, we will use the photograph from last year (attached) for the booklet.

Many thanks,

Dawn.

9 February 2017

Hi Dawn,

Thank for confirmation of the final version and for making those changes to the satisfaction of the Executive.

21 years sure is a long time to be dishing up the unmistakable, incontrovertible truth -- to be ignored and given the run around by those who in the first instance are responsible for identifying and dealing with that truth.

In fact there's been several replacements of the various executives throughout that time.

Will it be another 21 years before the obvious is acted upon, I wonder?

Whilst we await that revelation, here's wishing you lots of good fun and laughter,

Cheers,

Tom

Ps. That photo is a couple of years old and I'm aging fast. So please do use the photo.